

Public Document Pack

COUNCIL

A meeting of Council will be held at Council Chamber, Fenland Hall on TUESDAY, 24 AUGUST 2021 at 4.00 PM and I request you to attend accordingly for transaction of the following business:

- 1 To receive apologies for absence.
- 2 Previous Minutes (Pages 3 - 14)

To confirm and sign the minutes of 19 May 2021.
- 3 To receive any announcements from the Chairman of the Council and/or the Head of Paid Service.
- 4 To receive members' declaration of any interests under the Local Code of Conduct or any interest under the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters in respect of any item to be discussed at the meeting.
- 5 Fenland Electoral Review - Council Size report (Pages 15 - 48)

For Members to consider and agree the formal Council consultation submission in relation to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Electoral Review of Fenland District Council. This report forms the Council's response to the initial part of the electoral review process regarding the proposed future Council Size which is the numbers of Councillors required to run the Council in future.

Fenland Hall
March



Chief Executive

Monday, 16 August 2021

NOTE The Council may, by resolution, as exemplified below, exclude the public from a meeting during the consideration of any item of business whenever it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Section 100 I of the Local Government Act, 1972

"Resolved that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for Item No./Minute No. on the grounds that the item involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act"

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL



WEDNESDAY, 19 MAY 2021 - 4.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor R Skoulding (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor C Boden, Councillor G Booth, Councillor J Clark, Councillor S Clark, Councillor D Connor, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor S Count, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor K French, Councillor A Hay, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor M Humphrey, Councillor A Lynn, Councillor D Mason, Councillor A Maul, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor J Mockett, Councillor D Patrick, Councillor M Purser, Councillor W Rackley, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor S Tierney, Councillor D Topgood, Councillor S Wallwork and Councillor R Wicks

APOLOGIES: Councillor Mrs S Bligh, Councillor D Divine, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor C Marks, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor C Seaton, Councillor M Tanfield, Councillor S Wilkes and Councillor F Yeulett

C1/21 TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN FOR THE PERIOD TO THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING AND TO RESOLVE THAT AN ALLOWANCE OF £4,116 PLUS TRAVELLING EXPENSES BE PAID TO THE PERSON ELECTED.

It was proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Skoulding and resolved that Councillor Alex Miscandlon be elected as Chairman of the Council for the period to the next Annual Meeting and that he be paid an allowance of £4,116 plus travelling expenses.

The Chairman thanked everybody for their support and hoped that this would be a better year than 2020. He stated that he will do his best to uphold the high standards set by the previous Chairmen of this Council and going forward hopes for a better year for us all.

C2/21 TO ELECT A VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE PERIOD TO THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING AND TO RESOLVE THAT AN ALLOWANCE OF £1,000 PLUS TRAVELLING EXPENSES BE PAID TO THE PERSON ELECTED.

It was proposed by Councillor Miscandlon, seconded by Councillor Purser and resolved that Councillor Rob Skoulding be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Council for the period to the next Annual Meeting and that he be paid an allowance of £1,000 plus travelling expenses.

The Vice Chairman thanked all of the members who voted for him as Vice Chairman. On a personal note he gave a big thank you to all of the Councillors who have phoned him, texted him and have sent Facebook messages to him, along with all of the staff and officers who have asked after him over the last ten weeks.

C3/21 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 23 February 2021 were confirmed and signed.

C4/21 TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to all of the Officers for their time and efforts in ensuring that the Annual Council meeting could be held in person, which is the first meeting of Full Council where members have been able to meet together since the lockdown

The Chairman took the opportunity to welcome the newly elected member to the Lattersey Ward of Fenland District Council, Councillor Mockett.

Members observed a two minute's silence in memory of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh, who passed away on 9 April and also as a mark of respect for former Councillor David Wheeler who served between 2007 and 2011 and who sadly passed away on 23 April 2021.

C5/21 MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL 2021/22

The meeting dates for the Annual Meeting of the Council and for the ordinary meetings of the Council for 2021/22 were agreed as follows:

The Annual Meeting of the Council in 2022 to be held on Thursday 12 May 2022.

The ordinary meetings of the Council be held on:

Thursday 16 September 2021

Wednesday 8 December 2021

Thursday 24 February 2022

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Boden stated that on the original schedule of meetings, which had been published on the Council's website, there was a meeting listed for Full Council for the 15 July 2021, but due to the Covid arrangements that have had to be made to reduce the number of meetings and to reduce the potential spread of Covid a number of committee meetings have either been rescheduled or cancelled. Councillor Boden stated that he would like it recorded that the meeting scheduled for 15 July 2021 has been cancelled.

C6/21 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 Miscandlon stated that no questions had been submitted under Procedure Rules 8.6 and asked if there were any questions under Procedure Rule 8.4 from Councillor Cornwell as Leader of the Opposition Group.

Councillor Cornwell stated that he was disappointed that he had not received a written response to a letter he had sent Councillor Boden on 12 March following the Full Council Meeting held on 23 February 2021. Councillor Boden stated that he was under the impression that he had responded to the correspondence that Councillor Cornwell was referring to and gave assurances that he would ensure that a response was sent without any further delay.

Councillor Cornwell stated that in addition to the closure of its branches in Whittlesey, Chatteris and Ramsey, Barclays Bank have now announced the closure of their branch in March, which provides services to a very large part of Southern and Central Fenland and only leaves the Wisbech Branch in operation. He added that the branch is due to close in late June or early July and its closure will inconvenience local businesses and residents especially the elderly. Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that their decision to close seems to be based on several factors, which Barclays have determined and they have also used the pandemic as a contributing factor. He expressed the opinion that it is ironic given the location of the branch in the town centre and

directly in the area which is subject of £6.4 million pounds worth of investment planned to be spent on it, and is not supportive of the community, and he expressed the view that any company that provides a service to the community and relies on community support has a moral duty to support them. Councillor Cornwell asked Councillor Boden if it would be possible for a severe objection to be posed to Barclays on behalf of the Council expressing the concerns of the Council and asking them to reconsider their proposal? Councillor Boden stated that the situation is something which is not unique to March or Fenland and high street banks across the country are closing. He added that it is a shame that Barclays have made the decision to close their March branch and it is also clear that it is a decision which they have made and are not going to retract that decision. Councillor Boden stated that the decision may be due to the lease of the building ending in July, and it may be that they had commercial reasons to close the branch rather than a decision due to footfall. He stated that it is more important to protect the interests of residents and businesses of Fenland as far as possible to be able to access banking facilities in person, rather than to protest on a decision which has already been made. Councillor Boden stated that it is understanding that in Whittlesey and Chatteris those facilities have already been lost and there is the danger that Wisbech and March will follow suit. He stated that there needs to be an engagement process with the remaining High Street banks in March and Wisbech to ensure that these in person banking facilities are not lost. Councillor Boden stated that the commercial reality of the situation is that fewer and fewer branches will exist and the remaining branches need to be made aware of the commercial reality that Fenland is a growing area with a growth agenda and it is in their commercial interests to continue to maintain services rather than expect customers to travel to Peterborough, Kings Lynn, Ely or Cambridge.

Councillor Cornwell reiterated his initial question as to whether Councillor Boden is prepared to write to Barclays and then engage with the existing High Street banks? Councillor Boden stated that as Barclays is one of the High Street's major banking establishments they will of course be contacted, and he added that the letter to Barclays will also raise our disappointment and anger of the banks closure in March. He stated that looking forward the protection of in person banking facilities in Fenland is imperative where it still exists.

C7/21 **TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM AND ASK QUESTIONS OF CABINET MEMBERS WITH PORTFOLIO HOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE RULES 8.1 AND 8.2.**

Members asked questions of Portfolio Holders in accordance with Procedure Rules 8.1 and 8.2 as follows:

1. Councillor Topgood stated that there appears to be an increase in vandalism in the parks in the district currently and he asked Councillor Murphy what steps are in place to rectify the issue? Councillor Murphy stated that he is aware that the issue of vandalism has escalated very quickly over the last three weeks and he explained that repairs are taking place as soon as is practicable. He stated that vandalism has taken place at different times of day and night and at various locations across the district and some of the instances of vandalism are dangerous and have meant that it has been necessary to advise the Police. Councillor Murphy added that the parks have always suffered from vandalism but on a far smaller scale than what has been experienced recently. Councillor Topgood asked whether the Police are increasing their patrols and questioned what steps are taking place to rectify the situation? Councillor Murphy stated that although the Police are being advised of the issues and instances of vandalism taking place, there is never any form of response received. Councillor Topgood expressed the opinion that the Council should pressurise the Police into undertaking more regular patrols and added that, whilst he appreciates that there is antisocial behaviour everywhere, the issues and instances in the local parks are now becoming very serious and it is going to cost a great deal of money to rectify the damage. Councillor Miscandlon stated that it is his understanding that there are liaison meetings between Councillors and the Police and it may be advantageous to raise the issue with one

- of the members who can then raise it with the local Neighbourhood Inspector.
2. Councillor Sutton stated that two years ago he had raised the subject of the Forgotten Corners Local Highway Improvement (LHI) project and at that time he had asked Councillor Seaton whether there was the possibility of the Council joining the group. He stated that at that time Cambridgeshire County Council Officers had advised that each member of the bid would receive a financial contribution and added that it has now become apparent that the financial contribution is no longer expected. Councillor Sutton stated that the six interested authorities, including this Council, were all willing to contribute £1666, which was very much appreciated. Councillor Sutton stated that there has been a recent notification that costs have substantially increased and there is likely to be a financial shortfall of £5,000 to £10,000 despite in the region of £56,000 being raised outside of the bid and he asked Councillor Boden whether consideration could be given to the Council contributing towards that shortfall, so that the scheme can move forward? Councillor Boden stated that he was disappointed to hear about the issues concerning the funding and added that, even though it is a highways matter and not a Council issue, he was very pleased to support the LHI project along with other authorities due to its importance and he stated that it is regrettable that after a great deal of work it was determined that it was not possible to have a joint LHI project. He stated that with regards to the shortfall, he would be grateful if he can be supplied with further details concerning the current status of the project, including the costs, associated risks and the shortfall so that further consideration can be given to the request.

C8/21 MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR TIERNEY

Councillor Tierney presented a motion with regard to the Fens Biosphere. He expressed the opinion that the recent member seminar concerning the Biosphere in his view did not provide any information and that, after listening to the three speakers, it appeared that the same questions were asked, and the responses received were very vague and it was not clear how the Biosphere would benefit Fenland and what the consequences would be for Fenland. Councillor Tierney expressed the opinion the motion highlights the views of other members and he asked members to support it.

Councillor Boden seconded the motion and Councillor Miscandlon opened the motion for debate.

