

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 18 July 2017

Time: 1.30am – 5.35pm

Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillor M Smith (Chairman)
Councillors: D Adey, D Ambrose-Smith, A Bailey, H Batchelor, I Bates, C Boden, A Bradnam, S Bywater, D Connor, A Costello, S Count, S Crawford, S Criswell, K Cuffley, P Downes, L Dupre, L Every, R Fuller, I Gardener, D Giles, J Gowing, N Harrison, A Hay, R Hickford, M Howell, S Hoy, P Hudson, B Hunt, D Jenkins, L Jones, L Joseph, N Kavanagh, S Kindersley, S King, I Manning, M McGuire (Vice-Chairman), E Meschini, L Nethsingha, P Raynes, K Reynolds, C Richards, T Rogers, T Sanderson, J Schumann, J Scutt, M Shellens, M Shuter, A Taylor, S Taylor, S Tierney, P Topping, S van de Ven, D Wells, J Whitehead, J Williams, G Wilson, J Wisson and T Wotherspoon

Apologies: Councillors J French and L Harford

17. MINUTES – 23RD MAY 2017

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 23rd May were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

18. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made a number of announcements as set out in **Appendix A**.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct.

The Chairman advised that the Monitoring Officer had issued a dispensation, for items 8 (Members' Allowances) and 10 (Consultation on Changes of Governance with Fire), from the provisions of the Members' Code of Conduct in respect of the debates relating to those matters.

20. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman noted one question received from a member of the public as set out in **Appendix B**.

21. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

22. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Treasury Management Report Quarter Four

It was moved by the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee, Councillor Count, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hickford, that the recommendation from the General Purposes Committee as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved by a show of hands to agree to:

note the Treasury Management Quarter Four Report 2016-17.

23. ITEM FOR DETERMINATION FROM HIGHWAYS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Proposed Network Rail (Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Reduction) Order

It was moved by the Chairman of the Highways and Community Infrastructure Policy and Service Committee, Councillor Shuter, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Hunt, that the recommendations as set out on the Council agenda be approved.

It was resolved by a show of hands to:

- a) agree the proposed full response to the draft Network Rail (Cambridgeshire Level Crossing Reduction) Order;
- b) agree that officers should continue negotiations with Network Rail, and that any changes to the Council's position prior to the Public Inquiry should be delegated to the Executive Director: Economy Transport & Environment, in consultation with the Chairman of the Highways & Community Infrastructure Committee.

24. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Smith, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire, and agreed to formally receive the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel on Members' Allowances.

The recommendations as set out in the report were moved by Chairman of Council, Councillor Smith, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire

Councillor Count moved an amendment seconded by Councillor King as set out in **Appendix C**.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour and

Independents against; one Conservative abstained.]

Following discussion, the substantive motion (as set out in Appendix C) on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Labour and Independents against; one Conservative abstained.]

25. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

a) A change to the Council's Contract Procedure Rules for when the Council receives fewer than three bids back from a competitive process

It was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor Reynolds, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

It was resolved by a majority:

to agree that paragraph 4.7 of Part 1 of the Contract Procedure Rules be amended to read (additional text in italics and underlined):

4.7 Exemptions over the Council's Key Decision Threshold

Exemption requests cannot be sought for exemptions equal to or above the Council's Key Decision threshold, *except where the minimum number of bids cannot be obtained following a competitive process (tender/call off from a framework etc.). In that case, written approval to read and evaluate the responses must be obtained from the Chief Officer for the area conducting the procurement and the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer.*

[Voting pattern: Conservatives, most Labour, two Independents and one Liberal Democrat in favour; two Labour against; nearly all Liberal Democrats and one Independent abstained]

b) Revision of the Terms of Reference for the Audit and Accounts Committee

It was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by Councillor Hickford, and resolved unanimously that:

the Terms of Reference for the Audit and Accounts Committee be modified in accordance with the draft Terms of Reference set out at report Annex B.

c) County Council – proposed changes to the Constitution

It was moved by the Chairman of the Constitution and Ethics Committee, Councillor McGuire, and seconded by Councillor Hickford, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

Councillor McGuire moved an addition, seconded by Councillor Hickford to the

change agreed at the annual meeting of Council, as set out in **Appendix D**, which involved changing Part 3B/Section 12 - Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board membership - additions shown in bold and italics below. This amendment on being put to the vote was carried unanimously.

Membership

- Five County Councillors (to include the Chairman/woman, ***or Vice-Chairman/woman or any member*** of the ***following***: Adults, the Health, and the Children and Young People Policy and Service Committees)
- Five nominated District Council representatives (supported by Senior District Council officer with Observer Status)
- Three representatives of the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) (nominated by the CCG Governing Body)
- Five representatives for NHS providers (a mix of non-executive directors and executives, one each from Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust; Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust; Hinchingsbrooke Health Care NHS Trust; Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)
- One representative of the local HealthWatch*
- Director of Public Health*
- Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults*
- Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer)
- Representative of NHS Commissioning Board*

* Statutory members of the HWB. There is also a statutory requirement for at least one Local Authority Councillor, and at least one representative of the CCG, to be a member of the HWB.

Councillor Nethsingha moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Dupré as set out in **Appendix E**. This amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

[Voting pattern: Liberal Democrats and Independents in favour; Conservatives against; Labour abstained].

Following discussion, the substantive motion, on being put to the vote was carried by a majority.

- (i) that the number of substitute members be equal to the number of members on a committee/sub-committee with a minimum of three substitute members per political group.
- (ii) that the two new committees, Commercial and Investment Committee and Communities and Partnership Committee, be classified as policy and service committees.
- (iii) to remove the following requirement in the Council Procedure Rules which states that the Annual Meeting will "Receive a short (two sides of A4) report on each Policy and Service Committee. The report to be prepared by the relevant Service and not open for discussion at the meeting."
- (iv) that Article 7, paragraph 7.03 of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect that the Vice-Chairman/woman of General

Purposes Committee shall be, ex officio, Deputy Council Leader.

- (v) that Article 7, paragraph 7.05 of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect that one briefing meeting shall be held for all opposition lead members to brief them on the agenda for future service committee meetings and consider any other issues the officer may think appropriate.
- (vi) to recommend to Full Council that Part 3A – Responsibility for Functions, Section 2(f) of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect the fact that Council also appoints the Chairman/woman and Vice-Chairman/woman of Commercial and Investment Committee and Communities and Partnership Committee, and the Chairman/woman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- (vii) to remove the following requirement in Part 2 – Articles, Article 7 of The Council's Constitution which states:

“7.06 Training

The Council will hold an annual training day for Chairmen/women, Vice-Chairmen/women and lead members with a focus on their roles and remits individually and collectively.”

