



CAMBRIDGE

CITY COUNCIL

Motion Information Pack

Motion A	1
Motion B	3
Motion D	4
Motion F	14

Amendment to Motion 7a – proposed by Cllr Smart

Retain:

This Council is deeply concerned at projected housing and wider impacts on hundreds of Cambridge households caused by

- multiple allowance and benefit cuts
- further cuts in local housing allowances payable under the Broad Market Rental Area policy, and
- planned Localism Bill changes that will reduce the rights of people in housing.

Then delete all the rest and replace with:

The Council notes that

- protecting services for the most vulnerable was agreed as a priority in the Annual Statement
- a motion affirming the importance of life-time tenancies in council housing was passed by this Council in October 2010
- lobbying by Julian Huppert MP and others, resulted in the dropping of the suggested 10% cut in housing benefit for those on Job Seekers Allowance
- lobbying by the Leader and others has resulted in grants being awarded by the Homes and Communities Agency for new housing in this area without the requirement to charge 80% of market rent
- lobbying on the inappropriate size of the Broad Market Rental Area has been continuous since the last Labour Government brought it in: this has been by both the Liberal Democrat MPs and by Liberal Democrat councillors.

- that there is already a requirement in the Equalities Plan to track the effect of changes to allowances and benefits
- that there are commitments listed in several of the Portfolio Plans to track and mitigate the impact of changes on the most vulnerable

This Council therefore calls on the Executive Councillors to

- take the steps already outlined in the Portfolio plans
- identify what else can be done and include appropriate actions in the next Portfolio Plans
- ensure that fairness and social cohesion are given their full weight when drawing up the Local Tenancy Strategy
- ensure that members are kept briefed on an ongoing basis

This Council further calls on all its members to lobby on the issues which cause particular concern in Cambridge including:

- the extent and impact of the former Labour Government's Broad Market Rental Area
- the suggested cap on the universal credit for those out of work
- the impact of benefit reassessment on the most vulnerable, including the mentally ill.

Alteration of wording to Motion b (Councillor Herbert and Price)

The Council is committed to employing Contractors who treat their staff well, and who consistently and fully meet expected employment and health and safety standards.

The Council calls on the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources to bring forward a report to the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee to review its existing standards for contractors seeking future contracts, including,

- appropriate pay rate policies
- pension scheme entitlement for all staff
- health and safety, including provision and wearing of Personal Protective Equipment
- trade union recognition
- regular reporting of compliance with equalities and employment legislation, and
- appropriate wider terms and conditions for the work involved and to also minimise all inappropriate use of agency workers, whether by Contractors or by the Council

Alteration of wording to Motion d (Councillor Smart and Brown)

The Council notes that

- diverse high-streets, with a healthy representation of small traders, can form an integral part of the social fabric of local communities
- the competitive environment of the high street increasingly tends to produce generic streets populated by chain stores, resulting in "Clone Towns"
- the Localism Bill is designed to give more powers to local councils and local people to shape their neighbourhoods
- Liberal Democrat parliamentarians have responded to a call for action from Cambridge City and County Councillors by tabling an amendment to the Localism Bill, "The Cambridge Amendment" (153AKC) that would allow councils and the local community to protect the diversity of the local high street by giving councils a new power to protect retail vitality and diversity including taking into account whether the business is "independent" or "multiple".
- Labour parliamentarians have tabled similar amendments, including 153AKA that requires councils to adopt a sequential, "town centre first" approach to development of retail sites in order to stop retail diversity in town centres being harmed by out-of-town developments

The Council asks the Leader to write to both Cambridge MPs and to members of the House of Lords with links to Cambridge to support both amendments to the Localism Bill and invites all Councillors similarly to seek support for the amendments.

Amendment to Motion 7d – proposed by Cllr Pogonowski

KEEP ALL and ADD as a FINAL PARAGRAPH:

“The City Council further requests that Liberal Democrat Members in the House of Lords push for a vote on the Cambridge Amendment, and do not withdraw it as their colleagues have done on other positive amendments to the Bill in the House of Commons.”

