

COUNCIL



15 SEPTEMBER 2016 - 4:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor S Bligh, Councillor C Boden, Councillor G G R Booth, Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor Mrs V M Bucknor, Councillor M Buckton, Councillor J F Clark, Councillor S Clark, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor S Count, Councillor S R Court, Councillor Mrs C R Cox, Councillor M Davis, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor S Garratt, Councillor D Green, Councillor A Hay, Councillor D Hodgson, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor S J E King, Councillor D Laws, Councillor D Mason, Councillor Mrs K F Mayor, Councillor A Miscandlon, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor D C Oliver, Councillor C C Owen, Councillor A Pugh, Councillor C J Seaton, Councillor R Skoulding, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor M Tanfield, Councillor G Tibbs, Councillor S Tierney.

APOLOGIES: Councillor T R Butcher, Councillor D W Connor, Councillor M J Humphrey, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor F H Yeulett

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Paul Medd (Chief Executive Officer), Rob Bridge (Corporate Director), Gary Garford (Corporate Director), Kim Sawyer (Monitoring Officer), Anna Goodall (Head of Legal and Governance), Mark Matthews (Head of Environmental Services), John Carey (Press and Public Relations Officer), Jo Blackmore (Executive Officer) and Tanya Shepherd (Member Services Officer)

C26/16 TO CONFIRM AND SIGN THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 21 JULY 2016

Prior to the commencement of the agenda items, at the request of the representative, it was agreed that Item 8- Petition- Garden Waste Collections be moved to Item 6.

Councillor Booth stated that on page 7 of the previous minutes (9 of 78 in the current agenda pack) in the final paragraph, there is reference to a question he asked Councillor King in relation to the existing contract with Balfour Beatty. The minutes state that he asked if there would be involvement from 'County Council' when it should read 'Parish Councils'. With this amendment made:

The minutes of the meeting of the 21st July 2016 were CONFIRMED and SIGNED.

C27/16 CIVIC ENGAGEMENTS UPDATE - FOR INFORMATION ONLY

The Chairman Councillor Mrs Cox referred Members of the Council to the attached Civic Events undertaken by herself and the Vice Chairman in the weeks preceding Full Council.

C28/16 TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE.

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that she would like to take the opportunity to inform Members that she has decided to take a slightly different approach to this years' Chairman's Coffee morning. She stated that on this occasion, she is keen that the coffee morning is run in support of a local charity. As such, she has taken the decision to run this years' Coffee Morning in aid of The Royal British Legion with representatives present from each of the four local market towns. The Chairman's Coffee morning will be taking place on Monday 10th October in the Council Chamber. Members should already have received the invitations and she stated all are very welcome to attend.

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that she would like to thank all those Members who attended the Merchant Navy day ceremony on 02 September. The event was held in honour of the brave men and women who kept our nation afloat in both World Wars. The ceremony was well attended and we received extremely positive feedback from all of those present.

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that she would like to thank Councillor Cornwell for his work in organising the trip to Stadt Nettetal on behalf of the Fenland Twinning Association. She stated the trip was a great success and thoroughly enjoyed by those who attended.

Finally, Councillor Mrs Cox stated that Members will be aware that Councillor Mrs Newell had passed her apologies for this meeting as a result of ill health. She stated she would like to take the opportunity to wish Councillor Mrs Newell a speedy recovery following her recent surgery and felt sure that Members will support her in doing so.

There were no announcements from Paul Medd.

C29/16 PETITION - GARDEN WASTE COLLECTIONS

Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that she wonders whether all have a pecuniary interest in the item concerning the garden waster petition by virtue of them all having to pay the associated costs if adopted. She stated that she had taken some legal advice as to whether or not she can be involved in the discussion as she had signed the petition itself, and was advised that although she has a predisposed view regarding the proposed scheme she may contribute in the discussions as she is not predetermined. She stated she is looking forward to hearing from other members about the potential merits associated with the scheme, before she formulates her final view.