- (viii) to revert to the original meeting start time of 10.30am for all full Council meetings.
- (ix) that the re-drafted terms of reference for the Commercial and Investment Committee be adopted, as set out in Appendix A of the report before Council;
- (x) that in relation to the Corporate Asset Management Plan and the Strategy Asset Development Strategy, Full Council takes into account the recommendation of Commercial and Investment Committee rather than of General Purposes Committee.
- (xi) to remove reference in the Constitution to approving the Local Transport Plan.

[Voting pattern: most Conservatives voted in favour; Labour, Independents, Liberal Democrats and one Conservative voted against]

26. CONSULTATION ON CHANGES OF GOVERNANCE WITH FIRE

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor Smith, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire, that the recommendations as set out in the report be approved.

Councillor Count moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Shellens as set out below. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried unanimously.

The substantive motion, as amended, on being put to the vote was also carried unanimously.

It was resolved to:

Submit the following responses to the consultation, issued by the Cambridgeshire Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) on the changes to the governance of the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service:

- (i) Express its opposition to the option as detailed with the PCC Business case option 3 (Governance Model)
- (ii) Express its support for option 2 (Representative model) and
- (iii) wholly support and endorse the response of Cambridgeshire & Peterborough's Fire Authority to the consultation process
- (iv) delegate the preparation of a full written response to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, by the closing date of 4 September 2017.

Furthermore this Council

- (v) delegates to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council the preparation of a letter to the minister responsible for emergency services, the PCC and the chair of the Ambulance trust setting out this councils view that a blue light hub, based on the Fire Service and Ambulance service is looked at in greater detail and the reasons behind this including the clear and historical synergy between both of these important public services.

27. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF HEALTH COMMITTEE, AND THE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

It was moved by the Chairman of Council, Councillor M Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman of Council, Councillor McGuire and resolved by a majority:

- (i) to approve the appointment of Councillor P Hudson as Chairman, and Councillor C Boden as Vice-Chairman of the Health Committee.

The Chairman, Councillor Smith, requested nominations for the Chairman/woman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Councillor Nethsingha proposed, seconded by Councillor van de Ven, to appoint Councillor Jenkins as the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

Councillor Tierney proposed, seconded by Councillor Hoy, to appoint Councillor Topping as the Chairman of the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board.

On both candidates being put to the vote, it was resolved:

- (ii) to approve the appointment of Councillor P Topping as Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

[Voting pattern for Councillor Jenkins: Liberal Democrats, Independents and most Labour voted in favour; Conservatives against; one Labour abstention]

[Voting pattern for Councillor Topping: Conservatives voted in favour; Independents, Liberal Democrats and most Labour voted against; two Labour abstentions]

28. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS (CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY – OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE)

It was moved by the Chairman of the Council, Councillor Smith, and seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor McGuire, and resolved unanimously:

To approve the change in membership to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority – Overview and Scrutiny Committee to appoint Councillor J French to replace Councillor P Hudson.

29. MOTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

One motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

a) Motion from Councillor Nethsingha

The following motion was proposed by Councillor L Nethsingha and seconded by Councillor Dupre:

This Council notes that:

The large number of studies which are looking at congestion on the A10 King's Lynn to Cambridge corridor including:

- County Council work on the A10 to King's Lynn in response to a previous motion.

City Deal work on the section of the A10 from the A14 interchange to the edge of the City Deal area.

- Work being done in response to the Mayor's 100 days programme, looking at an M11 extension north of the Bar Hill junction.

- Work in progress to improve the rail network in the same area.

This Council notes that with so many different groups requesting large scale changes any decisions on major road building projects to the north of Cambridge are likely to have to wait until work on all these studies is complete, as major changes to the road network will need to be considered together.

This council notes that under these circumstances major improvements to the A10 are unlikely to start quickly.

This council notes that congestion on the A10 largely occurs at junctions.

This council therefore requests that a small study on the impact of improving the junctions between Littleport, and the A14 be carried out, with a view to improving flow at the junctions, to allow traffic to run smoothly along the current road in the short to medium term.

Councillor Bates moved an amendment seconded by Councillor Bailey as set out in **Appendix F**. This amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives and Labour in favour; Liberal Democrats and two Independents against; one Independent abstention]

Following discussion, the substantive motion (as set out in Appendix F) on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives and Labour in favour; one Independent against; Liberal Democrats and two Independents abstained.]

30. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH COMBINED AUTHORITY AND OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – ORAL QUESTIONS

Eight questions were asked, in accordance with the protocol agreed by Council on 14th February 2017. *(The questions and answers were filmed and are available (3 hours 43 minutes and 15 seconds into the recording on the Council's You Tube site at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O58fll2eDJ8>)*

The following items were agreed for further action:

- In response to a question from Councillor Dupre, Councillor Count agreed to provide all members of Council with a written response regarding the relationship between the East Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy and Interim Transport Strategy for the whole of Cambridgeshire.

31. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Four written questions were submitted under Council Procedure 9.2 as set out in **Appendix G**.

.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 18TH JULY 2017
CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Carla Hall

It is with regret that the Chairman reports the death of Carla Hall, a valued member of the Reablement Team at Sawston who has died, aged just 36.

Carla really cared about the people she helped and had patience for everyone. She was a happy and bubbly young woman who loved her job helping people. She will be sorely missed in the team and the Council’s thoughts are with her family, friends and colleagues at this very sad time.

Children, Families and Adults Management Changes

Wendi Ogle-Welbourn is now the permanent Executive Director: People & Communities Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils.

The following permanent appointments have also been made:

Charlotte Black - Service Director: Adults & Safeguarding

Adrian Chapman - Service Director: Community and Safety

Will Patten - Service Director: Commissioning

Lou Williams - Service Director: Children & Safeguarding

Claire Bruin – Assistant Director: Adults (Cambridgeshire only)

Sarah Ferguson – Assistant Director: Housing, Communities & Youth

Meredith Teasdale – Assistant Director: Commissioning (Cambridgeshire only)

Sarah-Jane Smedmor - Assistant Director: Housing, Communities and Youth

Keith Grimwade continues as Service Director for Learning for Cambridgeshire only until he retires in December 2017.

AWARDS

Municipal Journal Awards

Cambridgeshire County Council has been jointly commended, by the Municipal Journal judges, with Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group, for the Joint Child Health and Wellbeing Commissioning Unit (JCU) in the Reinventing Public Services category. This three-way partnership set up the JCU in 2015 to create a more integrated approach to the commissioning of services for children, young people and their families. It was also shortlisted in the Delivery Better Outcomes category.

