

COUNCIL25 February 2010
6.00pm – 12.10pm

Present: Councillors Baker, McPherson (Chair), Stuart (Vice-Chair), Al Bander, Benstead, Bick, Blackhurst, Blair, Blencowe, Boyce, Bradnack, Cantrill, Dixon, Ellis-Miller, Hart, Herbert, Hipkin, Howell, Kerr, Levy, Liddle, McGovern, Newbold, Nimmo-Smith, Pitt, Reid, Rosenstiel, Sanders, Smart, Smith, Taylor, Todd-Jones, Walker, Ward, Wright and Zmura

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**10/01 APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22 OCTOBER 2009**

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 October 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

10/02 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**1. APOLOGIES:**

Apologies were noted from Councillors Armstrong, Dryden, Kightley and Lynn.

2. INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

The Council had successfully retained its Investor in People (IIP) status following a recent review.

The assessor, Sarah Garwood, identified strengths such as the huge effort staff put into their jobs and their customer and council loyalty that had ensured the Council had maintained a high level of performance.

In March, the Corporate Management Team would review an action plan to build on the Council's strengths and address development areas.

3. CIVIC RECEPTION FOR THE COUNCIL'S RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The civic reception for the Council's retired employees would take place on Wednesday, 17 March at 6.30 p.m. It was hoped that members would be able to support the event.

4. CAMBRIDGE-HEIDELBERG EASTER FESTIVAL

This year it was the turn of Cambridge to host the annual Cambridge-Heidelberg Easter Festival. A civic reception would be held on Thursday, 1st April at 7 p.m. to welcome the participants, and especially those from our twin City of Heidelberg. It was hoped that members would be able to come along.

5. THE STUBBS PERSE TROPHY

Displayed on the dais was a trophy presented to the City Council by No. 104 (City of Cambridge) Squadron Air Training Corps. It was presented to the Mayor by the Chairman of Marshall of Cambridge, Sir Michael Marshall, on the occasion of the Air Training Corps awards evening. It was to mark the close association the Corps had had with the City of Cambridge since its inception 70 years ago. In Mr. Marshall's remarks, he referred particularly to the fact that the ATC was awarded the Honorary Freedom of the City in 1999 and acknowledged with appreciation the arrangements that were made in 2009 for the Corps once again to march through the City and to receive civic hospitality. The City would hold the trophy for one year.

6. SPONSORSHIP AWARDS

The Council had been awarded two sponsorship awards for its partnership with The Co-operative for the Cambridge Folk festival.

It had been given one of the Awards to keep which was an attractive hand crafted wooden bowl, and this would be displayed in the Mayor's Parlour.

7. TWINNING VISIT

Last month the City was proud to entertain five civic guests from each of its two twin cities. Guests from Heidelberg and Szeged came over to participate in the Winter Finale of the University of Cambridge 800th anniversary celebrations and enjoyed a very full programme of visits. Some extremely complimentary feedback had been received from the Lord Mayor of Heidelberg and the Vice-Mayor of Szeged for the extremely enjoyable time they spent in Cambridge. Members and Directors who helped to host the guests were thanked.

8. PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION OF THANKS

The Mayor noted that during the last year he had served as Deputy Mayor to Councillor Mike Dixon. He therefore had first hand knowledge of the enormous amount of work he and Anne undertook on behalf of the City in their roles as Mayor and Mayoress. They showed great support and enthusiasm for their two chosen charities, carried out hundreds of civic engagements and were great ambassadors for Cambridge. At the Annual Meeting of the Council held in May last year, a resolution of our thanks to them was passed, and it was the Mayors great pleasure to present to Mike a framed copy of that resolution as a lasting token of the Council's appreciation.

9. "GOOD EGG" AWARD

The Council had received an email thanking the Council for its unanimous decision in 2008 to use only free range eggs in all its departments, and to advise where relevant of its policy, and to require the Corn Exchange to use only free-range chicken meat.

It had been recommended that the council receive Compassion in World Farming's "Good Egg" Award.