Councillor Mrs Cox invited Lawrence Weetman, a member of the public to present his petition on the Garden Waste Collections proposal. His presentation was as follows:

"I stand before Members of the Council with a petition. A petition against the proposed charges for brown bin collections, which has gathered over 1,600 signatures. As we have seen from the rise of UKIP and the Labour Party there are currently deep resentments amongst the public against the establishment at both a national and local level. In times of austerity and cut backs people don't recognise their politicians as people who work for them. Council tax has risen, as those taxes have risen, services have been cut. As people see the temporal benefits they get from their Council Tax- from grass cutting to highway maintenance, slipping away, they begin to further distrust those politicians. Nothing can be closer to the truth in terms of your proposed charges regarding waste collections. Fenland charges the highest rates of Council Tax in Cambridgeshire. The Fenland proportion for Council Tax on a 'Band D' property is more than £250 per year. This is £69 a year more than Cambridge City Council and shamefully double the £125 per year charged by South Cambs. Your garden waste tax effectively increases this already inflated taxation by another 16%. Councillors make arguments that this only represents 70p per week but this is a 70p per week increase, on top of the charge that many in Fenland are already struggling to afford, especially with the proposed cuts to the council tax support. At a seminar in July it stated that he Council accepts that over 65's who sign up to this scheme would be the highest proportion which seems obvious. They are the people least likely with their own transport to get to the local recycling centre and the people least likely to have the mobility required for home composting. In some parts of Fenland the issue of those who are paying for garden maintenance services cannot do this themselves. Those residents will also now have to pay for the brown bins to take the waste away. When the government increased the pension rate to £119.30 pensioners, the Pensions Minister Ros Altmann said 'pensioners have already done their best for society, worked hard and we owe them'. What is being given with one hand is being taken away with the other. This is the charge that will disproportionately hit the worst off among us. I don't know whether or not the council has carried out an equality impact assessment yet, back in July the Council stated that this will take place after the consultation had rose. I suggest that this accessible or therefore it would be a complete white wash or else the Council

would have risked wasting almost £14,000 of the tax payer's money on a consultation about schema impact assessments which might say it would be unviable, which is it? It has been reported that there were over 7,000 respondents to the £14,000 consultation. I believe that this was money wasted. A true consultation would have put various money saving options before residents. Instead the survey asked a series of questions that could be used by the Council as it is obvious it supports the new charge, regardless of how people answered those questions. I don't think that this would have passed as a piece of GCSE mathematics coursework and I think the Council should be ashamed of this. The Council spent nearly £10,000 of tax payers money on a previous survey asking residents which areas of Council spending they thought would be acceptable to be cut. Bin collections were 19th out of 19. The Council ignored that consultation and engineered the new one so that it was guaranteed to support their case, it was a sham. The consultation asked residents what they would do with their garden waste, they failed to give residents options such as 'fly-tip' it, burn it, leave it in my garden or hide it in my green bin. You might think that this is ridiculous suggestion but the questionnaire should have reflected the things that people do in real life. Especially since the scheme throws up all sorts of logistical anomalies. You will be allowed to put cut from the shops into the green bin, but not cut flowers from your garden. If you have no garden or you want your real Christmas tree taken away then you have to pay for a whole year of garden waste collections. This confusion will undoubtedly result in an increase in landfill waste. In Peterborough we saw landfill waste increase by 2.3 tonnes across a five month period. This increase was almost identical to the drop in waste in the food and garden waste recycling bins. The Council found that 45% of the contents of the landfill bins was recyclable organic matter. Matter which would go in resident's garden waste bins. This increase in land fill waste cost Peterborough an additional £118,000 over a 5 month period. In Fenland the landfill tax alone over those 5 months would have cost more than £200,000. Is it really fair that those paying for landfill services will end up subsidising others with their recycled waste in landfill? The proposed scheme does not work. It is bad for residents and it is bad for the environment. I will finish by warning Councillors not to dismiss these 1,600 signatures. The number may be small in comparison to the 7,000 consultation responses but this petition had absolutely no funding, imagine how many signatures I would have collected if I was able to spend £2 per response like Fenland has. Things have been quite good for Councillors in Fenland up until now. Some of you have held single seats for the opposition, many of those face very little opposition. If Councillors keep riding roughshod over residents with proposals which only serve to harm the people of Fenland and our environments."