Customer Service Excellence Award - Payroll and HR Transactions

The Payroll and HR Transactions service has been independently recognised with a Customer Service Excellence Award for the second year running, achieving an improved rating, called Compliant Plus.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities (SEND)

Following a recent SEND Inspection, Ofsted have told the County Council that the outcomes for children and young people in Cambridgeshire with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) are improving, and strong leadership from organisations and agencies involved in supporting them is making a difference.

Ofsted

Parkside Community College, Cambridge and The Fields Children's Centre, Cambridge have been judged 'outstanding' by Ofsted, having previously been judged 'good'.

Stonewall's Education Equality Index 2017

Cambridgeshire is leading the way when it comes to tackling homophobic, biphobic and transphobic (HBT) bullying in its schools ranking in the top five authorities in a prestigious index. The County Council has been listed as fourth in LGBT equality charity Stonewall's *Education Equality Index 2017*, which was published on June 28. The Council had to submit a range of evidence including how it works with local schools and the community to prevent and tackle HBT bullying, and what elected members have been doing to promote LGBT issues. Cambridgeshire's submission for the award was led by CREDS (Cambridgeshire Race Equality and Diversity Service) in partnership with the newly-branded Kite Trust (formerly SexYOUality) – the local charity that supports LGBT children and young people in the county.

MESSAGES

His Royal Highness The Duke of York

The Chairman was honoured to welcome His Royal Highness The Duke of York to Cambridge recently, on behalf of the County Council.

On Tuesday 11 July, His Royal Highness visited AstraZeneca at Academy House, Cambridge. During the day, he also visited the Cambridge Biomedical Campus and the Cambridge Judge Business School.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18TH JULY 2017

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

No.	Question from:	Question to:	Question
1.	Mr Antony Carpen	Councillor Mathew Shuter	"What plans do councillors have for increasing the budget for, and increasing the revenue-raising activities of the county archives? What plans do councillors have to improve the online presence of the archives service?"
	Response from:	Response to:	Response
	Councillor Mathew Shuter	Mr Antony Carpen	<p>Thank you very much Mr Carpen. I'm disappointed not to see your assistant; I understand you have a mythical beast who is normally with you, so I was hoping this would be my first opportunity to address a mythical beast but clearly he's not with you today, so <i>(inaudible interjection from Mr Carpen)</i> - oh I see. So am I so, you know we're at one on that one.</p> <p>I'm afraid there are no plans to increase the revenue at the moment, in this area. However you've raised some very important and interesting points which I will certainly discuss with officers. The plans we do have is that we recognise that the archive service is effectively operating at the statutory minimum at the moment and there's much more we can do on that. The future efficiencies on the increased income generation are really important. I appreciate the costs that you're talking about may not be great as far as you're concerned but we need to look at this whole area and see if we can produce more income and make it more accessible. We're looking to sell images of documents, carry out research for enquirers, repair and conserve documents for external customers, so that's another area that potentially can produce income. And I mean obviously it is a very extensive collection as you rightly point out, which you'd expect in an area with the history of Cambridgeshire. We are looking to give talks to outside groups which also can generate further income and once the service relocates to Ely, which is where it's going, we hope to greatly extend the ability of this service to respond. Obviously it will be important for people who live in Cambridge to have access to it; there is train access, but also we need to do a lot more to increase our web presence and the ability of that web presence to be searchable, to have the</p>

			documents in a much more accessible form. As you rightly point out this is a potential for revenue generation, so it is something we certainly are investigating at the moment.
--	--	--	--

Item 8 – Members’ allowances

Amendment from Cllr Count

To replace recommendation (a) with the following:

It is recommended that Full Council

- (a) Having considered the proposed scheme of allowances contained in appendix 1 to the report, rejects it and approves as an alternative, the scheme listed below to take effect from the 19th July 2017.

Substitute Allowances Scheme proposal

Elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council may claim the following allowances as specified in this Scheme:

- Basic allowance;
- Special responsibility allowances; and
- Travel and subsistence allowances.

Financial loss allowance is not available to Councillors.

- 1.1 The basic allowance and special responsibility allowances will be paid in equal monthly instalments and will be subject to tax and national insurance deductions where appropriate. The scheme to take effect from 19th July 2017 with no indexation and to last for a period of four years or until the next review whichever is soonest.

2. Basic Allowance

- 2.1 The basic allowance is £10,315.

3. Special Responsibility Allowances

- 3.1 No member may receive more than one special responsibility allowance. No allowances other than the basic allowance and special responsibility allowances are payable.

Role	Allowance
Group Positions	
Leader of the Council	£31,745
Deputy Leader of the Council	£20,627
Leader of the Main Opposition (12 Seats or more)	£10,234
Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition (12 Seats or more)	£1,790
Leader of Minor Opposition (Based on 4 seats to 13 any allowance proportionally based on 7 seats = 100%)	£3,825
Deputy Leader Minor Opposition (Based on 17.3% of their leadership)	£662
Service Committees	
Policy and Service Committee Chair	£18,372
Policy and Service Committee Vice Chair	£7,927
Area Community Champions	£5,000
Regulatory Committees	
Audit Committee Chair	£7,345
Pension Fund Board Chair	£7,345
Planning Committee Chair	£7,345

Other Roles	
Adoption/Fostering Panel Member	£3,750

- 3.2 Where a councillor in receipt of a special responsibility allowance fails to attend at least 50% of the meetings for which that allowance is paid in any six month period, that councillor shall be invited to repay an appropriate sum of the allowance received during that period.

4. Travel expenses

- 4.1 Travel by private vehicles will be reimbursed at the same rates as those used by officers.
- 4.2 Where a councillor's normal place of residence is outside of Cambridgeshire, travel to council offices within Cambridgeshire will be paid from the point of entry to the county and not from the councillor's home.
- 4.3 Parking fees and public transport fares will be reimbursed at cost on production of a valid ticket or receipt. In the case of travel by rail, standard class fare or actual fare paid (if less) will be reimbursed.
- 4.4 Travel allowances are not payable for journeys undertaken outside the County, other than for authorised attendance on behalf of the Council at those meetings under Section 10 (below) that are held outside the County. International travel shall require approval in advance from the Chief Executive in consultation with the Council Leader.
- 4.5 Taxi fares will only be reimbursed on production of a valid receipt. Taxis should only be used where use of an alternative is not available or if the following conditions are applicable:
- There is a significant saving in official time;
 - The councillor has to transport heavy luggage or equipment; and/or
 - Where councillors are travelling together and it is therefore a cheaper option.
- 4.6 Travel expenses will be reimbursed for any journey undertaken where the councillor was undertaking approved duties (see Section 10 below). Travel expenses will only be reimbursed if claimed within two months.