10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Item	Interest
Reid	7a	Prejudicial Interest: Husband involved with firm that was associated with the Station Road Development. Cllr Reid left the meeting during this item and did not vote.
Walker	7c	Personal Interest: Husband employed by University of Cambridge
Herbert	7c	Personal Interest: Employed as consultant for ARU and partner employed by ARU
Bradnack	7c	Personal Interest: Wife employed at ARU
Rosenstiel	7c	Personal Interest: MA of Trinity College
Pitt	7c	Personal Interest: Wife employed by University of Cambridge and taught for a college
Cantrill	7c	Personal Interest: Wife employed at University of Cambridge

Smith	7c	Personal Interest: Employed at University of Cambridge
Blackhurst	7c	Personal Interest: Employed at University of Cambridge
Taylor	7c	Personal Interest: Employed at Cambridge University Press and sister-in-law was employed by the University of Cambridge
Baker	7c	Personal Interest: Fellow of Emmanuel College
Ward	7c	Personal interest: Wife employed at Cambridge University Press
Nimmo-Smith	7c	Personal Interest: received supervision and examination fees from Cambridge university
Blackhurst	7c	Personal Interest: Wife Employed by University of Cambridge
Todd-Jones	7c	Personal Interest: Employed by University of Cambridge
Bick	7c	Personal Interest: Worked in the Cambridge economy and wife employed by Anglia Ruskin University

10/03 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr Hillman addressed the Council as the local Conservative candidate and spoke in support of Council Motion C regarding education funding.

He felt that it was regrettable that universities in Cambridge were being asked to take further cuts, and stated that, per head of population, Cambridge was now the worst affected City in the country.

Mr Hillman wholeheartedly supported the Motion and the suggestion that the Leader and the Chief Executive forward the City Council's concerns to government ministers, the Greater Cambridge Partnership and local MPs and prospective parliamentary candidates.

Mr Hillman stated that the universities were helping the economic recovery and research would suffer as a result of the cuts.

The Leader welcomed the support of Mr Hillman and highlighted the Council's role in promoting economic development for Cambridge.

Mr Gawthrop addressed the Council with the following statement:

“In November 2009, without any further professional advice, Council officials recommended that the Planning Committee vary the planning permission allowing Ashwell to rephrase the scheme and giving the company huge financial concessions. The financial position of Ashwell, despite being in the public domain, was not reported to the Committee.

In the new arrangements the bus interchange is to be paid for with a public subsidy of £1.5 million. The cycle park deferred and eventually to be paid for by the County Council at £750,000. The station square ‘Gateway to Cambridge’ was also deferred.

With national commercial property values 40% down in two years the only part Ashwell now proposed was the low risk, hugely profitable, 1,000 place student housing blocks.

Even here they reaped another subsidy as the contribution on this phase to the guided bus and local traffic schemes, worth £1.2 million, have been deferred to an indefinite date in the future when the offices on the South side of Station Road are to be rebuilt. (the Red phase)

During 2009 some of the Ashwell directors with help from Lloyds Bank organised to form a new company and start again. They used a little known financial device known as pre pack administration. This allows the Directors of a failing company to arrange to buy back the best assets as soon as the Company goes into administration. This is exactly what happened. Having secured a very favourable deal from the Council, Ashwell went into administration leaving huge debts to its bankers, a debt which is being paid for by the bank bailout from the taxpayer.

Using the pre pack administration process the new company Brookgate has bought the best Ashwell assets, including the Cb1 site and the planning permission at estimated current market value, presumably for a fraction of the price originally paid.

This means that the new refinanced company is in a position to pay its full due to the Council, but for reasons, which are unexplained, the Planning Dept. is refusing to review the agreement or obtain a new report from Price Waterhouse Coopers. In my view this is not exercising due diligence with public funds.

With regard to Planning Application number 08/0266/OUT, the Station Road Cb1 development which was given approval subject to the conditions and the completion of the S106 Agreement as set out in the officers' report, by 31 March 2009”

Mr Gawthrop then asked the following questions:

1. Who is authorised to extend time limits for the signing of the Section 106 agreement set by committee resolution?
2. If it is the Chair of Planning and opposition spokesperson on the Planning Committee was this authorisation granted to them by Committee at the time this application 08/0266/OUT was considered in October 2008?
3. If this power was not granted by Committee, at the time, is it a legal right of these two Councillors to grant these extensions without further report to Committee?
4. How many extensions have been granted for this application?
5. For each extension of this application who granted them?
6. For this application what dates were the extensions granted?
7. When did each extension start and expire?
8. Can extensions be legally granted retrospectively?
9. What documentary proof does the Council hold to verify the above answers?
10. If the extensions to time limits are not contiguous would Councillor Baker agree that Planning application 08/0266/OUT has failed to meet the criteria set out by the Planning Committee and is therefore refused?

