

Date of Publication of Decision List: 20 July 2021

FOR INFORMATION ONLY – THESE DECISIONS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO CALL-IN



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**COUNCIL – 15 JULY 2021 – DECISION LIST**

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, Cllr Anna Bailey and Cllr Lorna Dupré (on behalf of Cllr Charlotte Cane) each delivered a tribute, and a minute's silence was held as a mark of respect following the death of former District Councillor Philip Lewis, Liberal Democrat Member for Cheveley from 1999 to 2003.

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Report Ref.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Action by</b>
1.	-	Public Question Time	To answer questions from members of the public.	One question from a member of the public was received and a response given as detailed at the end of the Decision List.	-
2.	-	Apologies for Absence	To receive apologies for absence from Members	Apologies were received from Cllrs Brown, Cane, Huffer, J Schumann, Trimarco and A Whelan.	-
3.	-	Declarations of Interest	To receive declarations of interests from Members in respect of any items on the Agenda in accordance with the Members Code of Conduct.	No declarations of interest were made.	-
4.	-	Minutes – 29 April 2021	To receive the Minutes of the last Council meeting.	It was resolved: That the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 29 April 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.	Democratic Services Manager
5.	-	Chairman's Announcements	Announcement of items of interest.	The Chairman welcomed Members, Officers and the public to the first face-to-face meeting of the Council for over a year	-

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Report Ref.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Action by</b>
				and reminded them of the protocols for speaking.	
6.	-	To Receive Petitions	To receive public petitions.	No public petitions had been received.	-
7.	-	Notice of Motions Under Procedure Rule 10	To consider Motions with Notice.	No Motions with Notice had been submitted.	-
8.	-	To answer Questions from Members	To receive questions from Members of Council.	Three questions from Members were received and responses given as detailed at the end of the Decision List.	-
9.	W38	Corporate Plan 2021-2023 (Updated)	To consider the updated Corporate Plan 2021-2023 for East Cambridgeshire District Council.	It was resolved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) That the updated Corporate Plan, set out in Appendix 1 of the report, be noted.</li> <li>ii) That the completed actions and progress made during the past 12 months be noted.</li> <li>iii) That the Monitoring Officer be instructed to make the necessary amendments to the Constitution (ref: Article 1 paragraph 1.05) to reflect the new Corporate Plan.</li> </ul>	Monitoring Officer  Chief Executive
10.	W39	Independent Remuneration Panel Recommendations – Audit Committee Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs)	To consider the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) relating to Special Responsibility Allowances for the newly established Audit Committee.	It was resolved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) That the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP), as set out in paragraph 3.5 of the report, be approved.</li> <li>ii) That the IRP comment regarding potential conflicts of interest in the</li> </ul>	Monitoring Officer  Democratic Services Manager

Agenda Item No.	Report Ref.	Item	Issue	Decision	Action by
				<p>membership of the Audit Committee and the Finance &amp; Assets Committee in paragraph 3.7 of the report be noted and therefore the Constitution be amended, specifically the terms of reference of the Finance &amp; Assets Committee and Audit Committee, to exclude joint membership of the respective Committees and to exclude the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council from the membership of the Audit Committee.</p> <p>iii) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary and consequential amendments to the Constitution to implement the Council's resolution.</p>	
11.	W40	Boundary Commission for England (BCE) 2023 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies – East Cambridgeshire District Council Response to Consultation on Initial Proposals for New Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries	To agree the submission to the Boundary Commission for England (BCE) consultation on the initial proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries.	It was resolved: That the submission to the BCE, attached at Appendix 1 of the report, be agreed.	Infrastructure & Strategy Manager

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Report Ref.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Action by</b>
12.	-	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Update Reports: June 2021	To receive reports on the activities of the Combined Authority from the Council's appointees.	It was resolved: That the Council's appointees' reports on the activities of the Combined Authority be noted.	-
13.	W41	Actions taken by the Chief Executive on the Grounds of Urgency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional Restrictions Grant – Rounds 4 and 5</li> <li>• Meetings after 6 May 2021</li> </ul>	To note the actions taken by the Chief Executive on the grounds of urgency.	It was resolved: That the actions taken by the Chief Executive on the grounds of urgency in relation to Additional Restrictions Grants and Meetings after 6 May 2021, as detailed in the report, be noted.	-

## **1. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

### **Former District Councillor Tom Kerby asked the following question:**

“With the current Parliamentary Constituency Boundary review under way, would the Council support the inclusion of Newmarket moving from the constituency of West Suffolk to South East Cambridgeshire? This would be the first step in joining Newmarket with Ely under the Council of East Cambridgeshire.”

### **Response from the Leader of Council, Cllr Anna Bailey:**

“Thank you for your question and welcome back to Council.

This Council has always recognised the close bond between our towns and villages in the south of our District and the town of Newmarket and has always sought to build positive relations and close working with our Suffolk neighbour. To many, the boundary between our District and the town are something of an anomaly. Cllrs Alan Sharp and Amy Starkey in particular, work closely with both West Suffolk and Newmarket Town Council and I also know that Cllrs David Brown and Lavinia Edwards, for example, are working with Exning Parish Council on cycle routes. So there is close working and co-operation at both Officer and Member levels.

Nevertheless, I don't honestly believe that the current parliamentary constituency boundary review is necessarily the most appropriate mechanism to address this issue. I say this for three pragmatic reasons:

Firstly, we support the current proposal which for the first time keeps our District in one constituency and we would be reluctant to make counter proposals that could put this in jeopardy. Later in this meeting there is a paper about the Council's response to the review consultation.

Secondly, whilst that may be arithmetically possible, all Members will know that changing our proposed boundary will have a domino effect on surrounding areas that could be problematic.