5. Subsistence expenses

- 5.1 Overnight hotel accommodation must be booked through Democratic Services who will ensure that accommodation is booked at the appropriate market rate. Higher rates of accommodation will only be booked where it is clearly in the County Council's interest and formal approval has been given in advance by the Democratic Services Manager. Any other reasonable and unavoidable costs related to overnight stays will be reimbursed on production of a receipt.
- 5.2 The cost of meals purchased while undertaking Council business cannot be claimed for, except where the member is attending an event such as a conference and meals are not provided, or where the member is required to stay overnight.
- 5.3 The Democratic Services Manager shall be authorised to allow claims to cover the actual cost of the meals up to a reasonable maximum (£10 for lunch, £15 for an evening meal) and upon production of a receipt.

6. Dependents' and carers' expenses

- 6.1 Councillors with care responsibilities in respect of dependent children under 16 or dependent adults certified by a doctor or social worker as needing attendance will be reimbursed, on production of valid receipts, for actual payments to a registered or professional carer. Where care was not provided by a registered or professional carer but was provided by an individual not formally resident at the member's home, a maximum hourly rate equivalent to the National Living Wage (currently £9.45/hour) will be payable.
- 6.2 Dependents' and carers' expenses will only be reimbursed if incurred where the councillor was undertaking approved duties (see section 9 below).

7. Stationery

- 7.1 No claims can be made for the cost of printer cartridges, paper, envelopes, stamps, pens, or other stationery. Nor are these to be provided free of charge by the Council.

8. Co-opted Members – Financial Loss Allowance

- 8.1 A financial loss allowance may only be paid to non-elected members of committees or sub-committees. Co-opted members serving on committees shall be eligible to claim a £50.00 flat fee per half day attended in addition to travel and subsistence allowances.
- 8.2 The fee shall also be paid for attendance at appropriate training events and seminars. Where an event is scheduled to last for more than a whole day, there shall be some discretion for making a higher payment than the usual rate, where this is considered reasonable. The Democratic Services Manager shall be authorised to exercise such discretion.

9. Approved duties

- 9.1 Subject to the provisions listed above, travel, subsistence and dependents' and carers' expenses incurred when undertaking duties matching the following descriptions may be claimed for:
- a) Attendance at meetings of Full Council and any committees, working groups or other bodies of the Council;
 - b) Attendance at other meetings clearly related to their role as a Councillor.
 - c) Attendance at Council premises for the purposes of taking part in formal briefings, training sessions or attending pre-arranged meetings with senior officers to discuss the business of the Council.
 - d) Representing the Council at external meetings, including Parish and Town Councils and those of voluntary organisations where the member is there on behalf of the Council;
 - e) Attendance at events organised by the Council and/or where invitations have been issued by officers or councillors (including Chairman's events and other corporate events);
 - f) Attendance at meetings/events where the Member is an official Council representative or requested by the Leader or the relevant Policy and Service Committee Chair; and
 - g) In respect of dependents' and carers' expenses only, undertaking general councillor responsibilities including surgeries.

Expenses incurred as a result of attendance at political group meetings or other party political events may not be claimed for.

10. Renunciation of Allowances and Part Year Entitlements

10.1 A Councillor may elect to forego any part of their entitlement to an allowance under this scheme by providing written notice to the Monitoring Officer.

10.2 If an amendment to this Scheme is made which affects payment of an allowance in the year in which the amendment is made, then in relation to each of the periods:

- a) beginning with the year and ending with the day before that on which the first amendment in that year takes effect; or
- b) beginning with the day on which an amendment takes effect and ending with the day before that on which the next amendment takes effect, or (if none) with the year;

the entitlement to the allowance will be to the payment of such part of the allowance as it has effect during the relevant period as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days in the period bears to the number of days in the year.

10.3 Where the term of office of a Councillor begins or ends otherwise than at the beginning or end of a year, the entitlement of that Councillor to a basic allowance or special responsibility allowance shall be to the payment of such part of the basic allowance as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days during which his term of office subsists bears to the number of days in that year.

10.4 Where this Scheme is amended as mentioned in 11.2 and the term of a Councillor does not subsist throughout a period mentioned in 11.2, the entitlement of any such Councillor to a basic allowance or special responsibility allowance shall be to the payment of such part of the basic allowance referable to each such period (ascertained in accordance with that sub-paragraph) as bears to the whole the same proportion as the number of days during which his or her term of office as a Councillor subsists in that period bears to the number of days in that period.

10.5 The Council has the power to withhold payment of all allowances if a member (or co-opted member) ceases to be a member (or co-opted member) or ceases to be entitled to receive an allowance for a period. The authority may require that such part of the allowance as related to any such period be repaid to the Authority.

11. Taxation

11.1 Allowances are liable for Income Tax and National Insurance contributions.

11.2 Subsistence allowances for meetings or events held on the Shire Hall site are classed as emoluments for Income Tax and National Insurance contributions. This includes either sums claimed or meals provided by the Authority. Meals provided or claimed for meetings in locations other than Shire Hall are not taxable.

11.3 The Council will record all meals provided at Shire Hall, and will remit the tax due to the Inland Revenue at the end of the year. Members are asked to note meals taken on the Shire Hall site on their claim forms. No direct taxation will be charged to individual members for those meals taken at Shire Hall. Members are encouraged to take advantage of the meals provided at Shire Hall whenever possible.

- 11.4 Members can claim some deductible expenses against tax for costs incurred in acting as a member for which no reimbursement is received from the Authority:
- Travel by car - where a member uses his or her own car for the performance of duties, but does not receive a mileage allowance, e.g. for a non-approved duty, the Tax Office may grant a deduction on the costs incurred based on 50% of the Council's approved rate. Members would need to keep records of their mileage on non-approved duties in order to claim this deduction on their tax return.
 - Travel by public transport - where a member incurs additional costs for which no allowance can be obtained from the Authority, these costs can be claimed as a deductible expense.
 - Where regular payments are made to an assistant to provide secretarial support to a member for any support services which are not provided by the Authority.
 - Where money is spent on the hire of rooms for surgeries or public meetings providing they are not for party political purposes.
 - Where additional household expenses are incurred (light, fuel etc.) relating to those parts of members' homes that are used for duties as members, Inland Revenue will accept a standard deduction of £120 per year to cover these costs.
- 11.5 Any items claimed should be itemised on the tax return - Inland Revenue may require evidence and details of the expenditure incurred. Refunds for non-claiming tax allowances can be made for up to the previous six years.