The Chair of the Planning Committee thanked Mr Gawthrop very warmly for his multiple questions, because answering them would enable him to unpack the layers of ambiguity and of misinformation that sadly obscured the progress of what was likely to be one of the most significant and positive developments in Cambridge during the 21st century.

He addressed first the general remarks made by Mr Gawthrop and then dealt with his ten specific questions.

In 2008 the Council commissioned an independent report on the viability of the proposed CB1 development. That viability assessment showed that the proposed development and its associated S106 package were deliverable. The Planning Committee at its meeting in October 2008 was informed about that report and took it into consideration in its own assessment of the outline planning application for CB1. Following legal advice, the report had not been made available to the public because it contained commercially sensitive information.

The viability of a development was a material planning consideration when a developer claimed that not all necessary mitigation measures could be provided to make the development acceptable in planning terms. In the event Ashwell included a complete set of mitigation measures as part of the scheme considered by Planning Committee on 7 October 2008 and that consideration was properly dealt with at that time.

The financial position of a developer was not a material planning consideration and consequently was not a matter that the City Council could take into account when making decisions on planning matters.

Any S106 and outline planning permission related to the land and was not made personal to the developer. A change of developer was therefore not a material planning consideration.

Discussions about the S106 agreement relating to CB1 were continuing - they had not been concluded. There was not, as Mr Gawthrop mistakenly believes, a signed agreement to be reviewed.

The Chair of the Planning Committee then answered each of Mr Gawthrop's ten sub-questions in turn.

1. Who is authorised to extend time limits for the signing of the Section 106 agreement set by committee resolution?

The Planning Committee sets deadlines for the completion of Section 106 Agreements, and so of course the Committee could extend its deadline. If it was not practical to ask the Committee to extend its deadline, officers had used urgency powers to do so when there had been good reasons. The use of

urgency powers was subject to consultation with the Committee Chair and Spokesperson.

In this case the Development Control Manager exercised the power to extend the time limits for the completion of the Section 106 Agreement on behalf of the Director of Environment and Planning.

2. If it is the Chair of Planning and opposition spokesperson on the Planning Committee was this authorization granted to them by Committee at the time this application 08/0266/OUT was considered in October 2008?

Extensions were granted by following the urgency action procedure set out in the Constitution.

3. If this power was not granted by Committee at the time is it a legal right of these two Councillors to grant these extensions without further report to Committee?

The Councillors themselves did not grant the extensions. Decisions to extend were taken at officer level under urgency powers after consultation with Councillors.

4. How many extensions have been granted for this application?

Two.

5. For each extension of this application who granted them?

These were not extensions of the application but of the time limits for completing the Section 106 Agreement

In relation to the first extension (April 2009 to September 2009) – the Development Control Manager under delegated powers in consultation with Councillors Baker and Blencowe.

In relation to the second extension (29 January 2010 to March 2010) – the Development Control Manager under delegated powers in consultation with Councillor Baker (no response to the consultation was received from Councillor Blencowe).

6. For this application what dates were the extensions granted?

3 April 2009 and 30 January 2010.

7. When did each extension start and expire?

First extension – 1 April 2009 to 30 September 2009.

Second extension - 29 January 2010 to 31 March 2010.

8. Can extensions be granted retrospectively?

Yes.

9. What documentary proof does the Council hold to verify the above answers?

The Council's Constitution and copies of email correspondence.

10. If the extensions to time limits are not contiguous would Councillor Baker agree that Planning application 08/0266/OUT has failed to meet the criteria set out by the Planning Committee and is therefore refused?

The Chair of the Planning Committee did not agree.

The application would be further considered by the Planning Committee on 10th March when the Committee would consider whether to grant an extension of time to complete the Section 106 Agreement.

One final point was emphasised: Planning permission had not yet been given for the CB1 Development.

In October 2008 the Planning Committee approved the application, but it did so subject to planning conditions and to completion of the S106 agreement. Given that the S106 agreement had not been completed, no decision letter had yet been issued by the Council for this application.

The Planning Committee would be giving further consideration to the S106 Agreement at its meeting on 10th March. If the Committee at that meeting agrees that the S106 can be completed and signed, then the Council's decision to approve the application and to grant planning permission would be communicated to the developer.

In response, Mr Gawthrop questioned the status of the application during the break in the two extension periods. His understanding was that during this period the status of an application was unclear, and should therefore be deemed to have failed.

He felt that the station area development would be ghastly, lack the feel of a real community and in the future be deemed as a failure by the public.