1. Councillor Boden stated that everybody wants to see improved biodiversity, less pollution and more open spaces and added that many of these aspects are already provided or being planned for by Local Authorities or other bodies. He added that it is very unclear as to what additionality would be created by the Fens Biosphere Project. Councillor Boden expressed the view that by having the designation of a biosphere could be valuable and helpful in terms of tourism and reputation and Fenland is the only Local Authority which falls totally within the planned area of the Fens Biosphere. He stated that he does not know, as it is currently constituted, where the Fens Biosphere would go and how far it will go. Councillor Boden questioned whether input would commence with the Planning process and whether representations would be made regarding Economic Growth or with the required new Infrastructure. He stated that all these questions were asked, but answers were never provided. Councillor Boden stated that he is not against the concept of the Biosphere, but it is what comes with it which needs to be limited. He stated that it is pleasing to know that in the last few days the Biosphere Steering Group have contacted the Council, asking for discussions to take place to discuss the project and he expressed the view that it is a shame that the discussions have not taken place previously. Councillor Boden welcomes the opportunity for discussions to take place to see if there are any areas of commonality, which he is sure will happen, however, the current proposal is so uncertain and open ended, it would be irresponsible for a Local Authority to agree and adopt such a proposal.
2. Councillor Count stated that he would like the newly formed administration at the County Council, Councillor Lucy Nethsingha, Councillor Elisa Meschini, Councillor Tom Sanderson, and Cambridgeshire County Council Officer Executive to be added to the circulation list. He

stated that the newly formed administration has already publicised their plans to oppose the Fens Biosphere across the whole area, however, that opposition does need the agreement of all relevant parties. Councillor Count stated that the previous administration had requested extra time during debate to consider further information with regard to the proposal, however, the new administration have disregarded this request. He expressed the view that the Fens Biosphere does have aspirations, including biodiversity and green space, and he has been looking at this project for over four years since they first approached the Combined Authority for extra money to keep themselves in a position where they could promote the Fens Biosphere. Councillor Count added that at that time the same questions concerning the project were asked and four years later there are still no answers and he expressed the view that it does appear to be a branding exercise in terms of the benefits, however, the disbenefits will place a number of restrictions which will be placed on the area which do not line up with the aspirations of the local people and it appears to only suit people outside of the area to determine that the proposal is the best thing for Fenland. He stated that at the recent Annual Council meeting of Cambridgeshire County Council, the new administration spoke at length with regard to the importance of collaboration and communication and their press statement appeared to state what their intentions are for Fenland by imposing the biosphere on the district, when in fact there have been no discussions. He stated that he cannot agree to the biosphere from the evidence he has seen to date, as the benefits are far outweighed by the tenuous links that have been stated with regard to what will happen to the area. Councillor Count expressed the view that Fenland is a great place to live, and the Biosphere is not necessary to achieve what can be attained anyway and he will support the motion.

3. Councillor Benney stated that he attended the seminar and expressed the opinion that the representatives who presented to members on the Biosphere did not seem to understand their subject matter. He added that they kept referring to Fenland as special and he stated that Fenland and the whole of East Anglia is special as it feeds the rest of the country. Councillor Benney expressed the view that their proposal would be economically harmful to the area as they referred to tourism being a replacement for farming. He expressed the view that Fenland is a farming area, and an economy cannot be dismantled that is good on the hope that something else will better it. Councillor Benney added that the proposal would be very detrimental to the core business of the area which is agriculture and to jobs and he fully supports the motion.
4. Councillor Sutton stated that he would support the motion if he felt that the fears of other members would come to fruition, but he does not. He added that the motion is incorrect in three places as it refers in Section 8 as David Thomas being the Chairman, which he is not, in Section 14 it states that at the seminar members were wholly against the proposal, which is not true, and at Section 18 it states that the proposal does not have community support, however, there is no evidence to support this fact. Councillor Sutton added that the Middle Level Commissioners administer over 30 Internal Drainage Boards (IDB) and he has been advised that every one of those IDB's support the proposal in principle. He expressed the opinion that the motion is slightly premature, and a decision should not be made currently as the application will not be submitted until the last quarter of 2022 and further discussion and information is needed before a decision is made. Councillor Sutton referred to the earlier comments made by Councillor Count regarding the new administration and made reference to their press statement, which does not categorically state that they agree with the proposal and have stated that they will work with them and other partners and he expressed the view that is what the Council should be doing.
5. Councillor Cornwell stated that the idea of the biosphere has been in place for some time and if it was ever to come to fruition, in his opinion, it would have been in place by now. He added that the Internal Drainage Boards that he is a representative for the Council on have only noted the report. Councillor Cornwell expressed the opinion that unless there is further movement on the proposal within the next three months there is no merit in moving the

project forward. He expressed the view that he does not understand what the benefits are in the proposal.

6. Councillor Hoy stated that she did not know what the Biosphere was initially, and had been looking forward to the seminar, so she was able to obtain a better understanding of the proposal, however, that did not happen. She added that the biosphere representatives stated that the Fens have no real green space which she finds meaningless. Councillor Hoy referred to a response she was given with regard to a question she had asked concerning re wetting the Fens and the reply she was given in her opinion was evasive. She referred to a BBC Radio Cambridgeshire debate that she had listened to earlier where Pippa Haylings from South Cambridgeshire District Council was quite animated over the topic of rewetting the Fens who had stated that it is something that should be done as the carbon capture is needed. Councillor Hoy stated that those comments worried her and added that one of the aspects that the people of the Fens should be proud of is the amount of agriculture and farming in the area, which help to feed people. She added that it was interesting listening to some of the Councillors at the seminar, who have links to the farming community and to hear their expertise and knowledge was interesting. Councillor Hoy stated that regarding the point made by Councillor Sutton about supporting the proposal in principle is that sometimes the contributing factors associated with proposals and projects may change in the future. She added that further questions and requests for detail have been requested, but there has been no further information received. Councillor Hoy made reference to the Rainbow Coalition at Cambridgeshire County Council with regard to the fact that they are not in support of the proposal and stated that at a previous County Council meeting Councillor Lorna Dupre was very much in support in everything she said with regard to the Biosphere and had made reference to the fact that Fenland District Council did not know enough about the proposal.
7. Councillor Booth stated that he agrees with the comments of Councillor Sutton and added that he attended a presentation from the Biosphere project representatives held at North Level Internal Drainage Board. He expressed the opinion that he was sceptical of what the obligations would be to the area if the Biosphere was adopted and after asking questions and carrying out some further research it has become apparent that the project would have no legislative power or impositions on the local area and would only be a designation. Councillor Booth added that the only way the Biosphere could enter discussions with the Planning Team is if the emerging Fenland Local Plan states that the Biosphere should be recognised. Councillor Booth expressed the opinion that there is a need for further information before the motion is put forward and he added that there is more background information that Councillors need to be made aware of and it is not necessarily the Fens Biosphere that could bring about changes referred to in the motion, such as re wetting the Fens, it is also Central Government. Councillor Booth made reference to George Eustice, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, who has published the Peat Action Plan which refers to re wetting of the Fens to bring peat back into better condition. He stated that Central Government are taking this very seriously and have set up a specific taskforce which will specifically look at the Fens. Councillor Booth stated that there is the assumption that the Internal Drainage Boards are dormant, however, he expressed the opinion that they still manage the water very well in our area, including dealing with the recent extreme weather events where some of the pumping stations were 40mls away from being flooded in the North Level catchment area. He added that the drainage boards are reviewing how the area can be protected against flooding and other possible mitigation needs to be considered, including the need to recognise that there needs to be change and the realisation that the drainage boards are going to operate differently with regard to the Peat Action Plan and also the fact that tax will no longer be able to be claimed for red diesel costs, which will have a direct financial impact. Councillor Booth expressed the view that the motion is too premature, and he agrees with Councillor Boden, that there should be further dialogue. He stated that the possibilities it could present is about more investment and he expressed the view that the Council is being poorly served by the Combined Authority

regarding Agritech up until now as there has only been one application to date in the Fenland Area for £68,000. Councillor Booth stated that the motion refers to the lack of public engagement, but consultation took place for the Wisbech Garden Town Project which was submitted to the Government having only consulted 150 people on one day in Wisbech Market Place, and that report stated the project had the overwhelming support of the Fenland, which in his opinion is incorrect. He stated that the Biosphere Project has probably consulted more people than the Garden Town project did and stated that the Wisbech 2020 Vision recently listed the Fens Biosphere as being on the Council's agenda moving forward as it is being listed as project that the Council wants to take forward in one document and there is now a motion to oppose it.

8. Councillor Topgood stated that during the debate it has been mentioned that the Biosphere Project are not looking for any public funding and he asked Councillor Tierney for clarity as the documentation following the seminar states that the project are looking for funding only for the public consultation process? Councillor Tierney stated that he does not recall and added that the information presented was so vague it was hard to tell.
9. Councillor Murphy stated that he is still unsure about the detail of the Biosphere and he asked at the time how much it was going to cost the Council. He added that the representatives from the Biosphere have never been able to answer any questions or provide the information requested. Councillor Murphy expressed the opinion that Fenland is a unique area and that is how it should stay, and Fenland does not want a World Heritage Site.
10. Councillor Sutton stated that the funding for the project so far has derived from the National Lottery and at this stage there has been no request for funding from Fenland.
11. Councillor Count stated that when the Biosphere project presented to the Combined Authority, there was a direct request for funding of public money.
12. Councillor Lynn stated that at the seminar he questioned the representative over funding, and he was advised that they needed the Council to join with them so that they could apply to the Government for future funding.
13. Councillor Tierney stated that Councillor Booth has advised the Biosphere Project would not have any legislative powers and although that may be the case to start with, the same could be said for the Centre for Disease Control, however, that agency has very much been in control globally for the last year. He added that when an emergency is declared, power is directed to all different types of agencies and bodies to deal with. Councillor Tierney referred to the comments made with regard to the Wisbech Garden Town Project and stated that many members had stated at the time that they were not ready to support the project as it was felt that there had not been enough public consultation and he added that he never supported the project.
14. Councillor Tierney referred to the point made by Councillor Sutton with regard to waiting to see what happens. He stated that there are consequences to taking no action and he added that the representatives who came to the seminar asked members whether they supported the proposal and, in his opinion, as Fenland were the authority they needed to have on side with the project he would have expected them to come fully prepared with information and answers, however, this was not the case. Councillor Tierney expressed the view that there is nothing stopping the representatives of the project from coming back to the Council in the future with clearer or different proposals, which would give the Council the opportunity to reconsider, however, based on what members were told, there was not enough information provided to enable members to make an informed decision.
15. Councillor Booth stated that he wished to respond to the point that Councillor Tierney made with regard to the Wisbech Garden Town Proposal. He stated that contained within

documentation provided to members it stated that 68% of respondents supported the proposal and that data was submitted by the Council to the Government as part of the submission bid and request for funding and as part of that it stated that it had public support.

A recorded vote was taken on the Motion:

In Favour: Councillors Benney, Boden, J Clark, S Clark, Connor, Cornwell, Count, Mrs Davies, Mrs J French, Miss K French, Hay, Hoy, Humphrey, Lynn, Maul, Miscandlon, Mockett, Murphy, Purser, Rackley, Skoulding, Tierney, Topgood, Wallwork and Wicks.

Against: Councillors Booth, Patrick and Sutton.

The motion was approved.

C9/21 COMMITTEE BALANCE, POLITICAL BALANCE AND ALLOCATION OF SEATS.

Members considered and Committee Structure, Political Balance and Allocation of Seats report and received an update in relation to the Committee Structure.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and AGREED to:

- **increase the number of committee seats on the following committees to achieve political proportionality at an individual committee level in addition to globally across all committees:**
 - **Overview and Scrutiny Panel**
 - **Planning Committee**
 - **Licensing Committee**
 - **Audit and Risk Management Committee**
 - **Conduct Committee**
- **maintain the committees and panels set out in Appendix A to the report for the 2021/2022 municipal year**
- **continue with the terms of reference set out at Part 3 of the Council's Constitution in relation to the committees and panels**
- **the allocation of seats and position of Chairman and Vice-Chairman on those committees subject to political balance arrangements**
- **the appointment to seats allocated to include co-opted and non-members**
- **the list of Outside Bodies and allocation of seats in accordance with political balance as set out in Appendix C of the report for 2021/22, with appointments to be made at a subsequent Cabinet meeting**
- **delegate to the Monitoring Officer to make the appropriate changes to the Constitution.**

C10/21 COMBINED AUTHORITY MEMBERSHIP AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS

Members considered the Combined Authority Membership and Other Appointments report presented by Councillor Boden.