This council notes the following rationale:

We are grateful to the Independent Remuneration Panel which has looked into the issue of Members Allowances and put forward its proposal to Full Council. The Panel picked up a considerable challenge in a short period of time. We asked it to look at the issue quickly following the May 4 elections where our number reduced from 69 Members to 61, and bearing in mind the additional responsibilities faced by Members as part of a Combined Authority and through our representation in the Greater Cambridgeshire Partnership (City Deal).

The Panel was asked to take on board a lot of information very quickly, including statutory provisions and guidance and has put forward its view based on what it has read and heard, and we thank the Panel members for that. We recognise that this task was a major undertaking.

This Council believes that for a number of reasons this has led to a proposed scheme of allowances that is fundamentally flawed and therefore cannot command its support. As part of any recommendations moving forward we recognise that lessons must be learned in order to bring about more evidence based schemes that are statutorily compliant and coherent to the world of Local Government.

The relevant statutory provisions and guidance provide that before the County Council makes its scheme of allowances for Members it must have regard to the recommendations from the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel but it isn't bound to accept those recommendations and is empowered to approve an alternative scheme.

In our analysis the Panel's recommendations contain a number of serious flaws and accordingly this Council believes an alternative scheme, as set out above, based on the following rationale should be adopted:

A) Basic Allowance

The Panel acknowledges that Cambridgeshire County Councillors receive allowances that are far below the UK average, with the basic allowance being the lowest in the Country. The Panel recommends, *"That the basic allowance be increased by £250 per year for the next four years in order to*

bring it to a level that will encourage more citizens from a wide range of backgrounds to stand for election, and further in line with the allowance paid in other comparable authorities”;

1) Government guidance on basic allowance states “10. Basic allowance is intended to recognise the time commitment of all councillors, including such inevitable calls on their time as meetings with officers and constituents and attendance at political group meetings. It is also intended to cover incidental costs such as the use of their homes.”

The Panel is required to have regard to the above guidance and to evidence its case. Starkly, the Panel’s recommendations include no reference to any published research material on time spent being a councillor or indeed that question having been put in interviews with respondents. There is no supporting evidence therefore in the Panel’s submission that recognises whether the above was in its thinking.

In fact, quite the opposite is the case. Instead of basing its recommendation for the level of basic allowance firmly on evidence of time spent by councillors (thereby in line with the guidance), the Panel has decided to follow a path from an initial arbitrary amount to a different arbitrary amount at the end of the four year term. There is no supporting evidence relating to the guidance to justify the original position, and similarly there is no explanation supporting the end position. This proposal is fundamentally flawed. Bearing in mind the guidance, which states that the basic allowance is intended to **recognise the time commitment**, the Panel’s proposal of a different amount each year for four years means that only one of the four years could potentially be a correct recommendation, with the other three years thereby being flawed. In order to meet the requirements of the guidance it is a pre-requisite that the basic allowance should be set at a level to reflect councillors time commitment, therefore, an argument that guidance in this case can be satisfied by lump sum increases each year clearly cannot hold true.

2) The argument in 1 above is clearly recognised as holding true in the way that the guidance provides for incremental increases to allowances linked to indexation only. “Annual Adjustments of Allowance levels

32. A scheme of allowances may make provision for an annual adjustment of allowances to be ascertained by reference to an index as may be specified by the authority and contained in the scheme. The scheme must be publicised each year, whether or not it has been amended.

33. Where the only change made to a scheme is that caused by the annual impact of an index contained within that scheme, the scheme shall not be deemed to have been amended, and thus an authority will not have to seek a recommendation from its independent remuneration panel.

34. Where a panel makes a recommendation that allowance levels should be determined according to an index, it should also make a recommendation as to how long the index should run before reconsideration. In any case, an index may not run for more than four years before a further recommendation on it is sought from an independent remuneration panel.”

It is felt that the proposal by the Panel to make the type of arbitrary lump sum incremental award is at odds with the spirit of the guidance and should be rejected by the Council.

B) Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)

In assigning Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) to relevant positions, factors taken into account by the Panel were; “4.11. The level of decision-making responsibility associated with each role. Other responsibilities associated with each role (such as responsibility for chairing a committee, and attendance at outside meetings associated with the role); The time requirement of each role; Any other specialist skills, knowledge or other factors needed to be able to carry out each role effectively.

Therefore the order of highest to lowest SRAs should accurately reflect that order; this Council believes they do not. When considering whether this is a singular point of view expressed by us or whether there is supporting evidence we have drawn on the benchmarking data used in this process for two tier authorities. Our understandings of duties are exactly aligned with the benchmarking made available to the Panel. The ranking list is provided below:

1) Leader of the council 2) Deputy Leader 3) Committee Chairs 4) Leader of the main opposition 5) Vice chairs of committees 6) Regulatory Chairs 7) Leader of minor opposition 8) Adoption/ Fostering Panel Members 9) Deputy Leader main opposition 10) Deputy Leader minor opposition

When considering why there is such disparity we note that;

“4.10 The Panel considered the levels of allowances paid at other authorities. Due to the fact that relatively few county authorities have chosen to adopt the committee systems since the power to do so was granted, limited weight was given to this source of evidence”

Having considered this statement, this Council believes the direct ability to compare placements and weightings can be made for leader of a council and their deputy and political leaders and their deputies. This is the same in a committee system as in a cabinet system. A direct comparison, regardless of systems, could also be drawn on the relative placements and weightings for regulatory chairs and adoption and fostering panel members. The areas where direct comparisons may be more nuanced are limited to committee chairs, vice chairs, and the basic allowance.

Additionally the panel considered in 4.10;

“ although it was found to be helpful in highlighting areas in which allowances at this Council are significantly lower or higher than in other areas.”

This statement is somewhat at odds with the recommendation where we compare the Panel's recommendations with the benchmarking data made available below.

Council Leader ;	21% <u>lower</u> than the UK mean average.
Deputy leader ;	46% <u>lower</u> than the UK mean average * (the lowest in the country)*.

Main opposition party leader; 22% **higher** than UK mean average.

The Panel provides no explanation, justification or evidence for recommending this glaring disparity between its statement, proposal and benchmarked results.