Background Note for Motion 7d

Introduction

The Localism Bill started in the House of Commons and is now in the House of Lords in its Committee Stage. Detailed line-by-line examination of the separate parts (clauses and schedules) of the Bill takes place during this stage. Any Member of the Lords can take part. The committee stage has now had seven sittings and it is expected that there will be two further sittings.

At the 7th sitting on 12 July Lord Greaves tabled **Amendment** 153AKC, which proposed a new **clause**, entitled, "**Health and diversity of town centres and high streets**".

Lord Greaves said in the Chamber that,

"The **amendment** that I am proposing is slightly different because, unlike the others, it concentrates not so much on town centres but on town centres and high streets..."

"...My **amendment**, which internally we are calling the "**Cambridge amendment**", comes from campaigners in a part of **Cambridge** called **Mill Road**-a shopping street that is not part of the town centre but is a district shopping street of great variety that is under threat. It was at the suggestion of the campaigners that resulted in us putting this **amendment** together..."

"...I want to include an extra section in that, saying, first, that the duties in putting together the development documents should include, **a requirement to assess the vitality and diversity of the shopping areas in the area.**

Secondly, that:

When preparing local development documents and other local planning documents the local planning authority must consider the results of that assessment and consider whether to include appropriate policies to promote the vitality and diversity of those shopping areas.

Thirdly, that:

The local planning authority may prepare a scheme for retail vitality and diversity which may be a local development document or other local planning document.

The local planning authority may,

Define a network of retail centres in the area ... assess the existing character and vitality of those centres ... designate the desired retail mix for each of these retail centres ... promote sustainability and diversity in the retail mix that is desired in each case.

In doing this, it must consult with the local community, which includes the traders in each shopping centre, and a shopping area means an area of town centre or high street where the substantial use is retail. So sustainability and diversity, which we are suggesting should be foremost in these policies, means that there is an appropriate balance of independent and multiple traders, of unit sizes, and balances of classes of use."

This was one of 3 similar amendments put forward. Lord Greaves withdrew the amendment to allow it to be resubmitted during the report stage, to enable a single, stronger clause to be put forward. At the end of committee stage, the Bill moves to report stage for further examination.

The report stage in the Chamber gives all Members of the Lords further opportunity to consider all amendments (proposals for change) to a Bill. Report stage usually starts 14 days after committee stage. It can be spread over several days (but usually fewer days than at committee stage).

The Bill moves to third reading for the final chance for the Lords to debate and amend the Bill. After third reading in the Lords, the amended Bill is sent back to the Commons for it to consider the Lords amendments.

Both Houses must agree on the exact wording of the Bill. There is no set time period between the third reading of a Bill and consideration of any Commons or Lords amendments.

Background Note 2 for Motion 7d (Prepared by Councillor Owers)

Introduction

In addition to the so-called 'Cambridge amendment', Amendment 153AKC, moved by Lib Dem Lord Greaves in the Localism Bill's Committee Stage, several other amendments have been moved at Commons and Lords stages by Labour MPs and Peers.

On 17th May 2011, in the Localism Bill's House of Commons Report stage, Jack Dromey MP, Labour Shadow Minister for Communities and Local Government, moved amendment New Clause 29, entitled "**Retail Diversity Scheme**".

Jack Dromey said in the chamber:

"We need to do more to put the heart back into Britain's high streets. New clause 29 would require a local planning authority to include a retail diversity scheme within its local development framework. Crucially, the scheme would be developed through a consultation process with the local community, with the voices of local people and of local retailers heard. The new clause establishes a vital goal: the promotion of retail diversity, striking the right balance between large and small businesses and, in particular, focusing on establishing and growing small and specialist retail businesses."

He added:

"The new clause ensures that communities and not central Government decide how their retail provision should change and grow to meet their needs."