Councillor Boden drew members attention to 3.5 of the report where it states that he is the substantive member for the Housing and Committees Committee, with Councillor Mrs Laws as the substitute member and he asked for it to be noted and amended to reflect that Councillor Mrs Laws should be shown as the substantive member and he is the substitute member.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and AGREED that:

- **the following appointments to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority be made for the municipal year 2021/2022:**
 - **Council's appointee to the Combined Authority Board – Leader of the Council,**

with substitute Deputy Leader

- **Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Councillors Hay and Miscandlon, with substitutes being Councillor Tierney and one vacancy**
- **Audit and Governance Committee – Councillor Benney, with substitute being Councillor Hoy**
- **Employment Committee – Councillor Miss French, with substitute being Councillor Mrs Davis**
- **Housing and Communities Committee – Councillor Mrs Laws, with substitute being Councillor Boden**
- **Skills Committee – Councillor Seaton, with substitute being Councillor Mason**
- **Transport and Infrastructure Committee – Councillor Seaton, with substitute being Councillor Boden**
- **to authorise the Chief Executive to make any amendments to the appointments to the Combined Authority Board, all existing committees and any new committees which may be created in consultation with relevant Group Leader at any time throughout the municipal year.**

C11/21 REVIEW OF MEMBERS ALLOWANCES SCHEME

Members considered the Members' Allowances Scheme Review report presented by Amanda Orchard, the Chairman of Independent Remuneration Panel.

Members made comments as follows:

1. Councillor Booth stated that he will support the report and added that the changes are modest which in his opinion is appropriate in the current situation. He added that although the Parish Councils were also consulted the report makes no reference to them and he asked when that information will be made available? Anna Goodall advised that the information will be available imminently.
2. Councillor Boden stated that it is important that the proposals detailed within the report are adhered to and he expressed the view that he has seen some small inconsistencies within the report, one of which he has noted by virtue of the fact that there is a position with additional responsibilities, which is now in receipt of a lower amount of allowance, than previously, which he knows was adjusted for mathematical reasons, but he finds it unfortunate. He stated that after reading the report, he has concluded that Councillor Sutton was correct when he had referred to the previous Independent Remuneration Panel report two years ago, with Councillor Sutton making the point that every four years following the elections, members allowances should be determined and as there is a democratic deficit in the process. Councillor Boden stated that on reflection he agrees with the view of Councillor Sutton and he added that he will be reviewing the process along with other members, to ascertain whether there is a more directive scheme, which is still legally compliant and where it may be possible for the electors of Fenland to know in advance what the expectation is of an Independent Remuneration Panel review.
3. Councillor Mrs French referred to page 68 of the report and questioned why the Independent Remuneration Panel are referring to electric charging points in their review and she added that she would like that aspect removed from the report, as it has nothing to do with the panel. She added that the subject of Civil Parking Enforcement is currently being looked into by the Council and she added that she has been advised that the £400,000 of funding which has been allocated by the Combined Authority for the project is still in place. Councillor Miscandlon added that Whittlesey Town Council have recently installed two electric charging points and they are not chargeable to members of the public as they are powered by solar panels on the roof of the Town Council offices. Councillor Mrs French stated that the project is being looked into for consideration across the whole of the district.
4. Councillor Tierney expressed the opinion that the report is reasonable, but he has always promised his constituents that he would never vote for a pay increase in members

allowances and for that reason he will abstain from any vote.

5. Councillor Hoy expressed the opinion, that looking forward, consideration should be given to forming a cross party working group when looking at member allowances and for those members who sit on the Combined Authority. She added that she can understand why the panel have recommended that those members who sit on the Combined Authority do not receive any allowance, because when it was set up, discussions took place with regard as to whether an allowance was paid and it was decided that an allowance should not be paid, however, that changed as time went on and an allowance was paid. She added that as it appears in the panel's report it may be shows a clearer picture of what the members actual wishes were when the Combined Authority was formed. Councillor Hoy added that she is aware how much time is spent by those members who sit on the Combined Authority and to not pay those members an allowance seems unfair, but to pay them would go against the decision made initially and, therefore, looking forward this should be an aspect of the scheme that should be reviewed.
6. Councillor Sutton stated that he has always had the opinion that the scheme should always be an independent review carried out by independent people and, in his opinion, their findings should be agreed. He stated that he will support the report and thanked the panel for their involvement and work in putting the report together.
7. Councillor Wallwork stated that she has read the review and added that the recommendations and increases appear to be fair. She added that she takes great honour in being a Councillor and agrees with the comments made by Councillor Tierney and for that reason she will not support the report.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Booth and Council AGREED:

- **the conclusions and recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in respect of its review of the current Members' Allowances Scheme, to come into effect from 1 April 2021**
- **to authorise the Monitoring Officer to make such typographical amendments as are necessary to produce clean text copies of the Constitution.**

(Councillors Lynn, Tierney and Topgood requested it be recorded that they abstained from voting on this item)

C12/21 ELECTORAL REVIEW FOR FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Members considered the Electoral Review for Fenland District Council report presented by Councillor Boden.

Members made comments as follows:

1. Councillor Booth stated that whilst he does not disagree with the content of the report and the mathematical formula as set out, he expressed the view that he does have concerns over the consequences of the review. He added that there is potentially going to be a review of Local Government, which will include a white paper due to be published and he questioned as to what the impact will be of that, if the electoral review is carried out. Councillor Booth also stated that previously when the Council undertook a boundary review, a year later the Boundary Commission undertook a review of the County Council divisions, which led to difficulties with regard to warding arrangements of surrounding parishes and wards within the district boundaries. He expressed the view that it may be better to undertake a combined County Council and District Council ward boundary review, but he realises it would be problematic as the County Council would need to be in agreement.
2. Councillor Boden stated that since the 1880's there have been 20 white papers that have been produced with regard to the review of Local Government and as a result there have been approximately four actual changes. He added that the point Councillor Booth made with regard to reviewing the County Council and District Council boundaries at the same

time is a logical approach and it is something that used to take place, however, it has now been agreed that County reviews and District reviews will now be undertaken separately, which, in his opinion, is a far less effective and efficient process.

3. Councillor Sutton asked Councillor Boden if he could advise him of what the aim and objective of the review is, and whether it includes reducing the number of members? He added that during the evolution of the Combined Authority, members all stated that four tiers of Local Government was too many and members were led to believe that the County Council or the District Council would be abolished and he has been an advocate of unitary authorities for a long time. Councillor Sutton questioned whether the outgoing Mayor had looked into that proposal? Councillor Boden stated that the process of a Local Government Boundary Commission for England Review involves firstly a request to be made for a scientifically produced estimate of the likely electorates due to be in place in 5 years' time. He added that consideration is then given with regard to Council size and when that takes place the Local Government Boundary Commission for England consults with all councillors and many others to determine based on the needs that there is in the area and the demand that there is within the Local Authority what the appropriate Council size is. Councillor Boden stated that to suggest any numbers would be premature until the electorate numbers for 5 years' time is known, but in his personal view a smaller Council would be better than the current size and he added that further discussion will take place at the second stage of the review. He stated that with regard to the four tiers of Local Government, along with the boundaries of the Council and the Town and Parish Council, they do not form part of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England review so are not allowed to change. Councillor Boden expressed the opinion that four tiers of Local Government is at least one too many and he would look for a change to that. He added that, in his view, changes to Government policy that have taken place in the last two years have not been conducive in his opinion when looking at the form of localism that he would like to see when there is a review to the tiers of Local Government.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and Council AGREED to approach the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to request an Electoral Review of Fenland District Ward Boundaries in time for this review to inform the 2023 Fenland District Council elections.

C13/21 RESOLUTION TO APPROVE REASONS FOR ABSENCE UNDER S.85 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Members considered the resolution to approve reasons for absence under Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972 report and amendment presented by Councillor Boden.

Councillor Boden stated that if any member is unable to attend a meeting due to Covid 19 reasons or if a meeting has been postponed or cancelled due to Covid 19 reasons then that will count as a qualifying reason for the six-month qualification to start rolling again.

Councillor Boden drew members attention to the tabled item which states that in respect of any of the first five bullet points in paragraph 5.2, being a reason for non-attendance at a relevant meeting, a member must advise Member Services in writing in advance of that meeting that one or more of those five reasons applies in relation to their non-attendance.

Councillor Boden stated that it had been agreed that an additional reason be added as provided by Councillor Booth, which would be listed as bullet point 6

- Has caring responsibilities that cannot be catered for due to Covid-19

Councillor Boden drew members attention to the tabled item which states that in respect of any of the first six bullet points in paragraph 5.2, being a reason for non-attendance at a relevant meeting,

a member must advise Member Services in writing in advance of that meeting that one or more of those six reasons applies in relation to their non-attendance.

Members made comments as follows:


1. Councillor Mrs French expressed the opinion that given the circumstances she thinks that the proposal is totally appropriate.
2. Councillor Sutton stated that he supports the proposal and it is wholly appropriate.
3. Councillor Cornwell stated that the proposal makes perfect sense and added that both himself and Councillor Boden both agreed that this was the right thing to do.
4. Councillor Hoy stated that she is pleased to see the amendment included, which gives members the opportunity to make contact to state that they are unwell.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Booth and members AGREED

- **in relation to each and every member, as a reason for failure to attend any meeting of the Council, Cabinet, Committee or Sub-Committee (“a Relevant Meeting”) between 8 May 2021 and the day after its 2022 Annual General Meeting, the circumstances set out below, as a reason for non-attendance with Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972**
- **the circumstances which comprise approved reasons for non-attendance at a Relevant Meeting are because the member:**
 1. **Has contracted or been infected by COVID-19**
 2. **Has tested positive for COVID-19**
 3. **Is suspected of having or suspects that he/she has contracted or been infected by COVID-19**
 4. **Has concerns that they may contract or become infected with COVID-19**
 5. **Is in quarantine or self-isolating in relation to COVID-19**
 6. **Has caring responsibilities that cannot be catered for due to COVID-19**
 7. **Is unable to attend the Relevant Meeting because the meeting is cancelled or postponed due to COVID-19**
- **in respect of the reasonable reasons 1-6 above for non-attendance, the member must advise Member Services in writing in advance of that meeting which one or more of those six reasons applies to their non-attendance.**

5.58 pm

Chairman

Agenda Item No:	5	
Committee:	Council	
Date:	24 August 2021	
Report Title:	Council Consultation Response in relation to the Fenland Electoral Review - Proposed Future Council Size	

1 Purpose / Summary

- For Members to consider and agree the formal Council consultation submission in relation to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Electoral Review of Fenland District Council. This report forms the Council's response to the initial part of the electoral review process regarding the proposed future Council Size which is the numbers of Councillors required to run the Council in future.

2 Key issues

- The LGBCE are responsible for conducting reviews of local authority electoral arrangements through an electoral review. Electoral reviews are usually an 18-month process which take a series of defined steps, to establish new electoral arrangements.
- Full Council, at its meeting on 19 May 2021, agreed to approach the LGBCE to commence an Electoral Review of Fenland District Council given the predicted electoral inequality that would be apparent by the next round of all out elections in 2023. The LGBCE subsequently agreed to this request and Fenland was added to the Electoral Review Programme.
- This submission sets out Fenland District Council's response to the LGBCE's request for us to submit a proposal regarding the future total number of Councillors to be elected to the Council, known as Council Size. Considerations regarding the future Council size form the initial part of the electoral review process and is a key factor in determining the type and scale of the review to be undertaken by LGBCE.
- In considering Council Size the Commission considers the following four parts:
 - Governance and decision making – what is the right number of councillors to take decisions and manage the business in an effective way?
 - Scrutiny functions – what is the right number of councillors to administer Fenland's scrutiny responsibilities in a convenient and effective way?
 - Representational role of councillors – what is the right number of councillors to represent and provide leadership to local communities in Fenland?
 - The future – what governance changes are being considered and how do these impact on the number of councillors needed in the future?
- The Council's submission has been developed by a cross-party Member Working Group which has been informed by solid evidence, contributions from all Members

through specific Member Focus groups, a Member survey and informal feedback via briefings, email and virtual face to face contact.