Mr Gawthrop thanked the Mayor for the opportunity to speak.

The Chair of the Planning Committee noted Mr Gawthrop's comments.

Mr Harvey addressed the Council regarding the 'Cambridge Matters' magazine.

He claimed that information provided by the Council estimating the cost per issue at 12 pence was incorrect. Figures obtained by Mr Harvey from 2004 onwards, suggested that the average cost per issue was 21.5 pence or 19.3 pence excluding staff costs.

Contrary to claims of the Council, Mr Harvey felt that the two separate contracts agreed by Manning and Bright Publishing were not similar. Concern was also raised that when private sector advertising in the magazine fell, public sector advertising seemed to increase – therefore being funded directly from taxpayers.

Mr Harvey urged Councillors to inspect all of the figures as he felt that there was an estimated hole in the accounts of £27,995.70 excluding staff. He also claimed that 'Cambridge Matters' currently cost taxpayers over £38,500 per year and not the £24,500 claimed by the Council.

The Leader invited Mr Harvey to submit his findings to the Council and they would be looked into. The Council had identified a net cost for the 'Cambridge Matters' magazine and this was achieved through a contract with an outside organisation. Regardless of whether the advertising was public sector or private sector, the publication still provided value for money.

In response, Mr Harvey claimed that he had invited the Leader and the Chief Executive to a meeting but had received no reply. It was difficult to assess whether to publication was value for money as the renewal rates were awful.

The Council had stated that the cost of its own advertising in the publication would be capped, but Mr Harvey claimed that this cost had been exceeded on a number of occasions.

The Council had also claimed that the publication helped to increase the recycling figures in Cambridge. Mr Harvey had requested these figures, so that the claim could be verified, but the Council had not yet to provide them.

These comments were noted by the Leader.

**10/04 SUB-COMMITTEE TO MAKE CHIEF OFFICER APPOINTMENTS
(The Leader)**

Resolved (unanimously) that:

An Appointment Sub-Committee of the following 6 Councillors:

- Ian Nimmo-Smith (Lib Dem)
- Max Boyce (Lib Dem)
- Sian Reid (Lib Dem)
- Catherine Smart (Lib Dem)
- Councillor Herbert (Labour)
- Councillor Hart (Labour)

be established to undertake the recruitment of any new Chief Officers and to agree the terms and conditions of appointment for successful candidates.

At 8.05pm the Deputy Mayor took change of the meeting

**10/05 TO CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE
FOR ADOPTION:**

The Mayor ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Full Budget Setting Report and the Budget Precepting Amendment, as circulated, be considered despite hard copies not being made publicly available five clear working days prior to the meeting.

Due to understandable pressures in the Finance Department and technical problems at the Print Room the paperwork had not been available for dispatch within the normal timescales, but it was not practical for the Council to defer setting a budget and Council Tax.

The Executive presented its budget recommendations to Council as set out in Agenda Item 5a.

Labour Group Alternative Budget Proposals

Councillor Herbert presented the Labour Group's alternative budget as set out in the Council Agenda, which under the Procedure was deemed to have been moved and seconded as an amendment.

Councillor Howell Budget statement

Councillor Howell presented his budget statement and claimed that the residents of Cambridge were suffering as a result of the mismanagement of Council finances, and specifically the incompetence around the Folk Festival issues.

In respect of the Liberal Democrat budget he commented that:

- The savings identified were not wide ranging enough.
- Council tax rises proposed were too high, particularly in later years.
- Cuts in grants to voluntary bodies including community legal services were poorly thought through.
- Whilst the negative subsidy around the Housing Revenue Account was beyond the control of the Council, the cuts to the Area Housing Teams would have a huge impact on local residents.
- Very little of the money spent on the climate change agenda resulted in a reduction in Council costs.

It was proposed that:

- Zero based Service Reviews would identify further efficiencies.
- Potential commercial opportunities such as car parks and the Mill Road Depot should be investigated further.
- More imagination around the use of the property portfolio was needed.
- Council Tax collection should be improved.
- The cost of procurement should be monitored closely with more information being available to the public.
- 'Cambridge Matters' was wasted self-publicity by the Council.
- Area Committees were not successful and only attended by those residents already politically engaged.
- More frequent refuse and recycling collections were needed.

- Cycle parking in the City needed to be addressed.
- The Council needed to further encourage participation in sport - especially in the run up to the London 2012 Olympics.
- The value for money of the climate change agenda should be assessed.