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that it is recommended within the report that Members consider the petition following which the matter will be considered by Cabinet on 20 October 2016.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor requested to raise a point of order before the report is proposed, which was agreed. She asked if this petition goes to Cabinet, does this mean it will come back to Council or is it being inferred that it will go to Cabinet where the final decision will be reached? Councillor Mrs Cox referred this point of order to Councillor Murphy for a response.

Councillor Murphy firstly replied to the petition. He thanked Lawrence Weetman for presenting the petition to the Council. He stated there are clearly a proportion of the Council's customers who value the refuse and recycling services offered and are concerned by the proposal. He added that Cabinet will be considering the valid points that were raised, alongside those raised by the 12,000+ customers who have filled in their feedback forms on the proposal via the consultation, when they make their determination in October. He then referred back to the point of order made by Councillor Mrs Bucknor stating that if the recommendations in the report are agreed, then Cabinet will make their determination on this proposal.

Councillor Mrs Cox stated at this point that the query raised by Councillor Mrs Bucknor was not in fact a point of order and requested to move to a proposal for the recommendation. Councillor Sutton proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Clark.

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that prior to the petition being open to debate, she would like to take the opportunity to remind members that in accordance with the Council's Petition Policy, members are allowed a maximum of 15 minutes to discuss petitions (unless such time is extended by the majority vote of the Council).

The petition was opened for discussion.

Councillor Booth requested to move a motion in that we put aside standing orders of the 15 minute time limit in case the discussion takes longer, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Bucknor.

Councillor Mrs Cox asked if the rest of the Council were in agreement with this, which they were not. This was referred to a vote, with the majority voting against the motion. Councillor Mrs Cox stated that the motion was not carried.

The petition was then re-opened for discussion.

Councillor Mrs French requested that Councillor Murphy answer the question, if this does go to Cabinet does it come back to Council? Councillor Murphy stated that the Garden Waste proposal has been through this process, it will therefore be presented to Cabinet on 20 October where the matter will be decided. He stated that this particular proposal had already been to Council twice.

Councillor Booth thanked the petitioner for the information that had been given in terms of the research by other areas that had introduced the charges. He stated members hadn't actually seen some of this information. He stated that some of the questions he had raised included what these areas, such as Peterborough had faced. He stated he had friends in Peterborough who informed him there had been an increase in fly-tipping which is information members hadn't been given. He felt it was somewhat worrying that there is different pictures coming from neighbouring authorities and proposed that the Garden Waste Collections proposal goes back to Overview & Scrutiny. He stated that this committee now serves two functions and that Councillor Fred Yeulett was running this effectively. He stated that reservations have been raised in relation to this proposal and its potential impact on residents. He added that bin collections are a service that most residents use on a weekly basis whereas other services offered are used as and when they are needed. He stated that the consultation cost £12,000 more than the initial CSR consultation and there was perhaps more information that needed to be considered. He felt that the Overview & Scrutiny committee should look further into this information and give recommendations. Councillor Mrs Bucknor seconded this. Councillor Mrs Bucknor thanked the petitioner for the great deal of information that had been relayed. She stated that there is a small group against it, and that she is happy for Cabinet to make the decision. She added that this proposal was the last thing that the residents of Fenland wanted. She added that there is clear evidence from Peterborough even though officers hadn't been provided with the information. She stated in relation to the increased fly-tipping mentioned by Councillor Booth, Fenland already has issues with this. She stated that there are a number of people from the villages who are Norfolk based that use the Wisbech Waste disposal as it is closer. She stated the people in Norfolk could pay more if they want a waste disposal but they come to Wisbech. She stated that there are constant extra smaller charges and felt the additional cost was a lot to a large amount of Fenland residents. She stated this is not what the residents wanted which is why she supported the petition in the first instance. She asked if Councillors could justify going against what the public want.

Councillor Murphy confirmed the proposal will be submitted to Cabinet in October and reiterated that there is £2.3m savings required and there were 3 items considered in order to achieve this. He stated the first was within Leisure services which takes a long time to put into place, the second being car parking charges and the third being the garden waste collections. This will save the Council £500,000 if implemented, however if it goes back to Overview & Scrutiny then this would delay the process. He stated he is aware of the 1,622 names on the petition however 61.2% of 12,000 residents who took part in the consultation stated they would pay. He added that one thing raised as a concern was the elderly, however the highest figures returned within the consultation came from this age group. He stated he felt the younger people do not necessarily have the same concerns about the costs associated with the scheme as they are out working all day. He stated that this charge is being introduced across the country and they are all charging around £40 which seems to be the average price. He stated that the District Council cannot make any money out of this, that the Government has stated that the Local Authorities can now charge for brown bins, not the green or blue. He stated that all Councils have to make savings, this service costs £700,000 and this is no longer available to spend. If this were to get turned down then an additional £500,000 to £700,000 would need to be found to balance this.