- Whilst the LGBCE seek the views of the District Council regarding the proposed future Council Size they will ultimately be the decision maker on all aspects of the review, their decision informed by the consultation process. The Commission will confirm a future Council Size which they believe will provide the appropriate basis for the preparation of warding proposals, which is the second key component of the electoral review process.
- The cross party Member Working Group wishes to propose a range of figures in relation to the potential future Council Size, in order to inform but not fetter the debate at Full Council.
- The proposed future Council size range will enable this fundamental consideration to be the subject of a full debate, involving all currently elected members therefore allowing all Members to have their views heard, thus allowing all the equal opportunity to influence the formal Council consultation submission in relation to this matter.
- The Member Working Group wishes for Council to consider a future Council size of between 39 to 48 elected representatives. This range reflects the Working Group's recommendation that the future Council Size should not be less than it is currently, as they assert this would impact the future effective running of the Council in addition to having a detrimental impact on effective community representation. The Member Working Group recommend that the future Council should not exceed 48 elected representatives, as this would retain the current ratio of electors to elected representatives when considered in conjunction with the draft future electoral forecast figures, which have yet to be agreed by the LGBCE.
- Members should consider their thoughts and feedback in relation to the four LGBCE criteria as set out above as the final submission needs to provide relevant evidence and a rationale as to what Council Size the Council ultimately chooses including why other options were discounted.
- The selected Council Size, supporting evidence and rationale will be forwarded to the LGBCE by 31 August using the LGCBE template which is structured around the four criteria. Sections 5-16 of this report identify the necessary contextual information that will be submitted to the LGBCE and provides a background narrative to inform Members' views of their future Council Size figure.
- The LGBCE will consider the Council's evidence for its recommended Council size at its Commissioner's meeting in September 2021. However, whichever Council size figure is agreed by the LGBCE they reserve the right to alter this figure up or down by 2 at the ward boundary stage.

3 Recommendations

- For Members to consider the Member Working Group recommendation that the future Council size should be within the range of not less than 39 and no more than 48 elected representatives and to agree a figure within that range for submission to the LGCBE
- To delegate to the cross-party Member Working Group in conjunction with Officers to add in the rationale for the selected Council Size figure and any discarded options within the proposed consultation submission Council Size range, prior to formally submitting the Council consultation submission to the LGBCE for consideration.

Wards Affected	All	
Forward Plan Reference	N/A	
Portfolio Holder(s)	Cllr Chris Boden - Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Governance	
Report Originator(s)	Paul Medd - Chief Executive Carol Pilson - Corporate Director Anna Goodall - Head of Transformation, Customer Services and Democracy	
Contact Officer(s)	Paul Medd - Chief Executive Carol Pilson - Corporate Director Anna Goodall - Head of Transformation, Customer Services and Democracy	
Background Paper(s)	Full Council Paper - Electoral Review for Fenland District Council - 19/05/21	

4 Council Size - Consultation Submission

- 4.1 This submission sets out Fenland District Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) request for us to submit a proposal regarding future Council size. This was the result of the Council requesting that the LGBCE undertook an electoral review, primarily as a result of the criteria in relation to electoral equality. The issue of Council size is the key factor in determining the type and scale of the review to be undertaken by LGBCE.
- 4.2 In considering Council Size the Commission considers the following four parts:
- Governance and decision making – what is the right number of councillors to take decisions and manage the business in an effective way?
 - Scrutiny functions – what is the right number of councillors to administer Fenland's scrutiny responsibilities in a convenient and effective way?
 - Representational role of councillors – what is the right number of councillors to represent and provide leadership to local communities in Fenland?
 - The future – what governance changes are being considered and how do these impact on the number of councillors needed in the future?
- 4.3 This document represents the Council's submission on Council Size after consideration of these four factors. This document constitutes the preliminary stage of the Electoral Review process and in keeping with guidance provided by the LGBCE the Council has not sought to address future ward patterns and boundaries as part of its submission.
- 4.4 The Council's submission has been developed by a cross-party Member Working Group which has been informed by solid evidence, contributions from all Members through specific Member Focus groups, a Member survey and informal feedback via briefings, email and virtual face to face contact.
- 4.5 The Member Working Group provided for a robust consultation process with all Members to ensure the views of all Members from across political groups and individual Councillors were sought and taken into consideration within this submission. The Member Working Group also considered the current and projected electorate figures for Fenland.

5 Background

- 5.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body established by Parliament in April 2010. One of its objectives is to work with principal local authorities to help them deliver effective and convenient local government to citizens. Every year, the LGBCE assesses electorate data for each local authority in England with the intention to intervene where "significant" electoral inequality exists. As a

result the LGBCE intervention would be in the form of an electoral review should significant electoral inequality have been identified.

5.2 An electoral review is an examination of a council's electoral arrangements. This means:

- the total number of members to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards / divisions) for the purposes of the election of councillors;
- the number of councillors for any electoral area of a local authority; and
- the name of any electoral area.

5.3 The LGBCE will aim to ensure its recommendations remain relevant for the long term delivering effective and convenient local government well after the completion of the review.

5.4 A review can be initiated for two reasons:

- 1. At the request of the local authority; or
- 2. If the local authority meets the Commission's intervention criteria, where significant electoral inequality exists, namely:
 - a) If one ward has an electorate of +/- 30% from the average electorate for the authority.

b) If 30% of all wards have an electorate of +/-10% from the average electorate for the authority.

5.5 In April 2021, the Council conducted a review of current electorate figures, and projected electorate figures in 2026 for wards within Fenland, taking into account County Council population forecasts, extant planning permissions and empty properties.

5.6 Reviewing current and future projections in relation to elector numbers illustrates that Fenland District Council will exceed the LGBCE intervention criteria therefore reviewing ward boundaries to correct these inequalities ahead of the 2023 elections will ensure that Councillors represent closer to the average number of electors overall through an Electoral Review process.

5.7 If FDC's electoral arrangements are not reviewed in time for the 2023 elections, the electoral inequality between wards within Fenland may increase by 2027 to levels which would not be conducive to good governance in the District.

5.8 An example of this is the draft projection that, by 2027, if no changes are made to existing ward boundaries before the next District Elections, Wenneye ward in Chatteris (represented by 1 Councillor) is projected to have an electorate of 3,309, whilst Benwick, Coates and Eastrea ward (represented by 2 Councillors) is projected to have an electorate of 4,041. This would equate to 3,309 electors per Councillor in Wenneye ward and 2,020 electors per Councillor in Benwick, Coates and Eastrea. If a Councillor in one ward was to represent 50% more electors than a Councillor in another ward, there would be a level of inequality of representation within the District which may be undesirable.

5.9 As a direct result of the projected electoral inequalities arising in the short term (by 2027), during the Annual Council meeting in May 2021, elected Members agreed to approach the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to request an Electoral Review

of Fenland District Ward Boundaries in time for this review to inform the 2023 Fenland District Council elections.

- 5.10 Whilst elected Members did not give an early indication of the future Council size, discussions during the Annual Council meeting suggested general early agreement that the number of elected Councillors that are needed in order to support effective, efficient and accountable local democracy would benefit from a review.
- 5.11 The LGBCE subsequently agreed to conduct an electoral review.
- 5.12 The most recent review of the Council's electoral arrangements was undertaken in 2012, with the new arrangements coming into effect at the May 2015 all out local elections. During the 2012 electoral review a number of boundary anomalies arose requiring resolution via a Community Governance review in Chatteris, Manea and Whittlesey.
- 5.13 Whilst the initial recommendation regarding Council size was to maintain the status quo at that time of 40 elected Councillors. When we moved onto the second stage of the electoral review process, namely to consider the names, numbers and boundaries of district wards in conjunction with the electoral review statutory criteria in relation to electoral equality, community identity and effective and convenient local government, the criteria could not be effectively achieved and therefore at that point the LGBCE decided that the Council size should reduce by one elected representative to 39 Councillors.
- 5.14 Following the changes introduced in the Local Government Act 2000, the Council has changed its governance model to the 'Strong Leader' model of Executive arrangements. Full Council appoints the Leader of the Council for a four year term. This model of governance has been in operation since 2003 following a change from operating a traditional committee system. There are no proposals to change the current approach to governance.
- 5.15 Fenland District is relatively unique in that it is served by 4 tiers of local government – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council, Fenland District Council and is fully parished at a town/parish council level, with 16 Town and Parish Councils. There are 9 Cambridgeshire County Councillors representing 7 county divisions, the entire district currently falls within the North East Cambridgeshire Parliamentary Constituency. Whilst financially beneficial to the area the emergence of the Combined Authority has undoubtedly increased the workload of those Councillors chosen to represent Fenland within the Committees and at the Combined Authority Board.

6 Context

Fenland District Overview

- 6.2 Located in East Anglia, Fenland covers an area approximately 550 square km (210 square miles) and is one of five districts within the county of Cambridgeshire. Fenland is a predominantly rural district located in Northern Cambridgeshire. Bordering with Peterborough, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, South Holland and East Cambridgeshire. Fenland District has a population of approximately 102,080. Fenland residents account for 15.53% of the population of Cambridgeshire.
- 6.3 There are around 45,770 dwellings in Fenland, the majority of which are owner occupied (2020) and 72% of residents live within the districts 4 market towns, with the remaining 28% residing in more rural locations interspersed between the district's 29 villages. Fenland has an ageing population with 28.2% of residents aged 65 or over, and indications are that this trend will continue.

State of the District

- 6.4 Fenland ranks 51st (out of 317) local authorities in the English Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019 and is the most deprived area in Cambridgeshire with Cambridge City 205th, Huntingdonshire 247th, East Cambridgeshire 266th and South Cambridgeshire 300th. There are pockets of deprivation in the district, with the highest levels of multiple deprivation located in the North of the District in Wisbech.
- 6.5 Fenland has a set of unique and varied challenges as a district that the Council is working proactively with its partners to overcome.
- These challenges include:
- High levels of deprivation.
 - Low levels of educational attainment, aspiration and skills.
 - Lowest levels of healthy eating and exercise in the East of England.
 - Highest levels of smoking in the East of England.
 - Lowest employment rates in Cambridgeshire (Fenland 70.1% employment rates in working age people compared to 76.6% across Cambridgeshire),
 - One of largest populations of Gypsy Travellers in the country.
 - Poor public transport links and infrastructure impacting accessibility to further education and employment opportunities.
- 6.6 Other issues also exist within the district which are not as visible such as rural isolation, literacy levels and levels of caring for family members.
- 6.7 Fenland has the lowest house prices in Cambridgeshire, with the average house priced at £182,549 (UK HPI: 2020), along with plentiful availability of commercial land. As a result, our population is growing quickly. By 2036, it is predicted that the population will have increased by 9% to 110,700 (ONS: 2019).
- 6.8 Relative poor connectivity in the Fenland area is an important factor in shaping both the recent and longer standing lower growth in the area (CPIER Report 2018)
- 6.9 The population of the Fenland district is predominantly white, with 97.2% of all residents of white ethnic origin which is higher than the average for Cambridgeshire (92.6%) and England (85.4%). The district has the lowest percentage of residents from a Black Minority Ethnic (BME) origin in Cambridgeshire (0.5%). The largest single BME group in the district is Asian/Asian British representing 0.8% of the total population.
- 6.10 In economic terms, 55.7% of the population of Fenland District are of working age (aged 16 to 64 years of age) which is lower than the Cambridgeshire average at 58% 5.4% of working age people across the district were claiming either Universal Credit or Job Seekers Allowance, which is the highest monthly claimant rate across Cambridgeshire.