Councillor Hipkin Budget Statement

Councillor Hipkin presented his budget statement and stated that as a result of the dire economic situation, there should be no increase in Council Tax. Whilst he felt it was essential that public services be protected, the City Council needed to prioritise their spending.

It was proposed that:

- 'Cambridge Matters' was a dull publication that failed to adequately relate to its audience. Halting publication would result in a saving of approximately £30,000.
- Area Committees had failed and were regularly attended by the same audience. A budget of £50,000, which equated to around £100 for each person that attended, was not affordable.
- Whilst the 'Big Day Out' was an event enjoyed by many, it cost the Council £66,000. A cut of 20% would be appropriate.
- As Council spend on translation services was twice that required by law, and common view was that this service did not encourage integration, cuts would produce a saving of £27,000.
- A total saving in excess of £163,000 could be achieved by these measures.

Councillor Wright Budget Statement

Councillor Wright presented her budget statement and stated that it was no surprise that groups were unwilling to raise the rate of Council Tax above the rate of inflation during an election year.

It was proposed that:

- As the gap between rich and poor was widening, an increase in Council Tax *above* the rate of inflation would bridge this.
- In the current climate jobs needed to be protected, so this was not a time for service cuts.
- 'Cambridge Matters' should only be published once per year and used as a signposting tool for local residents.
- Cuts be made in Mobile CCTV provision.
- Production of event specific leaflets should continue (e.g. Environment Festival/weeks)
- Whilst being committed to addressing grass verge issues, the residents survey should be halted.

- Whilst the Park Street car park should be redeveloped as a site for mixed-use housing/retail/education, the allocation of £1m did not fit with the Councils sustainable city objectives.
- The 4 Youth Worker posts should be retained.
- In order to encourage participation in youth services, a minibus service should be introduced.
- Free swimming for under 16 year olds should be introduced.
- The idea of a City Farm should be further investigated.
- Community projects such as the 'Apple Festival' should be encouraged.
- Allotment provision should be increased.
- An increase in small Business Centres should be encouraged.
- The number of taxi cards should be increased.
- Mental health projects such as art and pottery should be increased.
- The number of salt bins should be increased.
- The cost of legal advice in relation to the Grand Arcade car park be recouped if the City Council did not have to pay the Stamp Duty Land Tax.

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 22

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

Reference	Details
LB20	Create Cambridge 2012 Sports Training Fund

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 9 votes to 19

Reference	Details
LB8	Restore and retarget youth facilities funding reduction (S2326)

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 8 votes to 19

Reference	Details
LB12	Increase value of Taxicards by further 10%

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 8 votes to 21

Reference	Details
LB11	Provide residents with salt bins for safer streets, and ensure older people can get out in bad weather

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 9 votes to 21

Reference	Details
LS2	Cease publication of 'Cambridge Matters' magazine

On a show of hands the proposal was lost by 10 votes to 21

RESOLVED (by 21 votes to 10) to agree the Executive's budget proposals:

Revenue: [Part B, page 25 refers] in relation to the General Fund Revenue Budgets 2009/10 :

a) Approved the 2009/10 revised budget savings and bids as shown in Appendix C *[page 111 refers]*.

b) Approved the overall revised budget for 2009/10, with net committee spending at £24,471,950, as shown in Section 3 *[page 27 refers]* and Appendix Y *[page 260 refers]* for General Fund Services.

c) Approved the level of reserves to be used to support the 2009/10 budget, at £4,420,790 (including temporary use of reserves for Guildhall Working Party – Option 1 of £71,840 and payback of temporary use of reserves for Customer Access of £541,860, and Memorials of £10,000, as shown above and in Appendix Y *[page 260 refers]*.

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

d) Approved the Revenue Bids and Savings shown in Appendix G *[page 136 refers]* and which are built into the General Fund Summary, Appendix Y *[page 260 refers]*.

e) Approved the Bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds, set out in Appendix E *[page 129 refers]*.

f) Agreed the position regarding PPF funding as outlined in Section 10 *[page 63 refers]*.

g) Approved the overall base budget for 2010/11, as shown in Appendix Y *[page 260 refers]* and summarised below:

	2010/11
	£
SPEND:	
Scrutiny Committees / Portfolios	
Community Services – Arts & Recreation	4,919,440
Community Services – Community Development & Health	3,626,310
Community Services – Housing	2,520,270
Environment – Climate Change & Growth	5,071,250
Environment – Environmental & Waste Services	6,732,950
Strategy & Resources - Customer Services & Resources	(4,763,130)
Strategy & Resources – Strategy (including central Provisions to be allocated)	5,796,220
Committees Total	23,903,310
Capital Adjustments Account	421,720
Minimum Revenue Provision	(3,147,120)
Contribution to Capital Spending	2,291,000
Additional Council Tax earmarked for growth (unallocated)	50,080
Technology Investment Fund (TIF) contribution	84,320
Efficiency Fund	75,000
Spending met from Earmarked Reserves (Climate Change Fund and HPDG)	(122,200)
Spending Requirement	23,556,110

FUNDING:

Revenue Support Grant	(1,577,150)
Business Rates	(10,861,220)
Collection Fund Deficit (net)	0
Raised from Council Tax (based on recommendation (i), below)	(6,696,950)
Total Funding	(19,135,320)

Contribution from Reserves**(4,420,790)**

Including temporary (use) / payback of reserves for :

Customer Access	655,050
Guildhall Working Party – Option 1	(203,510)
Memorials	10,000

h) Approved the level of reserves to be used to support the 2010/11 budget, at £4,420,790, including temporary use of reserves for Guildhall Working Party – Option 1 of £203,510 and payback of temporary use of reserves for Customer Access of £655,050, and Memorials of £10,000, as shown above and in Appendix Y *[page 260 refers]*.

i) Approved the Council Tax Base and set the level of Council Tax for 2010/11, based on a 99% collection rate *[Section 8, page 53 refers]*, Appendix H (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 40,205 – see Appendix H(a) *[page 166(a) refers]*;

– The increase in the City Council level of Council Tax at band D to be from £162.51 in 2009/10 to £166.57 in 2010/11 (2.5%) – see Appendix H(b) *[page 166(b) refers]* also attached;

Note that the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority met on 11th February 2010, Cambridgeshire County Council will meet on 16th February 2010 to consider the amounts in precepts to be issued to the City Council for the year 2010/11.

j) Approved:

- i) The Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix L, Annex 1 *[page 188 refers]* and to note that the “authorised limit” determined for 2010/11 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3 of the Local Government Act 2003 *[Section 14, page 87 refers]*.
- ii) To delegate to the Director of Finance, within the borrowing totals for any financial year within the above (i) mentioned prudential indicators, authority 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 U *[page 236 refers]*.
- iv) The changes to the Council’s Approved Lending (counterparty) List, shown in Appendix V *[page 249 refers]*. *(As updated by the Executive Recommendation)*.
- k) Delegated to the Director of Finance authority to finalise changes relating to the reallocation of support service and central costs in accordance with the CIPFA Best Value Accounting Code of Practice *[para 6.53, page 49 refers]*.

***Capital: [Part D, page 75 refers]
in relation to the Capital Plan: [section 13, page 81 refers]***

- l) Approved the following project appraisals, which have been referred by Executive Councillors:

From the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources:

- (i) Corporate Fixed Line Telecommunications: approved the procurement of Corporate Fixed Line Telecommunications and subsequent award of a contract for a two-year term. The indicative potential financial implications are outlined within the project appraisal for Corporate Fixed Line Telecommunications.

From the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth:

- (i) Riverside Cycle Conflict Reduction & Environmental Improvement Scheme
(ii) Fitzroy/Burleigh Street Environmental Improvement Scheme
(iii) Deployment of Large/2nd Computer Monitors
(iv) Holy Trinity Church War Memorial refurbishment

m) From the Executive Councillor for Climate Change & Growth:

(i) Agreed the transfer of the Sustainable City Capital Programme (PR004) to the Sustainable City Grants revenue budget in 2009/10 and 2010/11 only.

(ii) Agreed to amend the funding for the approved capital project SC421 E&P Server Replacements, so £37,000 is funded from Housing Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) in place of the existing Repairs and Renewals (R&R) funding.

n) From the Executive Councillor for Housing:

(i) Approved the use, in 2009/10 and 2010/11, of £290,000 Section 106 resources identified for investment in affordable housing, to meet the required local contribution, towards the cost of delivering 7 new affordable dwellings to be managed in the HRA, with the balance of funding to be met through Homes and Communities Agency grant and an element of prudential borrowing.

(ii) Approved the removal of funding for the discretionary void element of the decent homes kitchen replacement programme, resulting in the ability to only undertake replacement of kitchens where this is required to make the property decent.