C) Area Community Champions (referred to as Area Lead Members by the Panel);

“7.2 The Panel has not recommended that special responsibility allowances should be paid to the newly-established Area Lead Members. This should not be interpreted as a rejection of those roles by the Panel. Rather, the Panel did not feel that they had received sufficient information or evidence to enable them to have the confidence to form a recommendation about these roles. Although role descriptions have now been prepared, they were not available within the timeframe that the Panel were asked to conduct this review. The Panel is open to reconsidering these roles once they have been established for some time.

It is unfortunate that the Panel has taken this approach to the speed at which information was made available. Officers were available to test whether there could be flexibility in the dates and the role descriptions were made available before publication of the scheme. Under 3.3 The Panel correctly states;

“In line with the statutory guidance, the Panel took into account the principle that an element of the role of councillor must be voluntary, but that should not mean that councillors should suffer significant financial loss as a result of undertaking the role;”

However, by recognising that there was a possibility that this may be a time consuming role, not enough weight has been given to the clear guidance;

“but that should not mean that councillors should suffer significant financial loss as a result of undertaking the role;”

It is not appropriate to ask councillors to take on significant extra duties and let them be “established for some time” before considering potential financial hardship. Therefore this Council believes this is also at odds with the guidance and that the duties ascribed to this role fall between that of a regulatory chair and a minor party opposition leader.

D) Minor Political Parties

In the existing Members Allowance scheme which forms part of the Council's Constitution, SRA's are not awarded to the leader or deputy leader of political groups of less than four. The Panel's recommendation is to award £3,000 to the leader and £1,200 to the deputy leader of the Council's three person Independent group. There is no supporting justification or evidence provided to validate this change which has to be tested against the Panel's own cited criteria for these allowances as follows;

"4.11. The level of decision-making responsibility associated with each role. Other responsibilities associated with each role (such as responsibility for chairing a committee, and attendance at outside meetings associated with the role); The time requirement of each role; Any other specialist skills, knowledge or other factors needed to be able to carry out each role effectively."

Whilst this Council acknowledges some extra time requirement may be required it does not see any link to the other supporting criteria. When compared with other non-remunerated positions, Chair of Constitution and Ethics, Chair of Health and Wellbeing Board, Chair of Staffing and appeals etc. and comparing the potential additional time requirement dependent on this role and lack of supporting rationale for change, this Council believes the two proposed SRAs to be unsubstantiated.

E) Committee Lead Members

"7.4.3 The Panel heard a range of evidence and opinion about recent changes made to the role of other councillors on the Policy and Service Committees. A significant range of views were aired about the role of the Committee Spokespersons, and the decision to remove these roles and replace them with Committee Lead Members. The Panel acknowledges that the role undertaken by these posts has changed and is now demonstrably less onerous, but also note that the post holders have an important role to play in coordinating the views of their groups and bringing this insight to the committees of which they are members. The Panel believes that an allowance should be paid in respect of these posts."

The guidance for the payment of SRAs provides as follows;

"Special responsibility allowance

11. Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of special responsibility allowances for those councillors who have significant responsibilities. Special responsibility allowance may be payable for duties which fall within the following categories:

- acting as leader or deputy leader of a political group*
- membership of the executive, where an authority is operating executive arrangements*
- presiding at meetings of a committee, sub-committee, or joint committee*
- representing the authority at meetings of another body*
- membership of a committee or sub-committee which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods*
- acting as a spokesperson for a political group on a committee or sub-committee*
- membership of an adoption appeals panel or panel dealing with licensing or controlling any activity*
- any other activities in relation to the discharge of the authority's functions as to require equal or greater effort of the member than any of the activities listed above."*

The Panel recognises that Spokespersons used to command an allowance. It also recognises the new Committee Lead Member role is "demonstrably less onerous".

Therefore when tested against the statutory criteria above the Panel's own reasoning should endorse the position that these roles cannot be paid an SRA. Examination of the criteria leads to the conclusion that only one criterion can be used for Committee Lead Members, namely the final general exclusion clause *"any other*

activities in relation to the discharge of the authority's functions as to require equal or greater effort of the member than any of the activities listed above.

However, the Panel's acknowledgement that this role is "**demonstrably less onerous**" precludes any possibility of the provision of an allowance.

F) Agreed positions

This Council agrees with the Panel's recommendations;
Any councillor is only entitled to one SRA

The positions of chair of General Purposes Committee and Vice Chair be combined with the roles of Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council in order to provide one SRA

E) Summation

Due to failure to have sufficient regard to guidance provided, the lack of sufficient evidence for some of the recommendations, and the disparity to accepted practice this Council regrettably has no option but to reject the scheme proposed by the Independent Remuneration Panel and to recommend one of its own.

F) Recommendations

In moving towards a recommendation a number of points were considered.

- 1) If an amendment is put forward that is not based on an evidenced approach it would be purely subjective and open to criticism.
- 2) The opportunity to conduct an evidenced based approach for each position before the meeting of the Council is not possible.
- 3) Benchmarking against two tier authorities was provided and can be fairly and justifiably used as an evidenced based approach.
- 4) Whether that approach can be tested against statutory guidance *
- 5) Whether any recommendations should be subject to indexation.
- 6) Whether any recommendation should be backdated.
- 7) The SRAs that should be considered are Council leader, Deputy Leader, Leader and deputy leader of opposition parties of four or more members. The seven main service Committee chairs and vice chairs, the chairs of three regulatory committee, namely Pensions, Planning and Audit and Accounts. Members of the fostering and adoption panels and the new Area Community Champions in the Communities and Partnerships committee.

Based on the above, discussions were offered with all group leaders to try and find a mutual solution to the problem; however this has at time of writing not led to any agreed positions.

*With regards to point 4 above, by taking an average of all adopted allowance schemes for two tier authorities this Council must be satisfied that this considers national guidance. Considering that each and every scheme has already been tested against that guidance this Council believes that adopting this approach satisfies that criteria.

Additionally, when testing the UK Average Basic Allowance against statutory criteria and using approximate calculations, research repeatedly shows that Councillors now perform their duties on average 20 – 30 Hours a week. (Studies have shown a steady increase in the number of hours councillors are required to dedicate to their work (Robinson, 1977; Maud, 1967; Widdicombe 1986; Young and Davies, 1990; Bloch and John, 1991; Young and Rao, 1994; NFER, 2006, 2008 and 2010).

Taking twenty hours (the lowest in the range) and an average wage of £27,600 (2015) the value of the work, based on an average full time week of 37.7 hours (2016) at £14,642, the UK average basic allowance of £10,315 includes a voluntary element of 30%.