Fenland District Council

- 6.11 Fenland District Council was formed on 1 April 1974, with the merger of the Borough of Wisbech, Chatteris Urban District, March Urban District, Whittlesey Urban District, North Witchford Rural District and Wisbech Rural District.
- 6.12 Today, Fenland District Council (FDC) has 39 Councillors, representing 24 wards, with 2 political groups. The Council has majority Conservative control with 27 Conservatives and 12 Members of the Fenland Independent Alliance (which comprises of, 2 Liberal Democrats, and 1 Member of The Green Party, with the remaining 9 Members being Independent). The Council has adopted a Leader and Cabinet structure, with an Overview and Scrutiny Panel, and an Audit and Risk Management Committee.

- 6.13 Each of the 24 Fenland District Council wards is represented by 1, 2 or 3 councillors and whole council elections are held every four years with the next elections due in May 2023.
- 6.14 Fenland District is relatively unique in that it is served by 4 tiers of local government – Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, Cambridgeshire County Council, Fenland District Council and is fully parished at a town/parish council level, with 16 Town and Parish Councils. There are 9 Cambridgeshire County Councillors representing 7 county divisions, The entire district currently falls within the North East Cambridgeshire Parliamentary Constituency.
- 6.15 The Council underwent a Periodic Electoral Review in 2012 in order to implement the resulting changes at the 2015 ‘All Out’ local elections. Since then the Council has seen a growing electoral variance in a number of wards. Based on the electorate figures for May 2021, there are electoral variances of 10% or greater in the wards of Birch (+18%), The Mills (+16%), Wenneye (-11%) and Stonald (+17%). When considering the electoral forecasting figures up to 2027, the electoral variance trend continues with five of the district wards having an electoral variance of greater than 10%, including one ward with a variance in excess of 38% and a second with a variance of 24%.

Shared Services

- 6.16 At the 19 December 2013 meeting of Full Council members endorsed the Council’s approach to service transformation including the way forward in respect of Shared Services. This meeting approved that the Council’s Revenues and Benefits service joined the Anglian Revenues Partnership (ARP) as of 01 April 2014
- 6.17 In December 2018 Freedom Leisure, a charitable trust, took over the operation and management of the Council’s four leisure centres with a 15-year agreement. This arrangement, after Hudson Leisure Centre capital costs and gym equipment replacement costs, has saved FDC £351,000 p.a. Additionally, a review of contract management staff as a result of the new Freedom contract added £49,000 p.a. to the annual savings, equating to a total of £5.6 million of savings over the life of the contract.
- 6.18 At the September 2014 meeting of full Council the Council endorsed the proposal to join the CNC Building Control Partnership including the fact that full governance oversight would be achieved with Member representation on the CNC partnership Joint Committee, with Fenland established as a full partner.
- 6.19 On the 23rd July 2015, Fenland District Council agreed to join a Shared Planning Service arrangement with Peterborough City Council. The Shared Service consists of a Shared Head of Planning, Shared Technical Support Manager and the ability to buy and sell services between the Councils.
- 6.20 The Legal service provision within Fenland is currently being delivered through a partnership agreement with Peterborough City Council. This agreement has been in place since 2016 however the degree of service delivery has changed significantly over the duration of the agreement with the vast majority of legal support now being sourced via this successful agreement.

Commercialisation

- 6.21 On 9th January 2020 Fenland District Council approved the Commercial Investment Strategy and the associated formulation of the new Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo), Fenland Future Ltd, for the purpose of facilitating delivery of the strategy. To date a full business case is currently being developed in relation to Council owned land that could result in the delivery of good quality local housing.

Fenland District Local Plan

- 6.22 The Council agreed to start production of a new Local Plan for the District in February 2019, which will eventually replace the Local Plan adopted in May 2014. This will address the changes in national policy, but also to take into account local visions and objectives to attract new businesses, jobs and opportunities in Fenland, and promote increased housing growth across the district. The new Local Plan will focus on commercial deliverability, market demand, and meeting growth targets as well as supporting and encouraging economic investment. A Draft Local Plan will be published for public consultation in December 2021.

Fenland District Council Corporate Priorities

- 6.23 The Council's corporate priorities were developed, following comprehensive consultation with local people, to address the key demographic issues in the district. These priorities are reviewed every year as a part of the corporate Business Planning process. The 2021/22 Corporate Priorities are illustrated below

Council for the Future	Quality Organisation	Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support vulnerable members of our community• Promote health and wellbeing for all• Work with partners to promote Fenland through Culture and Heritage
		Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliver a high performing refuse, recycling and street cleansing service• Work with partners and the community on projects that improve the environment and our street scene• Work with partners to keep people safe in their neighbourhoods by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and promoting social cohesion
		Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attract new businesses, jobs and opportunities whilst supporting our existing businesses in Fenland• Promote and enable housing growth, economic growth and regeneration across Fenland• Promote and lobby for infrastructure improvements across the district

7 Governance Model

- 7.1 Following the changes introduced in the Local Government Act 2000, the Council has changed its governance model to the 'Strong Leader' model of Executive arrangements. Full Council appoints the Leader of the Council for a four year term. This model of

governance has been in operation since 2003 following a change from operating a traditional committee system.

- 7.2 The role of a Councillor within this model of local governance is substantial due to the varying aspects of a Councillors role.
- 7.3 The Leader appoints the Cabinet, which is where most of the day to day decisions of the Council are made. Cabinet consists of the Leader and nine other councillors. The Cabinet meets collectively on a monthly basis.
- 7.4 Major decisions to be made by Cabinet are detailed in the Forward Plan of Key Decisions, which is updated as required and not less than on a monthly basis.
- 7.5 Individual members of the Cabinet are known as Portfolio Holders and are allocated particular service responsibilities aligned to the Council's corporate priorities. They have wide ranging decision-making powers in relation to these responsibilities. Portfolio Holders are able to make individual decisions within certain restrictions, which are documented, published and circulated to members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, and can be subject to the call-in function.
- 7.6 Portfolio Holders also have monthly briefings with their responsible Corporate Director and associated Head of Service, as well as joint meetings collectively with members of the Corporate Management Team around six times per year. Portfolio Holders also become involved with events and other meetings associated with their portfolio area, ie. opening of play parks, award ceremonies, etc.
- 7.7 Portfolio Holders are also required to work in partnership with other agencies on issues and policies within their service area as well as representing the District Council within Executive Committees within the Combined Authority.
- 7.8 The Cabinet delivers reports to Full Council on their respective Portfolio areas at every meeting and also to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel on a regular basis.
- 7.9 The Council has 39 councillors, elected every four years at a single set of elections, the last being in 2019. Councillors have a duty to the whole community of Fenland and are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. All councillors are members of Full Council and meet on average 5 times per municipal year (normally in May, July, September, December and February). Full Council is responsible for appointing the Leader and Chairman of the Council, setting the overall policies of the Council and its budget, and approves the Policy Framework which comprises a series of major plans. The Council also receives recommendations from other committees and petitions from the public.
- 7.10 A comprehensive review of the Council's Constitution was conducted by a Member Working Group led by Cllr Mrs French (Deputy Leader) in 2011/12. This reviewed the entire Constitution including the scheme of delegation to ensure a greater degree of transparency, accountability of officers and to ensure Members were at the forefront of Council decision making. This review concluded the levels of delegation within the Constitution were appropriate and in keeping with the running of an effective Council.
- 7.11 An Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) recently reviewed Members' Allowances (May 2021). The previous IRP recommended that the Members' Allowances Scheme be subject to review 18 months after its last review in 2019, this was to ensure that the Members Allowances Scheme adequately reflected the changing Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) requirements and commitments as well as reflecting any impact from the implementation of the Commercial Investment Strategy (CIS).
- 7.12 The most recent Member Allowances Review researched and analysed the workloads and time commitments of all Members. The results of the interviews with elected

members and survey responses evaluated, suggest that on average District Councillors spend 15 hours a week fulfilling their district council role or 60 hours per month. This was an increase from 38 hours per month in 2011/12. This recognised that some Members committed substantially more time than the average due to the demands of the role in individual areas. This was taken into account when considering an increase or decrease to Council size.

- 7.13 There are six main Council committees with a total of 65 seats, which are allocated in proportion to the size of each of the political groups, plus a number of smaller sub-groups for example the Non Licensing Act 2003 Committee, the Investment Board as a Sub Committee of Cabinet in addition to the Audit and Risk Management Determination Sub Committee.
- 7.14 In addition to attending Council Meetings and other constituency work, Councillors are required to sit as representatives of the Council on other organisations and agencies. These organisations and agencies are known as outside bodies. The Council appoints Elected Members to represent it on a range of Outside Bodies, both at a national and local level. Such appointments ensure that the Council's interests and therefore citizens of Fenland are represented within key agencies.
- 7.15 The Council recognises the value and contribution outside organisations make to the wider community. Members also welcome the opportunity for the Council to be represented on outside organisations which operate within Fenland. There are currently 54 Outside Bodies requiring representation to 111 seats a number of which carry vacancies. Nominations and representation to Outside Bodies is reviewed annually by Cabinet. A previous Overview and Scrutiny review of Outside Bodies made recommendations regarding the criteria to assess requests for Outside Body representation these recommendations were later endorsed by Full Council and remain relevant. Prior to the Overview and Scrutiny review there were 73 outside bodies requiring representation.

8 Portfolios

- 8.1 The Cabinet is currently composed of 10 members (including the Leader) holding 10 positions as follows:
- Leader of the Council (also holds the Finance Portfolio)
 - Deputy Leader (also holds a Portfolio)
 - Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth
 - Portfolio Holder for Health
 - Portfolio Holder for Benefits, Anglia Revenues Partnership, Parking
 - Portfolio Holder for Housing
 - Portfolio Holder for Planning
 - Portfolio Holder for Licensing and Community Safety
 - Portfolio Holder for Finance
 - Portfolio Holder for Environment
 - Portfolio Holder for Social Mobility and Heritage
 - Portfolio Holder for Transformation and Communication

- 8.2 A detailed breakdown of each Executive Councillor's area of responsibility appears at Appendix A.
- 8.3 The positions of Leader, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder, although not deemed as being considered as full time positions, do require a substantial commitment given the level of responsibility and significant additional time that needs to be spent to undertake those roles effectively.
- 8.4 Executive Members serve on other decision making partnerships, sub-regional, regional and national bodies. Appointments are considered on an annual basis. The Executive Leader represents the Council on The Combined Authority Board. Whilst the most recent review of Members allowances did not conclude that the additional commitments associated with local Government Devolution, and the representational requirements of the Combined Authority, warranted an additional separate Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA), the IRP did conclude that the proposed increase to the Executive Leaders existing SRA was in part to recognise the additional requirements and commitments resulting from the Combined Authority.
- 8.5 In addition the Investment Board comprising of the Leader of the Council in addition to two other Cabinet Members was formulated in 2019. It is a sub Committee of Cabinet and is the Council decision making body in relation to the Commercial Investment Strategy, overseeing the three key strategic themes, 1, Commercialisation, 2, Commercial and Property Investment and 3, Regeneration and Place Shaping Investment. The Investment Board currently meet five times per annum but this may increase as the LATCo further develops and matures.