Councillor Mrs Hay stated that the Overview & Scrutiny panel were aware that the Council had to make big savings, which in reality could involve charges for parking or the brown bins. As the car parking charges had such opposition, it was determined that the brown bin charges would be moved forwards. She stated that not one Councillor would have chosen the brown bin charges but they had no option. She stated that as the Vice-Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee she believes there is limited merit in bringing this item back before the committee as the matter had already been thoroughly considered.

Councillor Cox stated at this stage that the allotted time to discuss the petition had been used and therefore a vote was required for this to be returned to Overview & Scrutiny as an amendment to the original report recommendation. Councillor Booth stated that in response to this amendment, Councillor Murphy had made a sweeping generalisation about individuals, such as the old and young, he stated that they need to look at the impact on all residents, and felt there was time for this to be put to Overview & Scrutiny as he had received an email regarding an additional meeting scheduled to take place in early October.

Councillor Mrs French asked what the recommendations of Overview & Scrutiny were and what purpose would it serve for this item to go back? The Monitoring Officer, Kim Sawyer stated that these recommendations are not available for the purposes of this meeting. Councillor Mrs Hay (Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) stated that the recommendations were to go forwards with the proposed charges for garden waste.

Councillor Clark asked for clarification prior to moving to a vote- exactly what members were voting for. Councillor Mrs Cox stated it was for the petition to go back to Overview & Scrutiny, an amendment suggested by Councillor Booth.

A vote was held with the majority going AGAINST the amendment. The amendment was not carried.

A second vote was held in relation to the first proposal, to go with recommendations outlined in the report as proposed earlier by Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Clark.

There were issues with this vote raised by Councillor Mrs Bucknor regarding length of time members were given to vote against the recommendation and requested that the vote be conducted for a second time so that she could ascertain the number of elected members voting for and against the report recommendations. The Monitoring Officer, Kim Sawyer stated that unless a decision was made to conduct a recorded vote, the original vote cannot be re-visited; therefore the majority vote to support the recommendation was carried.

Councillor Bucknor asked for a point of order as when it went to a vote it was all done very quickly. Councillor Mrs Cox clarified that it was a clear majority who were in support of this item going to Cabinet and therefore the motion was carried.

It was AGREED that the Garden Waste Collections petition be considered by Cabinet on 20 October 2016.

C30/16 TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS FROM, AND PROVIDE ANSWERS TO, COUNCILLORS IN RELATION TO MATTERS WHICH, IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIRMAN, ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PROCEDURE RULES 8.4 AND 8.6.

Councillor Booth stated that the boundary review had been released and it was clear that comments made had not been taken on board. He stated that there are still some ridiculous boundaries which show that people's views weren't looked at and what the Council asked for wasn't followed. Councillor Clark stated that he would take some advice on this as in the past when comments had been passed to the Boundary Commission; it will usually not have any effect on the final decision. Councillor Booth stated that we need to show distaste for the whole process, and that he understood it was not going to change anything, but it is another situation where other people are deciding what will happen in Fenland without listening to opinion. Councillor Clark felt the original query had been answered.

Councillor Booth asked in relation to the Rural Capital Grant could they explain the current situation as one of the bids had now been withdrawn and there is a £100,000 now available, could other capital rural communities use that fund? Councillor Clark stated that the fund has now been closed and the £100,000 had been put into the capital programme. Councillor Booth stated he was disappointed with this response as trying to find cuts and savings, and that relates more to revenue and expenditure. Councillor Clark stated that capital cannot be turned into revenue and that sites in the revenue account and that would save revenue in the future being converted into capital. Councillor Clark stated that he feels that it is clear that some members of this Council wished to continue to spend whilst others are prepared to look at the position it is in and look at making changes to save.