Furthermore; as a result of growth, plus boundary changes reducing councillors from 69 to 61, the electorate per councillor in Cambs will have increased by 23% by the end of this administration. The cost to the taxpayer

(total budget) by moving to the national average will increase by 8.9%. This represents a reduction in cost to each member of the public.

This Council therefore, in order to remove any accusations of bias or tampering bases its recommendations:

- on adopting the UK average against all positions where possible or the nearest estimation to that
- to not provide for indexation in the scheme
- on revoking the old scheme and that the new scheme starts at the date of this Council meeting with no backdating

Further, this Council recommends that:

- the Council Leader opens a dialogue with the Chief Executive to examine how best to tackle the lessons learned to improve the process for next time.

The financial result of these recommendations are listed below.

Basic Allowance	£10,315	x	61
SRAs			
Council Leader	£31,745	x	1
Deputy Council Leader	£20,627	x	1
*Main Service committee chairs	£18,372	x	7
Leader of the main opposition party	£10,234	x	1
(Group must have 12 or more seats)			
Vice chairs of Main Service committees	£7,927	x	7
Regulatory Chairs	£7,345	x	3
Planning, Pensions Audit.			
Area leads	£5,000	x	5
Leader of minor opposition	£3,825	x	1
(Based on 4 seats to 13 any allowance proportionally based on 7 seats = 100%)			
Adoption/ Fostering Panel Members	£3,750	x	2
Deputy Leader main opposition	£1,790	x	1
(Group must have 12 or more seats)			
Deputy Leader minor opposition	£662	x	1
(Based on 17.3% of their leader)			

The total budget for the above is £936,726.

9(C). COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION

Addition from Councillor McGuire to the changed agreed at the last meeting of full Council on 23 May 2017 (addition in bold and italics):

**The Constitution, Part 3B - Responsibility for Functions
Committees of Council
Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board**

12. CAMBRIDGESHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**Introduction**

The Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) is established as a committee of the County Council under section 102 of the Local Government Act 1972. Its remit is to work to promote the health and wellbeing of Cambridgeshire's communities and its focus is on securing the best possible health outcomes for all residents.

Membership

- Five County Councillors (to include the Chairman/woman, **or Vice-Chairman/woman or any member** of the **following**: Adults, the Health, and the Children and Young People Policy and Service Committees)
- Five nominated District Council representatives
(supported by Senior District Council officer with Observer Status)
- Three representatives of the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
(nominated by the CCG Governing Body)
- Five representatives for NHS providers (a mix of non-executive directors and executives, one each from Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust; Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust; Hinchingbrooke Health Care NHS Trust; Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust)
- One representative of the local HealthWatch*
- Director of Public Health*
- **Executive Director: Children, Families and Adults***
- Chief Finance Officer (Section 151 Officer)
- Representative of NHS Commissioning Board*

* Statutory members of the HWB. There is also a statutory requirement for at least one Local Authority Councillor, and at least one representative of the CCG, to be a member of the HWB.

Rationale for Change

It is important to add to the change agreed at the last full Council meeting in order to create flexibility. There is the potential for a conflict of interest to arise for the Chairs of the Health Committee and Adults Committee if they also take on the Chairmanship of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Chair of the Health Committee can scrutinise aspects of the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Board will be considering the integration of Health and Adult Social Care which will have a direct impact on the Chair of Adults Committee.

Due to the specialist nature of these committees it is beneficial to their operation to have effective cross-membership and representation on the Health and Wellbeing Board from the Adults, Health and Children & Young People Policy and Service Committees.

9(C). COUNTY COUNCIL – PROPOSED CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION

Amendment from Councillor Nethsingha (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

Recommendation: It is recommended that Full Council approve the amendments to the Council's Constitution, as recommended by the Constitution and Ethics Committee, as follows:-

- (i) that the number of substitute members be equal to the number of members on a committee/sub-committee with a minimum of three substitute members per political group.
- (ii) ~~that the two new committees, Commercial and Investment Committee and Communities and Partnership Committee, be classified as policy and service committees.~~
- (iii) ~~to remove the following requirement in the Council Procedure Rules which states that the Annual Meeting will~~

~~“Receive a short (two sides of A4) report on each Policy and Service Committee. The report to be prepared by the relevant Service and not open for discussion at the meeting.”~~
- (iv) that Article 7, paragraph 7.03 of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect that the Vice-Chairman/woman of General Purposes Committee shall be, ex officio, Deputy Council Leader.
- (v) that Article 7, paragraph 7.05 of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect that one briefing meeting shall be held for all opposition lead members to brief them on the agenda for future service committee meetings and consider any other issues the officer may think appropriate.

- ~~(vi) to recommend to Full Council that Part 3A – Responsibility for Functions, Section 2(f) of the Council’s Constitution be amended to reflect the fact that Council also appoints the Chairman/woman and Vice-Chairman/woman of Commercial and Investment Committee and Communities and Partnership Committee, and the Chairman/woman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.~~
- (vii) to remove the following requirement in Part 2 – Articles, Article 7 of The Council’s Constitution which states:
- “7.06 Training**
- The Council will hold an annual training day for Chairmen/women, Vice-Chairmen/ women and lead members with a focus on their roles and remits individually and collectively.”
- ~~(viii) to revert to the original meeting start time of 10.30am for all full Council meetings.~~
- ~~(ix) that the re-drafted terms of reference for the Commercial and Investment Committee be adopted, as set out in Appendix A of the report before Council.~~
- ~~(x) that in relation to the Corporate Asset Management Plan and the Strategy Asset Development Strategy, Full Council takes into account the recommendation of Commercial and Investment Committee rather than of General Purposes Committee.~~
- (xi) to remove reference in the Constitution to approving the Local Transport Plan.

13. MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LUCY NETHSINGHA

Page 3 of Council Agenda

Amendment from Councillor Bates (additions in bold and deletions in strikethrough):

This Council notes the large number of studies which are looking at congestion on the A10 King's Lynn to Cambridge corridor including:

- County Council work on the A10 to King's Lynn in response to a previous motion.
- City Deal work on the section of the A10 from the A14 interchange to the edge of the City Deal area.
- Work being done in response to the Mayor's 100 days programme, looking at an M11 extension north of the Bar Hill junction.
- Work in progress to improve the rail network in the same area.

This Council notes that with so many different groups requesting large scale changes any decisions on major road building projects to the north of Cambridge are likely to have to wait until work on all these studies is complete, as major changes to the road network will need to be considered together.