The New Clause 29 amendment, supported by the Association of Convenience Stores and the Campaign to Protect Rural England, contains the following provisions:

- 1) Makes it compulsory for local authorities to "prepare and maintain a scheme to be known as their retail diversity scheme", which must form part of the authority's Local Development Scheme.
- 2) This scheme must
 - (a) define a network and hierarchy of retail centres in the local authority area,
 - (b) assess the need for development in retail centres,
 - (c) identify sites for development based on the sequential approach, and
 - (d) promote retail diversity.
- 3) It defines 'retail diversity' as "a mix of retail provision that meets the requirements of the local catchment area in terms of range and quality of comparison and convenience retail businesses"

4) It defines the 'sequential approach' as meaning that local planning authorities must identify sites that are suitable, available and viable for development in the following order—

- i. locations in appropriate existing centres;
- ii. edge of centre locations, with preference given to sites that are or will be well connected to existing retail centres;
- iii. out of centre sites with preference given to sites well served by a choice of transport and are closest to existing centre.

5) It requires local planning authorities to consult with the local community in developing the scheme.

This amendment was voted down by the government by 308 votes to 224.

Later on, at the House of Lords Committee Stage on 12th July 2011, Lord McKenzie of Luton, Labour spokesperson for Communities and Local Government, tabled Amendment 153AKA, which was basically the same as NC 29, in the Lords. The 'Cambridge Amendment', amendment 153AKC, was put forward by Lib Dem Lord Greaves. This is very similar to the Labour amendment, and was covered in the first briefing note.

Discussing the Labour amendment, Lib Dem Lord Greaves said, "The policies that we set out are similar to those in the amendment from the noble Lord, Lord McKenzie"

Discussing Lord Greaves's 'Cambridge Amendment', Lord McKenzie said that "we [Labour] can and will support that amendment".

A further amendment of a similar nature was moved by Lib Dem Lord Cotter. With regards to these similar amendments, Lord Greaves, the Lib Dem, said "I am sure that if the three of us sat around a table, we might well have been to come up with an amendment with which we all agreed and would combine the best of all three amendments"

So far, the government has not clearly supported either the Labour or the Lib Dem amendments. Lord Taylor of Holbeach, speaking for the government in the Lords, suggested that these amendments might constitute a veiled attempt to promote an anti competition, anti-supermarket agenda, and said that councils may have other tools to promote retail diversity under existing legislation and also the provisions of the Localism Bill, for example via planning, business improvement districts and 'neighbourhood plans'. It remains to be seen what revised amendment will be put forward by Labour and Lib Dem peers when the bill comes to its Lords Report stage later this year.

153 AKA, After Clause 105,

Insert the following new Clause—

“Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: retail diversity

After section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (local development scheme) insert—

“15A Retail diversity

(1) The local planning authority must prepare and maintain a scheme to be known as their “retail diversity scheme”.

(2) The retail diversity scheme must form part of the local development scheme within two years of the local development scheme being published or within two years of this Act being passed, whichever is later.

(3) The scheme must—

- (a) define a network and hierarchy of retail centres in the local authority area,
- (b) assess the need for development in retail centres,
- (c) identify sites for development based on the sequential approach, and
- (d) promote retail diversity.

(4) In this section—

“retail diversity” means a mix of retail provision that meets the requirements of the local catchment area in terms of range and quality of comparison and convenience retail businesses;

“sequential approach” means that local planning authorities must identify sites that are suitable, available and viable for development in the following order—

- (a) locations in appropriate existing centres;

- (b) edge of centre locations, with preference given to sites that are or will be well connected to existing retail centres; and
- (c) out of centre sites with preference given to sites well served by a choice of transport and closest to an existing centre.

(5) The Secretary of State may direct the local planning authority to make such amendments to the scheme as the Secretary of State thinks appropriate.

(6) Any direction given under subsection (5) must include the Secretary of State's reasons for giving the direction.

(7) The local planning authority must consult the local community in developing the scheme.