(iii) Approved a Housing Capital Allowance for 2010/11 of £14,912,000.

o) Approved that the new capital bids, shown in Appendix S *[page 222 refers]*, should be included in the Capital Plan or added to the Hold list, as indicated, including any additional use of reserves required.

and, in addition,

p) Agreed the available funding shown in Appendix M, the Hold list shown in Appendix R, and the re-phased Capital Plan as presented in Appendix N *[page 191 refers]* for the General Fund and Appendix O *[page 203 refers]* for the HRA which incorporate the impact of the above decisions in respect of the capital plan.

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

i) supported the 2009/10 budget

ii) supported the 2010/11 and future years budgets.

[Section 16, page 93 refers].

in relation to the Housing Revenue Account

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

Other**s) From the Executive Councillor for Arts & Recreation:**

Approved the delegation of authority to the Director of Community Services to approve charges for new services and use of facilities that may arise from time to time.

t) From the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Health:

Approved the delegation of authority to the Director of Community Services to approve fees charges for the Bereavement Services Memorials Project, which will be completed during 2010/11.

New Recommendation:

u) In the event that Stamp Duty Land Tax (SDLT) is payable in respect of the underlease for the Grand Arcade Car Park, to approve the Director of Finance be authorised to make the appropriate payment, funded as outlined in paragraphs 15.9 to 15.10, with relevant changes to the Capital Plan.

Appendix H (b) – Council Tax Setting 2010/11

(1) The Council calculated its Council Tax Base to be **40,205** for the year 2010/11 in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as shown in the schedule of properties in this Appendix.

(2) The following amounts are now calculated by the Council for the year 2010/11 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

(a) £133,672,880 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) £114,537,560 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 2010/11**]

(c) £19,135,320 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) £12,438,370 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.

(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 2.5%.

City Council element of Council Tax

Band	City Council 2009/10 £'s	Council Tax 2010/11 £'s	Difference (£'s)
A	108.34	111.05	2.71
B	126.40	129.55	3.15
C	144.45	148.06	3.61
D	162.51	166.57	4.06
E	198.62	203.59	4.97
F	234.74	240.60	5.86
G	270.85	277.62	6.77
H	325.02	333.14	8.12

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**].

Updated Appendix H(b) - Council Tax Setting 2010/11

Subsequent to the publication of the Council Agenda papers, notifications of decisions had been received from precepting bodies. At their meetings the Cambridgeshire Police Authority and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority (11th February 2010) and Cambridgeshire County Council (16th February 2010) approved the amounts in precepts to be issued to the City

Council for the year 2010/11. The resulting changes to the tables in the Council Tax Setting Appendix H(b) in respect of the precepting bodies and the total *are as shown below in the shaded columns*:

Band	County Council £	Police Authority £	Fire & Rescue 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

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 **2010/11** 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

10/06 TO DEAL WITH ORAL QUESTIONS**ORAL QUESTIONS****1) From Councillor Herbert to the Executive Councillor for Housing:**

Will she review her decision to penalise council tenants who are disabled by charging them large sums for the maintenance of, often elderly, equipment that is essential for their daily lives?

2) From Councillor Bradnack to the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources:

Will the Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources ensure that the Council does not make any contractual arrangement to let 47-51 Norfolk St with City Life without first allowing other potential tenants to bid for the lease?

3) From Councillor Walker to the Chair of the Planning Committee:

Regarding the CB1 Station Area Development Planning Application 08/0266/OUT: How much has the City Council paid PricewaterhouseCoopers and Carter Jonas for their Viability Assessment on Ashwell CB1 Ltd./Ashwell Property Group, and ongoing advice?

4) From Councillor Rosenstiel to the Executive Councillor for Environmental and Waste Services

Can the Executive Councillor update members on the long-sought-for facilities to assist the public who wish to be able to dispose of compact fluorescent lamps in an environmentally sustainable manner?

5) From Councillor Howell to the Chair of the Planning Committee:

When will the City Council next update its local planning policies?

6) From Councillor Herbert to the Leader:

Given his written commitment on the folk festival ticket fiasco over 13 months ago (on 6 January 2009) that 'I am determined to do all we can to get our money back' can he detail the actions he has taken and the results that he has achieved so far?

7) From Councillor Howell to the Chair of the Planning Committee:

What s106 agreements are currently being renegotiated or have been renegotiated recently?