~~This council notes that under these circumstances major improvements to the A10 are unlikely to start quickly.~~

~~This council notes that congestion on the A10 largely occurs at junctions.~~

~~**This council therefore requests that a small study on the impact of improving the junctions between Littleport, and the A14 be carried out, with a view to improving flow at the junctions, to allow traffic to run smoothly along the current road in the short to medium term.**~~

This Council, on receipt of the three studies, will review to ensure that they meet transport issues arising from these studies, and this will include junctions between Littleport and the A14. Following the review, the outcome will be reported to the organisation who have commissioned these studies, and thereafter will continue to work in partnership with a way forward.

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 JULY 2017
WRITTEN QUESTION UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.2

Question from Councillor Mike Shellens

This council's Audit Committee has responsibility for "economy, efficiency and effectiveness".

A recent paper suggested that CCC was spending around £4m a year on agency staff. (NB this excludes people such as agency staff in Residential homes)

My question is this:

Typically, agency staff cost more than employees of the council.

Can you please tell us how many agency staff are employed by the council?

What is their total cost over the most recent 3 months for which convenient figures are available?

What is being done to reduce these numbers?

Response from Councillor Steve Count
Chairman of General Purposes Committee

Cambridgeshire County Council like most organisations uses agency workers, and has to rely on the use of agency staff to cover key posts where vacancies or staff sickness arises. At the end of May there were 193 posts occupied by agency workers covering social workers, professional staff and administration support.

Spend over the period March to May was as follows:

	March	April	May
Cambridgeshire Catering Service	£32,622	£5,309	£15,620
Children, Families and Adults	£536,243	£375,048	£483,824
Customer Service Transformation	£4,365	£11,056	£6,295
Economy, Transport and Environment	£37,376	£36,331	£64,298
LGSS	£203,968	£151,969	£218,045
Public Health	£1,818	£1,858	£3,650
Grand Total	£816,391	£581,571	£791,732

In terms of reducing reliance on agency workers, our use of this type of worker is always under scrutiny by senior managers, with our usage in the social work field at around 10% of our workforce which is significantly lower than most other local authorities. The filling of posts by agency is subject to the same scrutiny as recruiting to a post, and an exemption has to be signed off by a Head of Service to confirm that doing so is necessary.

We recognise that due to the nature of the services we provide we will always be reliant on agency workers to some extent, so have focussed our efforts on reducing the actual cost of engaging these types of workers. Following approval by GPC Committee at the end of July 2016 new arrangements with Opus LGSS People Solutions (Opus LGSS) were put in place as planned in January 2017. Opus LGSS is a partnership between Suffolk County Council and LGSS, created to provide a more cost effective solution in engaging temporary workers.

The switch over went smoothly and whilst the new arrangements have only been in place for just six months the anticipated benefits are now starting to be seen. The original proposal identified three primary objectives:

- To have greater influence over the wider issues including the quality and pay of agency workers in specific categories such as social workers as well as to support the overall workforce strategy;
- To provide financial savings by reducing the costs associated with securing agency staff;
- To ensure continuity of supply of agency workers

Of the 193 agency workers used in May, 20 were directly engaged via Opus LGSS which is 10.4% with the original target by January 2018 being 17%. For agency workers engaged directly the cost is lower, and the number of directly engaged agency workers is expected to rise as the year progresses.

Dashboard		Target	2016/17			2017/18		
			Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Headcount split	Workers out Agency Opus or direct		226	204	200	178	187	220
			95%	92%	89%	83%	80%	79%
			5%	8%	11%	17%	20%	21%

The original business case identified modest savings for CCC in the 1st year that were anticipated to increase once the other LGSS partners joined the model in subsequent years, those being Northamptonshire County Council and Milton Keynes Council. The projected saving for year 1 was £65,000 but this is now anticipated to increase to in excess of £100,000 given the early successes that have been realised.

Question from Councillor Ian Manning

Recently the City Deal project re-branded itself to be called "The Greater Cambridge Partnership". How was this decision made and what was the cost? In particular please can we be given a breakdown of the costs involved in this exercise, including both City Deal officer time, County Council officer time and any external costs including production of the video; who suggested the re-brand and at what point and by whom was the decision to go ahead made?

Response from Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Economy & Environment Committee

The decision to refresh the City Deal branding was made by members of the Joint Assembly and Executive Board in consensus, and in consultation with senior officers in the partnership. No County Council staff nor resource were used. Given this, it will be more appropriate for this question to be directed and answered at the Joint Assembly or Executive Board later this month.

Question from Councillor Susan van de Ven

Whippet has moved to deregister a large number of its bus services, because they are failing to run profitably. This takes effect September 2nd. Whippet notes that the future of these services will depend largely on what the County Council passenger transport budget is able to support, and also cite Cambridge congestion as a fundamental obstacle to effective running of services through the city. What new thinking does the Chairman of the Economy and Environment Committee propose, to ensure that bus services do not diminish just when a dramatic step change is needed toward high quality public transport for workers, students, apprentices and all people seeking to retain their independent living?

Response from Councillor Ian Bates, Chairman of Economy & Environment Committee

The immediate issue of the deregistration of a number of Whippet services will be discussed at Economy & Environment Committee on 10 August, and officers are currently working on potential alternative solutions. These could include traditional local bus services, but will also consider any alternatives that could be provided by the community transport sector or integration with other existing services. In terms of future development the Greater Cambridge Partnership is working on proposals to reduce congestion in Cambridge, and any support you can give to these proposals would be welcome, although only six of the seventeen services that are being deregistered actually operate into the city. As Chairman of the Total Transport Member Steering Group you will be aware of the current pilot service, East Cambs Connect, and although the trial only commenced a few months ago this may give further options and solutions in the future if it is proven to be successful. Unfortunately, diminishing bus services is a national issue but Cambridgeshire will also explore any opportunities through the new Bus Services Act, which has recently received Royal Assent to help authorities with this issue.

Question from Councillor Ian Manning

Please can highways give a breakdown of the repair bill for footpaths across the County in the last financial year? Please can we know how much of this was due to inappropriate loading (eg of parked vehicles on the footpath)? If there is no data, please can some estimate be made of the same?

Response from Councillor Mathew Shuter, Chairman of Highways and Community Infrastructure Committee

The 16/17 figures for footpath maintenance by area are as follows:

Area	Expenditure
Fenland and East Cambridgeshire	£159,068
South Cambridgeshire	£186,018
Cambridge City	£302,904
Huntingdonshire	£138,558
TOTAL	£786,548

Unfortunately there is no detail on how or why footpaths decline to our intervention level for repair. Without any such data, we are unable to provide an estimate as there is no factual evidence and therefore an estimate would have no value.