Councillor Booth asked in relation to the devolution deal, he felt that generally people were supportive but people were not clear on the Mayor situation, based on phone calls the survey seems one sided and again, going back to the Government imposing the directly elected Mayor upon us. Councillor Clark stated that the consultation had gone to the secretary of state. He also made reference to the recent story in the national media about devolution deals and the requirement to have a directly elected mayor. Councillor Clark stated that the media story had absolutely been denied by Central Government. He added that devolution does come with a Mayor, and the deal offered to Cambridgeshire comes with a mayor and this is non-negotiable. Councillor Booth asked if they had the power to try and negotiate the best deal for Cambridgeshire, and asked if these suggestions are made, are they saying that this would remove the deal offered. Councillor Clark confirmed that this was exactly what he was saying, if we stated we do not want the Mayor then the offer of the deal would be removed. Councillor Booth stated that he felt that Central Government are therefore imposing a Mayor on Cambridgeshire, with Councillor Clark stating that this was his interpretation of what the offer entails and they have to consider what is on offer in the deal at the present time.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that she was pleased to see the letter to CCG recently as she had raised her concerns about the proposed closure of Doddington hospital in May of this year. She requested that the full response from CCG be circulated, Councillor Clark confirmed that a response had been received which stated they are willing to come along to address this Council at a seminar and give their position on this, however no date has been set. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that she had written to them and received very un-detailed responses to specific questions. She stated that the letter from Councillor Clark had some clear sound questions, and if they could have the response to those prior to the meeting that would be useful. Councillor Clark stated the letter hadn't outlined the responses to the specific questions, they would therefore be asked at the meeting when they attend. He stated that Councillor Cornwell may be able to give more of an answer as he had attended a meeting that day.

C31/16 **TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM AND ASK QUESTIONS OF CABINET MEMBERS WITH PORTFOLIO HOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE RULES 8.1 AND 8.2.**

Councillor Mrs Cox stated that to allow full discussion on this item, she is proposing to suspend Standing Orders to enable members to make comments as well as ask questions. This was AGREED.

Councillor Mrs French stated that she had an update regarding CCG, as she had attended a meeting with CCG, and fully support the comments of Councillor Mrs Bucknor as the growth of the district within the local plan is concerning as they are only looking at the next 5 years, whereas the Council is looking at 20 years.

Councillor Mrs French also stated that March Town Council in conjunction with Cambridgeshire County Council have now put in for new street lights along Wimblington Road and wanted to check the £10,000 was still available. Councillor Clark stated that it is, however they would need to pay this

direct to CCC.

Councillor Hoy stated that she has been approached and asked what the difference is between the Council's street scene officers and enforcement for parking having been issued tickets, and under what circumstances they can do that. She stated that she is happy to accept a response in writing.

Councillor Tierney stated to Councillor Cornwell in relation to the Health & Wellbeing board minutes and the minor injuries unit, in the meeting in May they were asked about potential cuts to services throughout the minor injuries unit and they answered that that was not what they plan to do, which he felt seems to have been a lie. Councillor Cornwell responded stating that the cuts were in relation to Doddington Court rather than the minor injuries unit which has moved on considerably since the meeting in May. He stated they are still in engagement mode at the moment, referring to a presentation that he had attended that day and he stated there were a number of changes discussed that are necessary within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The presentation outlined that they are looking to deliver the minor injuries unit as part of a more comprehensive urgent care in the community approach, and they are still awaiting an outcome on this. He stated that there isn't much that the Council can do other than try and influence what decisions are reached with regards to this. He stated that this was the point of the letter that went out to the CCG and was copied into various other places in the last few days. The letters make a number of points, one of which is that they adequately take into account our Local Plan and the growth expected in this area, which was mentioned in the meeting that day. He stated the letter covered a lot of ground in terms of what they are aiming for, which is proper services for the residents of Fenland. He added that it has become apparent through meetings that there are a range of differences in the health services that cover Fenland such as GP's in different areas. He stated that this is a complicated situation with no commonality.