9 Delegated Responsibilities

- 9.1 Decisions are made by the Council every day. These decisions cover a wide range of functions and some can affect large numbers of the district's residents, while others may affect only a single individual. The level of impact that a decision might have affects how the decision can be made.
- 9.2 The most significant type of decision is a 'key' decision. A key decision is one which:
- Results in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the budget relates;
 - Is significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the District.
- 9.3 The majority of day-to-day decisions are taken under delegated authority by officers under authority from the Leader, Council or a specific committee. The delegating of specific powers, duties or functions to officers can speed up council decisions and ensures that council meetings are not tied down by procedural and routine administrative decisions. It also enables councils to use the technical knowledge, training and experience of officers to support their decisions.
- 9.4 Decisions to delegate specific powers to members, officers or committees are made at a formal council, cabinet or committee meeting and specify what the delegation authorises the delegate to do. They are usually required to observe the strategies, policies and guidelines adopted by cabinet or the council and may be required to report periodically to the council on decisions made. The Council's Constitution contains a full list of all delegations in Part 3 Responsibility for Functions.
- 9.5 The Council publishes, by way of decision notices, all member decisions taken outside of meetings under executive powers and all officer decisions that are key decisions or

considered significant decisions. During both the municipal years 2019/20 and 2020/21, there were 17 decision notices issued per year in respect of decisions taken by members or officers that fell within these categories. These decisions ranged from the Leader making nominations to an outside body to the disposal of land.

10 Internal Scrutiny

- 10.1 The Local Government Act 2000 requires that where a Council has adopted an Executive model of governance it must make arrangements that “must include provision for the appointment by the authority of one or more [scrutiny] committees of the authority.”
- 10.2 The Council must ensure that the scrutiny committees have the power to exercise the following functions:
- to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive;
 - to make reports or recommendations to the authority or the executive with respect to the discharge of any functions which are the responsibility of the executive;
 - to review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive;
 - to make reports or recommendations to the authority or the executive with respect to the discharge of any functions which are not the responsibility of the executive; and
 - to make reports or recommendations to the authority or the executive on matters which affect the authority's area or the inhabitants of that area.
- 10.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Panel has a challenging, wide ranging and in depth work programme which is set on an annual basis, led by Councillor Mason. This reflects the level of ambition within the Council and includes scrutiny of the Council's corporate priorities, council policies, Cabinet decisions and partners responsible for delivering services to the Fenland residents.
- 10.4 The Panel consists of 13 elected Councillors in accordance with political proportionality, in addition each political group can allocate up to 4 substitute members (again to reflect political proportionality rules). The Panel takes a range of evidence from FDC Members and officers as well as officers and Members from other organisations. The Panel uses this information to make recommendations to Cabinet or to other organisations for implementation. This is followed up to ensure action or the Panel have made use of ‘call-in’ procedures to emphasise their viewpoint on particular policies.
- 10.5 The Council has traditionally taken an inclusive approach to scrutiny and encouraged non-scrutiny committee members to attend, speak or alternatively pose questions via a Panel member at meetings where they may have a particular interest or concern.
- 10.6 In addition the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee attends meetings of the Investment Board in an observational capacity only as well being consulted regarding urgent decisions. A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public's interests. Any decisions deemed urgent have to be reported to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel as they are not subject to the ‘Call In’ procedure. During 2020/21 the Chairman was consulted on 4 urgent decisions.
- 10.7 Working groups are convened on a regular basis to scrutinise or review particular aspects of Council or partner organisation policy, for example the 2020 Member Led review of the Anglia Revenues Partnership

- 10.8 Special meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel are called to address emerging local issues, however ordinarily the Overview and Scrutiny Panel meets on a six weekly basis and no more than 12 occasions during the municipal year. The Panel also have pre meetings a week in advance of the formal public committee meetings to maximise engagement and ensure that Portfolio Holders, Officers and Partners are briefed in advance in relation to the anticipated key lines of enquiry therefore ensuring that attendees are able to give comprehensive, meaningful responses during the public meetings
- 10.9 The Panel does not generally cancel meetings from lack of business; indeed, they have in the past convened additional meetings to ensure the work programme and associated meetings agenda's do not become overly congested.
- 10.10 The Panel has a Work Programme report at every meeting to enable Members to monitor progress and plan ahead. The Panel is reliant on the goodwill and co-operation of external witnesses. This can mean that Agendas can sometimes be lengthy.
- 10.11 The District Council has previously (2011) had two Overview and Scrutiny Panels, the first responsible for scrutinising performance, therefore taking a backward look and the second responsible for scrutinising policy therefore taking a forward look.
- 10.12 Panel members previously feedback that they found the split confusing as key lines of enquiry would stray into the remit of the other panel resulting in a lack of clarity and the potential for an overlap or worse still contradictory recommendations.
- 10.13 A large number of our Members are either twin or triple-hatted and therefore represent their communities at County Council and Town and Parish Council positions. 39 members is sufficient to ensure conflicts of interest do not arise too often, however, this could potentially increase if the number of Members are reduced resulting in it becoming difficult to manage Council business effectively.
- 10.14 It is the view therefore that the proposed option to retain one Scrutiny Panel enables the Council to continue to effectively hold the decision makers to account and ensure that the council can discharge its responsibilities to other organisations (e.g. other public sector bodies and partnerships) while not significantly increasing the workload for scrutiny committee members or weakening the ability of backbenchers to be involved in the scrutiny process.

11 Planning

- 11.1 The Planning Service is an important function within the Council which enables housing growth, regeneration and economic development in the District; creating more homes and jobs for residents to enjoy.
- 11.2 The Planning Service aspires to provide excellent customer service and sound planning advice in reaching decisions that have an impact on residents and the look and feel of our towns and villages.
- 11.3 Members and the Planning Committee have a crucial role to play in the above in determining larger and more contentious planning applications using the policies set out in the Local Plan and using sound planning reasons.
- 11.4 Planning Committee is a regulatory committee of the Council and consists of 13 members of the Council, which can include up to three members of Cabinet. Places are allocated according to political proportionality rules and there is a Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Each political group can appoint up to 4 substitute members, Planning Committee members approach the substitute Members to attend in their absence.
- 11.5 The committee ordinarily meets every five weeks basis, however more recently there have been additional Planning Committee meetings to consider applications (7 extra meetings this calendar year). All members of the committee and substitutes are required to undertake internal and external training on an annual basis and no new member of the

committee is able to participate in decision making at a meeting until they have completed the internal and external training requirement. Training for Planning Committee members is also an on-going commitment during the municipal year.

- 11.6 The review of Members Allowances undertaken in 2019 stated the following 'The Panel considered the role of Planning Committee members, without exception feedback from all members confirmed that the Planning Committee meet more frequently compared to any other committees and the requirement to attend site visits, attend mandatory training, as stipulated in the constitution, in addition to reading significant volumes of reports in order to make informed decisions which directly impact on local residents, place additional responsibilities on committee members which are not comparable with other committees. Members also reflected that the time commitment associated with being a member of the planning committee could potentially be a barrier for some elected members'. Therefore, the panel recommended that all members of the Planning Committee should receive an SRA at a rate of £500pa. In addition substitute members attending Planning Committee meetings on behalf of a substantive member should receive an SRA of £100 per annum. This recommendation was endorsed by Full Council. The 2021 member allowances reviewed continued to endorse the Planning Committee SRA introduced in 2019.
- 11.7 The five weekly and additional Planning Committee meetings are often very lengthy. Experience has shown that providing interested parties with the opportunity to address the Panel on applications prolongs the process but Panel Members, and the Chairman in particular, strongly support the retention of this facility to aid their decision-making.
- 11.8 Members also undertake Site Inspections the week prior to committee. Prior to the COVID pandemic the Council organised a Site Inspection bus to enable all Members to attend collectively with the support of a Planning Officer. Since the start of the pandemic Members have attended site inspections individually including their own transport, thus ensuring compliance with COVID social distancing requirements. These Site Inspections are normally pre-empted site visits looking at sites and applications that will be considered by the committee at its meeting the following week.
- 11.9 The Chairman of the committee meets with the Chief Planning Officers on a monthly basis to discuss applications to be considered at committee and to agree a list of site inspections.
- 11.10 A Scheme of Delegation exists and the Planning Committee determine applications whereby they:
- Called-in by Member (the development must be within their ward area or adjacent ward area and the Member request has been granted by the Chairman of Planning).
 - 6 or more unresolved written opinions from 6 or more separate sources are received from within the ward area or adjacent ward area which differ from the officer recommendation.
 - Town/Parish views are in conflict with officer recommendation and the application is for more than 2 dwellings.
- 11.11 The number of applications determined by committee varies from month to month, with on average 5-6 applications being considered per month. The figures outlined below illustrate the number of Planning applications determined by the Planning Committee during the past 3 years.
- 2018/19 – 66
 - 2019/20 – 66
 - 2020/21 – 75
- 11.12 The number of applications determined by Committee remained consistent during 18/19 and 19/20 in spite of having a Planning Advisory Service (PAS) review, one of the

recommendations from which was that the scheme of delegation should be reviewed, however Members wished to await the new administration in 2019 before making any changes. This recommendation remains outstanding. Members have made a further change to the scheme of delegation in that the Chairman of Committee is consulted on every application that an officer is seeking to refuse and has the ability to recommend to the Head of Planning to place the application on the Planning Committee agenda which has seen an increase in business for the Committee to consider.

12 Licensing

- 12.1 Licensing Committee is another regulatory committee of the Council. The full Committee consists of 13 members of the Council. The same Members are to be appointed for the Licensing Act 2003 Committee and the Non Licensing Act 2003 Committee. These places are allocated according to political proportionality rules and there is a Chairman. In accordance with the Act, decisions affecting licensing conditions or policy making are all made at Committee level, ordinarily the Committee meets 2 -3 times per year.
- 12.2 The committee has the power to appoint panels of up to 3 members with 1 substitute to hold hearings considering individual cases in relation to the Licensing Act 2003, Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing and other miscellaneous licensing. These panels are formed from a rota of Licensing Committee members on a frequent basis, with the Chairman of Licensing Committee normally sitting as Chairman of the Panel. However, members cannot sit on a panel if the matter is in relation to something within their own ward or neighbouring area.
- 12.3 A new member appointed to the committee cannot take part in or vote on any decision until they have attended at least one internal and one external training session on Licensing related topics. Existing members should complete at least one internal and one external training session on an annual basis. Training for Licensing Committee is also an on-going commitment during the municipal year.
- 12.4 With the exception of the Licensing Act, which states that if an objection is received to an application it must go to a Committee or Sub-Committee, all licensing matters are determined by officers with a right of appeal to an Appeals Sub-Committee.
- 12.5 Members cannot sit on a hearing in relation to their area, therefore preventing any potential challenges regarding conflicts of interest, however this reduces the pool of Members available. Reducing Members could exacerbate the issue of servicing Licensing issues, however there has been a downward trend in relation to the number of Licensing Hearings in recent years as outlined below
 - May 2018 - April 2019 = 4
 - May 2019 – April 2020 = 9
 - May 2020 – April 2021 = 2

13 Other Regulatory Bodies

- 13.1 During the December 2020 meeting of Full Council, changes were agreed in relation to the former Corporate Governance Committee, which as a result of those agreed changes has become the Audit and Risk Management Committee in addition to the Audit and Risk Management Determination Sub Committee, the Sub Committee replaces the former Staff Committee.
- 13.2 The Audit and Risk Management Committee is a key component of Fenland District Council's corporate governance. It provides an independent and high-level focus on the audit, assurance and reporting arrangements that underpin good governance and financial standards. The purpose of our Audit and Risk Management Committee is to provide independent assurance to the members and other parties of the adequacy of the risk management framework and the internal control environment. It provides

independent review of Fenland District Council's governance, risk management and control frameworks and oversees the financial reporting and annual governance processes. It oversees internal audit and external audit, helping to ensure efficient and effective assurance arrangements are in place. It also ensures the Council is managing the risk of ensuring services have the resources to deliver on the Council's statutory responsibilities and corporate priorities whilst recognising the Council's financial position.