In this case and finally, I think it would have the effect of splitting the constituency across 2 counties which, particularly given we have a Combined Authority, would probably be undesirable. I also understand that the proposal would potentially split Suffolk into Essex and Cambridgeshire.

So for all of those reasons I don't think it's something we could take forward at this time. Many thanks for your question."

## **8. TO ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

### **i) Question to the Chairman of the Operational Services Committee from Cllr Mark Inskip:**

"At the Full Council meeting on 23 February I asked a question to the Chair of Operational Services Committee about the recent email outage, raising my concerns that further actions were needed to guarantee that the Council's email system was sufficiently resilient to future outages. In his response he dismissed my concerns in a politicised answer.

Last week the Council experienced a further outage which left email services unavailable for the best part of a day and a half along with several more days to recover emails sent during the period of the outage. Given this latest incident does he now support my previous call for a much more thorough review?"

### **Response from the Chairman of the Operational Services Committee, Cllr David Ambrose Smith:**

"Thank you Cllr Inskip for your question.

As Chairman of the Operational Services Committee I do not feel it necessary for a review as I am satisfied with the explanation given by the ICT Team regarding the cause and the action they under took in respect of the recent email outage. A full report from the ICT team is appended to the answer for you to look at."

ICT report:

At approximately 14:20 on Wednesday 7th July, the Exchange (email) server experienced an issue with the email index and the datastore, preventing clients and software (such as Outlook and OWA log-ins) from connecting to the server. After immediately attempting standard recovery steps for this kind of fault the ICT Team made contact with Microsoft support that afternoon, however unfortunately they were unable to recover the datastore that evening. From this point the team moved to a two-pronged approach: continue with recovery attempts on the failed datastore while also attempting restore from the most recent known good backup of the server (this being 10:00PM 6th July 2021).

Even with Microsoft's continued assistance it was not possible to repair the datastore. Our ICT System Administration Team was able to restore the backup and undertook further work to bring the newly restored server into the live network. Full functionality was restored at 9.30am on 9th July 2021. No emails were lost as these were caught with our Mimecast system and the Support Team have been restoring user emails to their Outlook mailboxes.

The issue has been caused by the import of .PST "Personal Folder" archives onto the server - a stage of our work towards the migration from our onsite Exchange email server to Microsoft Office 365. The work towards the migration to Microsoft Office 365 will continue, however we will be re-evaluating this stage of the project to ensure staff will continue to have access to the archived emails that they require after the migration project has completed without further impacting our current email server.

At this point in time the ICT team do not have a set date for when the migration to Microsoft Office 365 will complete but are working with our Microsoft partner to accomplish the migration as soon as practicable. We were not proposing to do any further investigations or reviews, as we have already identified the cause of the issue (the importing of the .PST folders causing index corruption) and have paused that element of the 365 migration project. We will be working with our Microsoft partner to be able to continue moving to exchange 365 without users being unable to access the personal folders/archive folders.

**ii) Question to the Chairman of the Planning Committee from Cllr John Trapp:**

"The District Council issued a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on self-build homes recently, and to my mind self-build is a means of encouraging more housing, and affordable housing. Would the Chair of Planning state how many of the self-build plots in planning applications have been taken up, and how he considers that the self-build programme is working, and whether it fulfils its aims?"

**Response from the Chairman of the Planning Committee, Cllr Bill Hunt:**

"Thank you Cllr Trapp for your question. I was quite surprised that you asked it because you could have found the answer from Officers to save some time.

I can tell you that the permissions that were given were 43 in 2018, 64 in 2019, and 93 in 2020. So far in 2021 there have been 7. I also asked Officers to give me information on how much CIL Self-Build Relief we have approved: 93 in 2017/18, 78 in 2018/19, and 94 in 2019/20. So not only are we giving consent, but people are building. So I'd say it was successful. As you know we have a policy in our

Local Plan which requires any development of over 100 dwellings to provide 5% of the site as self-build. The policy is working well, fulfilling its aims and long may it continue. I share with you your enthusiasm for self-build and, like you, I welcome it.”

**iii) Question to the Leader of Council from Cllr Simon Harries:**

“Please confirm how many sales have been completed for £100k houses in this district, and please also explain the actions taken by the Council to address mortgage approval issues encountered with respect to £100k homes.”

**Response from the Leader of Council, Cllr Anna Bailey:**

“Thank you Cllr Harries for your question.

I'm somewhat surprised that Cllr Harries doesn't seem to know that this question would be best directed to the Combined Authority - the £100k Homes initiative is a project of the Combined Authority not this Council. Of course we have, as a Council and a constituent member of the Combined Authority, fully supported £100k Homes, as it gives our residents - typically residents that are so often shut out of the housing market completely - the opportunity to get onto the property ladder at an affordable price, with the benefit that the discount stays with the property throughout its lifetime, allowing many more people into the future to benefit as well. So East Cambs has supported the policy, but East Cambs is not the authority responsible for involvement in the sales process itself.

To try to be helpful though, turning to the first part of the question: I am aware, that even though no one has yet moved in, buyers are progressing through the sales process. To answer the second part of the question, the Council has not taken any action relating to the sales process because, and I reiterate, it is not the responsibility of East Cambs District Council; this is a Combined Authority project. I am aware though that Combined Authority Officers are working hard to do what they can to enable the completion of sales.

I would like to remind everyone on this subject - particularly those that seem to enjoy casting doubt on social media about the sales of these properties to first time buyers trying to get onto the housing ladder - that these are real people involved in this process, buying their first home, and I think everyone would do well to remember that when taking to social media to pass comment.

I have every confidence that completions will go ahead and that proud new property owners will be taking up residence in Fordham, and I very much look forward to the day when the first people move in.”