Councillor Owen asked Councillor Seaton if the figures on the number of days taken to process Council Tax Support claims and Housing Benefits claims are correct, which he confirmed they were. He stated that previously the Council had received a number of letters condemning them due to the length of time it was taking to receive a response. He therefore he wanted to congratulate the staff members that have been involved in getting these figures down. Councillor Seaton stated that he feels this is a reflection of how well the ARP is working.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor referred back to Councillor Cornwell's response on the Health & Wellbeing issues. She stated that she had received a call from the Chief Executive Officer of the NHS Trust and she was asking lots of questions which were similar to that of what Steve Barclay, MP had said, his approach and his ideas and his approach as to what he wants for Wisbech are total variant from what the CCG are proposing. She asked if Councillor Cornwell could liaise with him and try and encourage CCG to talk with him, as they are hearing that one option is to close the Minor Injuries Unit. Councillor Cornwell stated that the overall intention is to increase the services and that they are talking to the MP, he stated they are aware of what was in the letters, and the content made common sense and was clear in terms of what the MP thinks should be achieved. He stated that they have to aim for an improvement in the services as well as sustainable services and there is currently a massive review underway within CCG.

Councillor Tierney asked Councillor Oliver about a report that was received from a constituent about a bike theft which CCTV has captured, however when this footage was passed to the Police in order to identify the face of the thief, the Police had already closed the case. He stated he recognised that bike theft seems a minor case however was interested who was responsible for the delay. Councillor Oliver stated the particular incident referred to was captured by the Horsefair CCTV not ours, and the police weren't notified of the image. He stated he has been in touch with the local Sergeant to see if it is a closed case as there have been a series of similar incidents.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked Councillor Cornwell for an update on the Wisbech Alcohol Project, having asked at the last Council meetings about whether or not this could be held at the Oasis

centre, Councillor Cornwell referred this to Councillor Oliver who stated that he would look into this and get back to her.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated to Councillor Sutton, when he attends an HMO, the only way other members get to find out is through the paper. She requested that if he attends an HMO involving serious issues, can he please involve the Councillors of that ward which Councillor Sutton confirmed he would.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked Councillor Murphy about the research into the park home insulation in terms of where the experiment was carried out and what the results were. Councillor Murphy stated he couldn't give an update on this as this is a new project that is being started. Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked that if such research is carried out within a particular ward, that the relevant member(s) are informed, which he agreed.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor asked if a question could be passed to Councillor Butcher in his absence at the meeting, in relation to the meetings on the Wisbech 2020 vision, she had noticed there was no attendance by any of the housing landlords and yet it has been identified that a percentage of the proposed new developments will be for social housing and therefore would like this passed to Councillor Butcher. Councillor Clark stated that he would take this away and answer this on behalf of Councillor Butcher.

Councillor Booth asked Councillor Sutton about the recent planning legislation changes announced by the Government, and if officers could review the contents and update the appropriate Parish and Town Councils regarding the changes as there are some going through the planning process at the moment. Councillor Sutton stated this was no problem and the affected parishes will be informed.

Councillor Booth stated to Councillor Murphy that he mentioned within the petition the responses the consultation had received was 12,000 however the report referred to 9,500- asking if 12,000 was the total now or are they still counting. Councillor Murphy stated this has now finished and the total is now just over 12,000.

Councillor Booth stated to Councillor King in relation to street lighting, thanking him for attending the meetings but stated that the Parishes were disappointed with the approach, he stated he had previously asked a question about category 1 street lights being installed, and there are still a number that haven't been installed. He stated that they had given clear assurance this has been dealt with but hasn't. Councillor King stated that he had found both of the meetings useful and that it is important that the Parishes and FDC continue to have dialogue on this. He stated they will be submitting the question for response in relation to the installation of the street lights within the next day or two and would circulate this once received.

Councillor Murphy stated he wanted to update Council on Anglia in Bloom as this had been successful again, with 19 awards being received. He stated the biggest award went to Wisbech again, and a lady from Whittlesey (Gill Lawrence) had been nominated. He added that Whittlesey involved some truly hard work, with this lady taking bottles of water around with her to water the ground. He wanted to offer thanks to those involved in volunteering around the villages and towns as this could not be achieved without them, and thanked the teams from FDC and ISS who came in towards the end. He also wanted to thank Bob Ollier for the amount of time that he puts into this.

16:00 to 17:10

Chairman