- 13.3 There are a maximum of 13 members of the Council on the Audit and Risk Management Committee with seats allocated to political groups in proportion to the number of seats held by each group on the Council as a whole. In addition each political group can appoint up to 4 substitute members. Up to three members from Cabinet and three members of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel may be members. A Cabinet member may not be Chairman.
- 13.4 The Committee holds no more than 5 ordinary calendar meetings of the Committee per annum. In addition, extraordinary meetings may be called from time to time as and when appropriate.
- 13.5 The Audit and Risk Management Determination Sub-Committee is a sub-committee of the Audit and Risk Management Committee and has decision-making powers in relation to the following delegated functions: (a) To receive reports from officers on strategic employment matters & policies; (b) To consider staffing restructures and changes to the establishment; (c) In collaboration with the Staff Side group to promote effective communications and consultation between the Council and its employees on general personnel matters; and (d) Exercise discretion allowed under the local government pension scheme, including the award of discretionary payments to employees.
- 13.6 The Audit and Risk Management Determination Sub-Committees comprises of six members of the Audit and Risk Management Committee including either the Chair or Vice-Chair but no more than 2 Cabinet Members. Political proportionality rules apply. There are no set number of meetings per annum of the sub committee as they take place as required, however the Sub Committee meets at least once a year to consider strategic staffing Policy updates and revisions.
- 13.7 The promotion and maintenance of high standards and conduct within the Council are the responsibility of the Conduct Committee. The committee comprises of up to 5 members of the Council. The Conduct Committee is advised by the Independent Person appointed in accordance with section 28 of the Localism Act 2011. The committee may appoint up to two non voting members who are Town or Parish Councillors, in addition three additional substitute members can be appointed.
- 13.8 Amendments to the constitution and associated Conduct Committee procedures, which recently include a comprehensive pre sifting process have resulted in fewer conduct matters requiring referral to the Conduct Committee and therefore the number of occasions they are required to meet has reduced significantly, to date since the process changes have been implemented no conduct matters have required referral through to Committee.

14 External Partnerships

- 14.1 On 3 March 2017, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority was established as a Mayoral Combined Authority for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area.
- 14.2 It is made up of a directly elected Mayor and the following seven local authorities (referred to as the Constituent Councils) and the Business Board (Local Enterprise Partnership):
 - Cambridge City Council
 - Cambridgeshire County Council

- East Cambridgeshire District Council
- Fenland District Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council
- Peterborough City Council
- South Cambridgeshire District Council

- 14.3 There are a number of decision making committees within the Combined Authority that require representation from the constituent councils including the following:
- 14.4 In accordance with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Order 2017, each Constituent Council must appoint one of its elected members and a substitute member to the Combined Authority Board. This is usually the Leader of the Council
- 14.5 The Combined Authority Board is chaired by the elected Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and consists of the leaders of the seven constituent councils, the chair of the Business Board and co-opted members: the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Police & Crime Commissioner and representatives from the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority and the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.
- 14.6 The purpose of the Board is to ensure that the decisions and actions of the Combined Authority deliver key outcomes for the people of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- 14.7 In addition there are several other decision making committees within the Combined Authority requiring Fenland representation. Nominated representatives are members of the Executive and more widely from elected members
- 14.8 The Audit and Governance Committee 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.9 The Employment Committee 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.10 The Housing and Communities Committee 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.11 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 2 Fenland representatives in addition to 2 substitute members
- 14.12 The Skills Committee 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.13 The Employment and Skills Board 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.14 The Transport and Infrastructure Committee 1 Fenland representative in addition to 1 substitute member
- 14.15 During the 2021 Member Allowances Review the IRP stated the following ‘The panel considered the roles that members undertake on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) both in respect of constituted committees in addition to the requirements associated with CPCA Board membership. Other constituent Councils of the CPCA have either already agreed to make SRA payments to members fulfilling roles on the CPCA or have been asked to consider making payments as part of their respective Independent Remuneration Panel deliberations. From the extensive feedback and evidence received in relation to this matter the panel recognises the significant responsibilities, extent of decision making and associated time commitment these roles carry above that expected of a District Councillor, which would suggest that an additional SRA was justifiable. The panel also acknowledge the importance and associated potential benefits of having Fenland representatives contributing to the role of the CPCA. The IRP asked all elected members about the potential for a further SRA in respect of the commitments and responsibilities associated with the CPCA. All members who were either interviewed or took part in the survey felt that an additional SRA could not be justified, particularly at this time due to the financial impact globally resulting from the

COVID pandemic. As a result the IRP recommend that No New SRA is to be introduced in respect of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, however the SRA for the Leader of the Council is proportionately higher in comparison to the basic allowance to reflect the additional commitment associated with the CPCA Board role.

- 14.16 In addition due to the Council's commitment to exploring shared service where appropriate and where they meet the needs of the Council and the local residents we serve Fenland also provides representation from 1 elected member on the Anglia Revenues Partnership Joint Committee and 1 elected member to the CNC Board for Building Control.

15 Community Leadership

- 15.1 Fenland is a unique and diverse area with strong traditions and a variety of strong identities. This is characterised and supported by historical traditions and the isolated and sporadic geographical layout of the different settlements across the District. It is important to maintain effective elector representation within all communities' right across the District to take account of the variety of values, perspectives and outlooks, which can vary substantially from town to town and village to village.
- 15.2 The majority of Fenland District Councillors are also Town and Parish Councillors or County Councillors. Feedback resulting from the recent Member survey confirmed that the majority of District Councillors regularly attend Town and Parish meetings. This can be a substantial commitment for Members who have a number of Parish Councils to attend, especially in the rural areas. Members confirmed that attending Town and Parish Council meetings is important to keep in touch with local issues and developments and to support Councillors and residents at the local level to achieve the aspirations they have for their area. These meetings are an important two way communication between town/parish councils and the District Council.
- 15.3 Councillors are often a focal point for the community and therefore they are asked to participate in numerous community groups to provide advice and to lever in support from the District Council or other organisations if appropriate. With the introduction of the Localism Act, this role will increase as Members are looked to by the community to support them to take on new roles and responsibilities.
- 15.4 The Council has a high retention rate for Councillors with 25 returning Councillors and 14 new Councillors elected in May 2019. New members also come on to the Council as a result of by-elections.
- 15.5 The Council is 'One Team' with Councillors and officers working together for the benefit of the community. Councillors set policy which officers work to implement and are accountable to Members for this delivery. Residents contact Councillors regarding service issues which are passed to officers for resolution. Councillors will respond to the residents involved. Other mechanisms available to residents are our Fenland website, telephone contact centre and 3C's (Correspondence, Compliments and Complaints) system for resolution of issues.
- 15.6 Councillors are also the focal point for resident issues with other agencies which Councillors research, contact relevant officers and follow up on issues if required on behalf of residents.
- 15.7 Councillors often proactively work together, especially in multi member wards, to fulfil their responsibilities when a Councillor is on holiday or ill. Feedback during the Member workshops in relation to Council size stated that Multiple Member wards do not necessarily result in the workload being equally shared across both or all 3 elected representatives in that area and therefore in order to level up the workload members need to effectively work together, which can be easier if elected representatives are from the same political party.

- 15.8 Councillors undertake a variety of formal and informal training to carry out their roles effectively. All Councillors participate in a Member Induction Programme which sets out what the Council does, committee responsibilities, the role of Members, the roles of Officers etc. Training is an important aspect of a Councillors role to ensure effective decision making. Compulsory training is set out in the Council's constitution for Planning and Licensing Committees which must be carried out before a Councillor can participate in the decision making process. For all other Committees, there is training associated with the role which is incorporated either before a meeting or within a separate session and is delivered by either an FDC officer or external trainer. Briefings on particular issues and legislative changes etc are incorporated on an as and when basis. Portfolio Holders, Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of committees will be consulted and briefed on a regular basis regarding on going or new issues affecting Council business.
- 15.9 Recent (July/ August 2021) survey information and focus group feedback has indicated that Members find time to fulfil their roles effectively and it is appropriate within the time they have to dedicate to the role. As one member described it 'there is enough work as a District Councillor to fill any time you are prepared to make yourself available. The more you make yourself available the more local people will approach you resulting in more work to fill your time'
- 15.10 Members confirmed that they are able to effectively sit on Committees, this includes training, briefings, report reading, research, and meeting attendance including travel, which is time consuming. Several Members commented that they were actually more productive during the pandemic when legislative changes enabled virtual meetings. When virtual meetings were allowed Members explained they could attend meetings relating to the Combined Authority, which would ordinarily be held across the whole of Cambridgeshire followed immediately by meetings about the immediate local area, without the need for any travel therefore being more available to attend meetings without any cost implications from the requirement to travel.
- 15.11 Many Members are self employed or retired, which enables those members to have greater autonomy about the use of their time. These Members reported they would find it difficult to fulfil all aspects of the role effectively if they had to cover a wider electorate and/or balance other substantial commitments, such as a young family or full time employment.
- 15.12 Councillors were concerned if the workload increased due to a reduction in Members then this would deter other members of the community from standing as a Councillor in future elections and this would reduce the diversity of perspectives and views available to set policy for the area. During 2015 there were 5 uncontested district council seats and this increased to 12 uncontested seats during the 2019 all out local elections, suggesting that recruiting potential candidates in already becoming increasingly challenging in the Fenland area.

16 Casework

- 16.1 The rapid increase in smart device ownership has resulted in 81% of people (nationally) having access to a smart device. This means that even people without traditional home internet access can now contact the Council and their Elected Members through e-mail and social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) which supplements or replaces more traditional methods such as face-to-face contact, letter writing and the telephone. Whilst the use of social media and other online communication methods has provided alternatives to traditional contact methods with residents, the increased use of emails and social media has resulted in the public having greater expectations that the Council and councillors will be instantly contactable.

- 16.2 The Council places strong emphasis on “channel migration” with the aim of encouraging its customers to obtain information and services for themselves through electronic means. Councillors, however, believe that while this has realised benefits in terms of reduced transaction costs for the Council as an organisation, it has not decreased their levels of constituent casework. On the contrary, it is commonly found that technology has contributed to increased contact with Councillors because they are readily available via email and mobile telephone there is an expectation of a quick response.
- 16.3 The Council does not issue elected members with Council owned devices, largely because the majority of members are twin or triple hatters at parish and county level and therefore wish to avoid having multiple devices depending on the role they are fulfilling at any given time. All Members are however issued with council email addresses to facilitate contact and better assist their constituents. In turn, Members are also now more easily able to contact officers through email and find out information themselves on-line
- 16.4 The Council has a 3C’s process (correspondence, compliments and complaints) which enables residents to raise issues directly with the Council rather than through their elected representative however some residents ask their local Member to conduct this process on their behalf.
- 16.5 Members have support with ongoing training and development through their respective Committee responsibilities and can also request to attend training courses etc. The Council promotes the use of free resources such as those available through the Local Government Association.

17 Effect on Corporate Objectives

- 17.1 The Council strives to be a Quality Organisation and it is a matter of good governance as displayed by the LGBCE intervention criteria for Councillors to represent as similar number of electors as possible which can only be achieved through an Electoral Review of Fenland District Council.

18 Community Impact

- 18.1 The community would be fully consulted by the LGBCE in regard to any future electoral arrangements for Fenland District Council.

19 Conclusions

- 19.1 The Member Working Group wishes for Council to consider a future Council size of between 39 to 48 elected representatives. This range reflects the Working Group's recommendation that the future Council Size should not be less than it is currently, as they assert this would impact the future effective running of the Council in addition to having a detrimental impact on effective community representation. The Member Working Group recommend that the future Council should not exceed 48 elected representatives, as this would retain the current ratio of electors to elected representatives when considered in conjunction with the draft future electoral forecast figures.

FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL CABINET

APPENDIX A

AUGUST 2021

Cllr Chris Boden



Leader of the Council





Portfolio Holder for Finance - Finance/Budgets (Financial & Performance Management), Benefits (strategic), Corporate Governance, Electoral Services, Business Rates, Policy & Resources, Capital Programme, IDBs (strategic)
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) – Portfolio Holder

<p>Cllr Ian Benney</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Assets & Management • Growth • Inward Investment • Port & Marine Services • Job Stimulation • Asset Disposal • Renaissance • Emergency Planning Deputy 	<p>Cllr Sam Clark</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports Development • Leisure Services • Health Inequalities • Health & Wellbeing • Supporting Vulnerable People • Golden Age Fairs • Community Partnerships • Community Grants • Pride In Fenland 	<p>Cllr Mrs Jan French</p>  <p>Deputy Leader of the Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits (operational) • ARP • Parking • Member Services • Street Lighting 	<p>Cllr Miss Sam Hoy</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing (including Regulated Providers) • Housing Strategy • Private Sector Housing • Homelessness • Rough Sleeping • Environmental Health (including enforcement) • Travellers 	<p>Cllr Mrs Dee Laws</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan • Neighbourhood Planning • Building Control • Planning Policy • Planning Delivery • Planning (operational) • Building Communities & Neighbourhood Management • Section 106 & CIL • Flooding & IDBs (operational) 	<p>Cllr Andrew Lynn</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Licensing & Community Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Liaison • CCTV • Community Safety • Community Cohesion • Licensing (including enforcement) 	<p>Cllr Peter Murphy</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Open Spaces, Street Scene & Waste Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste & Recycling (operational) • Cleansing • Grounds Maintenance • Cemeteries • Parks & Open Spaces • Markets & Events • War Memorials • Street Furniture 	<p>Cllr Chris Seaton</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Social Mobility & Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills • Transport • Rural Affairs • Community Cohesion • Education • Children & Young People • Tourism • Conservation • Heritage • Dilapidated Buildings & Enforcement 	<p>Cllr Steve Tierney</p>  <p>Portfolio Holder for Transformation, Communication & Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer Services • Marketing & Communications • ICT & Broadband • Waste & Recycling (strategic) • Energy Conservation • Equalities • Emergency Planning
--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

Cllr Mike Cornwell



Leader of the Fenland Independents Alliance

<p>Cllr Fred Yeulett</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth</p>	<p>Cllr Andy Maul</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Health</p>	<p>Cllr Mike Cornwell</p>  <p>Leader of the Fenland Independents Alliance</p>	<p>Cllr Gavin Booth</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Finance</p>	<p>Cllr Will Sutton</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Planning</p>			<p>Cllr Bob Wicks</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Social Mobility & Heritage</p>	<p>Cllr Michelle Tanfield</p>  <p>Shadow Portfolio Holder for Transformation & Communications</p>
---	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

Geographical Nearest Neighbours – Council Size

	Number of Seats	Size of Electorate	Population	Electorate per Seat	Ranking (1 Smallest)	Population by Seat	Ranking (1 Smallest)	Electorate as Proportion of Population
Fenland	39	76,358	102,100	1,958	1	2,618	1	74.79%
Cambridge	42	95,765	125,100	2,280	2	2,979	2	76.55%
East Cambridgeshire	28	66,228	90,200	2,365	3	3,221	3	73.42%
Huntingdonshire	52	134,506	179,000	2,587	4	3,442	4	75.14%
South Cambridgeshire	45	122,643	160,900	2,725	5	3,576	5	76.22%

Council	No. of Seats (2019)	Electorate (2020)	Total Population (2020)	Electorate per Seat	Electorate as % of Population	Population per Seat
Fenland	39	76,358	102,100	1,958	74.79%	2,618
Dover	32	88,434	118,500	2,764	74.63%	3,703
Bassetlaw	48	89,191	118,300	1,858	75.39%	2,465
Newark and Sherwood	39	91,160	123,100	2,337	74.05%	3,156
Erewash	47	87,416	115,300	1,860	75.82%	2,453
Amber Valley	45	100,530	128,800	2,234	78.05%	2,862
South Holland	37	71,556	95,900	1,934	74.62%	2,592
Breckland	49	105,228	141,300	2,148	74.47%	2,884
Nuneaton and Bedworth	34	99,884	130,400	2,938	76.60%	3,835
Wyre Forest	33	78,203	101,100	2,370	77.35%	3,064
High Peak	43	74,010	92,600	1,721	79.92%	2,153
Broxtowe	44	87,362	114,600	1,986	76.23%	2,605
Wellingborough (former authority)	36	61,838	80,100	1,718	77.20%	2,225
Rossendale	36	52,462	71,400	1,457	73.48%	1,983
Kettering (former authority)	36	76,761	102,200	2,132	75.11%	2,839
Bolsover	37	60,883	81,300	1,645	74.89%	2,197

43,635

Average electorate per seat	2066
Average population per seat	2727

Outside Bodies

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
1	Anglia Revenue Partnership	1 + 2 substitutes	Cllr Jan French Substitute members Cllr Connor Cllr Kim French	Conservative Party representation
2	Benwick Internal Drainage Board (IDB)	4	Cllr Laws Cllr Miscandlon Cllr Mrs Mayor Cllr Wicks	3 Conservatives 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
3	Cambridgeshire Horizons Board	1	Cllr Boden	Conservative Party representation
4	Cambridgeshire Military Community Covenant Board	1	Cllr Tierney	Conservative Party Representation
5	Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel	1 + 1 substitute	Cllr Lynn substitute member Cllr Connor	Conservative Party Representation
6	Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board + District Lead Members Group	1	Cllr Clark	Conservative Party Representation
7	Chatteris Community Centre Association	2	Cllr Murphy Cllr Benney	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
				Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
8	College of West Anglia Governing Body	1	Cllr Topgood	Conservative Party Representation
9	Community Learning and Skills Partnership	1	Cllr Benney	Conservative Party Representation
10	Curf and Wimblington Combined IDB	1	Cllr Davis	Conservative Party Representation
11	Feldale IDB	7	Cllr Laws Cllr Boden Cllr Miscandlon Cllr Mrs Mayor 3 Vacancies	5 Conservatives 2 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
12	Fenland Association of Community Transport	1	Cllr Seaton	Conservative Party Representation
13	Fenland Diverse Communities Forum	1	Cllr Tierney	Conservative Party Representation
14	Fenland Health and Care Forum	Open meeting		Open meeting available for elected members and members of the public wishing to attend
15	Fenland Tension	1	Cllr Hoy	Conservative Party

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
	Monitoring Group			Representation
16	Fenland Transport and Access Partnership	1	Cllr Topgood	Conservative Party Representation
17	Fenland Transport Strategy	2	Cllr Seaton Cllr Connor	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
18	Fenland Twinning Association	4	Cllr Mrs Hay Cllr Mrs Mayor Cllr Topgood Cllr Meekins	3 Conservatives 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
19	Hanson, Fletton Brickworks Industry	1	Cllr Boden	Conservative Party Representation
20	Health Committee	1 + 1 substitute	Cllr Clark Substitute Member Cllr Topgood	Conservative Party Representation
21	Hundred of Wisbech IDB	15	Cllr Topgood Cllr Wallwork Cllr Lynn Cllr Hoy Cllr Rackley Cllr Sutton Cllr Meekins	10 Conservatives 5 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
			Cllr Booth Cllr Tanfield 6 Vacancies	1 Member of The Green Party)
22	Kings Lynn IDB	1	Cllr Rackley with effect Feb 21	Conservative Party Representation
23	LGA/ LGA Rural Commission/ LGA Urban Commission	1 + 1 Substitute	Cllr Boden Substitute member Cllr Tierney	Conservative Party Representation
24	Manea and Welney Drainage Commissioners	3	Cllr Marks Cllr Sutton 1 Vacancy	2 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
25	March Area Transport Study	2	Cllr Count Cllr Skoulding	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
26	March West and White Fen Internal Drainage Board (Previously known as March and Whittlesey IDB)	6	Cllr Cornwell Cllr Wicks 4 Vacancies	4 Conservatives 2 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
				The Green Party)
27	March East IDB	11	Cllr Purser Cllr Clark Cllr Topgood Cllr Cornwell Cllr Marks Cllr Yeulett 5 Vacancies	7 Conservatives 4 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
28	March Education Foundation	1	Cllr Purser	Conservative Party Representation
29	March Fifth District Drainage Commissioners	8	Cllr Cornwell Cllr Jan French 6 Vacancies	5 Conservatives 3 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
30	March Sixth District Drainage Commissioners	4	Cllr Cornwell Cllr Jan French 2 Vacancies	3 Conservatives 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
31	March Third IDB	5	Cllr Cornwell Cllr Marks Cllr Jan French	3 Conservatives 2 Fenland

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
			Cllr Yeulett 1 Vacancy	Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
32	Middle Level Commissioners	3	Cllr Laws Cllr Miscandlon Cllr Sutton	2 Conservatives 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
33	Needham and Laddus IDB	1	Cllr Sutton	Conservative Party Representation
34	Nightlayer IDB	10	Cllr Benney Cllr Murphy Cllr Divine 7 Vacancies	7 Conservatives 3 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
35	North Level District IDB	7	Cllr Humphrey Cllr Sam Clark Cllr Laws Cllr Mrs Mayor Cllr Miscandlon Cllr Booth Cllr Meekins	5 Conservatives 2 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
				Party)
36	Wisbech Community Development Trust (Oasis Village Centre)	1	1 vacancy	Conservative Party Representation
37	Ransonmoor District Drainage Commissioners	2	Cllr Connor Cllr Wicks	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
38	RECAP	1 +1 Substitute member	Cllr Murphy Substitute member Cllr Tierney	Conservative Party Representation
39	Rural Cambs CAB	3	Cllr Miscandlon Cllr Booth 1 Vacancy	2 Conservatives 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
40	Safer Fenland Partnership	1	Cllr Lynn	Conservative Party Representation
41	The Wash and North Norfolk Marine Partnership	1	Cllr Rackley	Conservative Party Representation
42	The Combined Authority	1 + 1 Substitute	Cllr Boden Substitute member	Conservative Party Representation

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
			Cllr Jan French	
43	The Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee	2 + 2 Substitutes	Cllr Connor Cllr Miscandlon Substitute members Cllr Tierney 1 Substitute vacancy	Conservative Party Representation
44	The Combined Authority Audit and Governance Committee	1 + 1 Substitute	Cllr Benney Substitute member Cllr Hoy	Conservative Party Representation
45	The Combined Authority Employment Committee	1 +1 sub	Cllr Miss French Cllr Mrs Davis (substitute)	Conservative Party Representation
46	The Combined Authority Housing and Communities Committee	1+1 Sub	Cllr Boden Cllr Mrs Laws (substitute)	Conservative Party Representation
47	The Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee	1+1 Sub	Cllr Seaton Cllr Boden (substitute)	Conservative Party Representation
48	The Combined Authority Skills Committee	1+1 Sub	Cllr Seaton Cllr Mason (substitute)	Conservative Party Representation
49	Upwell IDB	2	Cllr Rackley Cllr Sutton	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
50	Waldersey IDB	2	Cllr Rackley Cllr Sutton	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents

Ref No	Outside Body	Number of representatives required	Nominated representatives during 2020/21	Proportionality
				Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
51	Warboys, Somersham and Pidley IDB	1	1 Vacancy	Conservative Party Representation
52	Whittlesey & District IDB	5	Cllr Mason Cllr Laws Cllr Mrs Mayor Cllr Wicks 1 Vacancy	3 Conservatives 2 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
53	Wisbech Access Strategy Member Steering Group	2	Cllr Lynn Cllr Rackley	1 Conservative 1 Fenland Independents Alliance (including 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 Member of The Green Party)
54	Young People March	1	Cllr Purser	Conservative Party Representation

This page is intentionally left blank