(8) The local community to be consulted under subsection (7) must include—

- (a) a parish council or parish councils authorised to act in relation to the neighbourhood area or areas to which the retail diversity scheme relates subject to section 61F of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990,
- (b) a “qualifying body” authorised to act in relation to the neighbourhood area or areas to which the retail diversity scheme relates subject to section 61F of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and
- (c) any other local person at the discretion of the local planning authority.

(9) Where a retail planning application is submitted and there is no retail diversity scheme in place—

- (a) the applicant must provide a statement to the local planning authority that sets out how the development impacts on the criteria identified in subsection (3), and
- (b) the local planning authority must consult the local community, before the local planning authority may reach a decision on the application.”

153AKC, After Clause 106

Insert the following new Clause—

“Health and diversity of town centres and high streets

After section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
(preparation of local development documents) insert—

“19A Town centres and high streets

(1) The duties under section 13 include a requirement to assess the vitality and diversity of the shopping areas in the area.

(2) When preparing local development documents and other local planning documents the local planning authority must consider the results of that assessment and consider whether to include appropriate policies to promote the vitality and diversity of those shopping areas.

(3) The local planning authority may prepare a scheme for retail vitality and diversity which may be a local development document or other local planning document.

(4) Policies set out in documents prepared under subsections (2) and (3) may—

(a) define a network of retail centres in the area,

(b) assess the existing character and vitality of those retail centres,

(c) designate the desired retail mix for each of those retail centres,

(d) promote sustainability and diversity in the retail mix that is desired in each case.

(5) The local planning authority must consult with the local community when making the assessment under subsections (1) and (2) and deciding whether to adopt policies under subsections (2) and (3).

(6) If a planning application is submitted for—

(a) a retail use, or

(b) a change of use from a retail use,

and policies under subsections (2) and (3) are still in preparation, the applicant must provide a statement to the local planning authority that sets out how the development will impact on the criteria identified in paragraph (4)(d) and the local planning authority must consult the local community before coming to a decision.

(7) In this section—

“local community” includes the traders in each shopping centre;

“shopping area” means an area of a town centre or high street where a substantial use is retail;

“sustainability and diversity” means that there is an appropriate balance of—

(a) independent and multiple traders,

(b) unit sizes, and

(c) a balances of classes of use.””

HMS Protector

Royal Navy ice patrol ship

Commodore Tim Hennessey, the Naval Regional Commander for Eastern England responsible for Royal Navy Community Relations within the Region, has approached us with a proposal to create an affiliation with the city and the new ice patrol ship HMS Protector.

The Royal Navy already has links with Cambridge through both the Cambridge University Royal Navy Unit and the Royal Navy Careers office in Hills Road.

Once commissioned into the Royal Navy fleet on 23 June, HMS Protector will carry out the functions of an Antarctic patrol ship. She will deploy for seven months of the year to patrol and survey the Antarctic and South Atlantic, maintaining a UK presence and supporting the international community in the region. This involves close links with the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, the UK Hydrographic Office and the British Antarctic Survey.

Protector will be equipped with a survey motorboat and two rigid inflatable boats which will be replaced next year by a landing craft vehicle. She will also have three all-terrain vehicles and three quad bikes which will be craned directly onto the ice to assist in the re-supply of British Antarctic Survey scientific stations.

The Navy wishes to use the affiliation to promote community relations and to promote careers in the Navy. They understand we do not have resources to support significant activities and will be a 'low maintenance' relationship. They have identified Cambridge as the city to affiliate to because of existing links and the British Antarctic Survey and Scott Polar Research Institute connections.

The Mayor has indicated his support for the affiliation and will be moving a motion at the council meeting welcoming the suggestion. If the council supports the motion then First Sea Lord will then write to us formally about the affiliation and we would mark the formal affiliation at the October Council meeting. The ship may be able to dock in Ipswich in late August so the crew can begin to make connections with Scott Polar Research Institute and the British Antarctic Survey and the city council before they go to the Antarctic in November.