10/07 TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION,**Motion A: Public Consultation by the Council**

Councillor Blencowe proposed and Councillor Newbold seconded the following motion:

To the Leader:

This Council regrets the lack of public consultation on two recently made decisions, notably:

- 1.The non-renewal of the section 30 dispersal order for the Petersfield end of Mill Road and it's surrounding area and
- 2.The use of Cherry Hinton Hall for the new dog compound.

It also regrets the lack of public consultation on the Planning Committee decision to vary the CB1/Station Area section 106 agreement. The Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to address this democratic deficiency as a matter of urgency.

Under Procedure Rule 13.8.1, it was agreed to deal with the business at the meeting.

RESOLVED: On a show of hands the motion was lost by 8 votes to 17.

Motion B: Housing Officer Posts

Councillor Todd-Jones proposed and Councillor Blencowe the following motion:

To the Executive Councillor for Housing.

This Council notes the public admission at the Housing Management Board meeting of 8th February that, as a result of the Tranche 6 Housing Management Services transfer to the Customer Service Centre, that 4 out of 8 estate housing officer posts are to be lost.

This Council on behalf of its tenants and leaseholders believes that this outcome is unacceptable and that the overall Housing Management Services transfer package should be revised and that the Executive Member for Housing is urged to bring a further proposal to the next HMB meeting which protects this essential frontline service.

Under Procedure Rule 13.8.1, it was agreed to deal with the business at the meeting.

RESOLVED: On a show of hands the motion was lost by 8 votes to 17.

Motion C: Cuts in higher education funding

Councillor Bick proposed and Councillor Nimmo-Smith seconded the following motion:

The Council

- recognises that the higher education sector in Cambridge is a major engine of the local economy, and a key gateway that offers access and opportunity to be part of the educated, qualified and skilled workforce on which local economic development is critically dependent.
- is apprehensive at the prospect of an estimated £2.5b of cuts in funding for universities nationally over the next three years. .
- believes that the government's planned financial retrenchment will have a serious impact not only on jobs in the city's universities but also on the wider economy.

The Council therefore instructs the Leader and Chief Executive to write

- to relevant government ministers asking them to think again about their proposed cuts in higher education funding,
- to the Greater Cambridge Partnership asking them to monitor the impact of any higher education cuts on the sub-regional economy.
- to local MPs and prospective parliamentary candidates urging them to commit to defend the Cambridge economy, and with it the wider national interest, from these risks.

Under Procedure Rule 13.8.1, it was agreed to deal with the business at the meeting.

Councillor Herbert proposed and Councillor Blencowe seconded the following amendment:

Delete all after first bullet point and add:

- is committed to retaining the benefits of record current Government investment in higher education in expanding student numbers, in increasing research from £1.3bn to £4bn, and in financing major new higher education building programmes in Cambridge and nationally
- supports the Government aim of 50% of school leavers attending University and taking degree level courses

The Council therefore instructs the Leader and Chief Executive to write to government ministers asking them to give clear priority to higher education in future national financial reviews

And also commits the Council to action with the County and Greater Cambridge Partnership, including asking the Executive Councillor for Climate Change and Growth to expand the Council's Draft Economic Development Statement to include a strategy on increasing the contribution of higher education to the Cambridge economy including to expand Cambridge high tech research and local engineering industries and employment.

On a show of hands the amendment was lost by 18 votes to 5

Resolved (by 19 votes to 0) that:

The Council

- recognises that the higher education sector in Cambridge is a major engine of the local economy, and a key gateway that offers access and opportunity to be part of the educated, qualified and skilled workforce on which local economic development is critically dependent.
- is apprehensive at the prospect of an estimated £2.5b of cuts in funding for universities nationally over the next three years. .

- believes that the government's planned financial retrenchment will have a serious impact not only on jobs in the city's universities but also on the wider economy.

The Council therefore instructs the Leader and Chief Executive to write

- to relevant government ministers asking them to think again about their proposed cuts in higher education funding,
- to the Greater Cambridge Partnership asking them to monitor the impact of any higher education cuts on the sub-regional economy.
- to local MPs and prospective parliamentary candidates urging them to commit to defend the Cambridge economy, and with it the wider national interest, from these risks.

10/08 TO RECEIVE RECORDS OF URGENT DECISIONS MADE BY MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE (October - February)

The Council received the records of urgent decisions made by Executive Councillors as set out in the agenda.

10/09 TO RECEIVE THE RECORDS OF DECISIONS AND MINUTES

Members noted the written questions and answers circulated around the Chamber and received the minutes of committees, which were for information.

The meeting ended at 12.10pm

CHAIR