



Democratic Support Service
PO Box 136
County Hall
Northampton
NN1 1AT

MINUTES of the Business Meeting of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
held at County Hall, Northampton on 6 October 2016 at 10.30am

PRESENT:

Councillor Jim Harker OBE (Chairman)
Councillor Dudley Hughes (Vice-Chairman)

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Councillor | Sally Beardsworth | Councillor | Stephen Legg |
| " | Wendy Brackenbury | " | Chris Lofts |
| " | Julie Brookfield | " | Malcolm Longley |
| " | Robin Brown | " | David Mackintosh |
| " | Mary Butcher | " | Arthur McCutcheon |
| " | Michael Clarke | " | John McGhee |
| " | Adam Collyer | " | Allan Matthews |
| " | Elizabeth Coombe | " | Andy Mercer |
| " | Gareth Eales | " | Dennis Meredith |
| " | Brendan Glynane | " | Ian Morris |
| " | Matt Golby | " | Steve Osborne |
| " | André Gonzalez De Savage | " | Bill Parker |
| " | Christopher Groome | " | Suresh Patel |
| " | James Hakewill | " | Ron Sawbridge MBE |
| " | Eileen Hales MBE | " | Bob Scott |
| " | Mike Hallam | " | Mick Scrimshaw |
| " | Stan Heggs | " | Judy Shephard |
| " | Alan Hills | " | Heather Smith |
| " | Sue Homer | " | Danielle Stone |
| " | Jill Hope | " | Winston Strachan |
| " | Sylvia Hughes | " | Michael Tye |
| " | Cecile Irving-Swift | " | Sarah Uldall |
| " | Joan Kirkbride | " | Allen Walker |
| " | Graham Lawman | " | Malcolm Waters |
| " | Derek Lawson MBE | | |

Also in attendance (for all or part of the meeting):

Honorary Alderman Marie Dickie
Dr Akeem Ali, Director for Public Health & Wellbeing
Dr Paul Blantern, Chief Executive
Maureen Campling, Head of Service (Safeguarding Adults)
Laurie Gould, Monitoring Officer
Lesley Hagger, Director of Children's Services
Paul Hanson, Manager, Democratic Services
Dr Carolyn Kus, Director of Adult Social Care Services
Jenny Rendall, Democracy Officer (Minutes)
David Watson, Independent Chairman of the Audit Committee

And 5 members of the public.

49/16 Apologies for non-attendance:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Bell, Jim Broomfield, Michael Brown, Phil Larratt, Bhupendra Patel & Russell Roberts as well as Honorary Alderman Gina Ogden.

50/16 To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2016:

RESOLVED that: Council approved the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 16 June 2016 as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

51/16 Notification of requests by members of the public to address the meeting

Agenda Item No: 6 - Petitions

- Honorary Alderman Marie Dickie

Agenda Item No: 11(d) - Motion submitted by Councillor Adam Collyer

- Mr Colin Bricher
- Ms Angela Walters (Whitehills & Spring Park Residents Association)

52/16 Declarations of Interest by Councillors:

There were none.

53/16 Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting including those watching via a live webcast.

He also referred to the sad death during the summer of Honorary Alderman John Bailey. He had been a councillor for over 40 years serving both on the County Council until 2013 and until his death the Borough Council of Wellingborough where he was twice Mayor. He was Vice-Chairman of the County Council from 1989-1991 and again from 2011-12. He was Chairman from 2012-13. He had served on various committees taking the role of Chairman of the Leisure & Libraries Committee, Deputy Chairman of Strategic & Support Services Scrutiny Committee and Deputy Chairman of Finance & Performance Scrutiny Committee. He became an honorary alderman at the County Council in 2013 and was awarded an MBE in the 2016 New Year's honours list for services to the community in Wellingborough. The Chairman then referred to Honorary Alderman Bailey's strong sense of service and as a representative of the people, particularly to those in his home town of Finedon. He was also a well-known author in the county having written several books on it and served on various archives and heritage bodies within the county.

At the Chairman's invitation members also made comments as follows:

- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Heather Smith stated Honorary Alderman Bailey had given most of his life to public service. He had been very loyal about attending meetings of Council and retained his interest in Council business even after retiring as a councillor. His unique sense of humour and style in chairing meetings would be remembered and she was delighted that his wife was now a councillor with the Borough Council of Wellingborough.
- The Leader of the Major Opposition, Councillor John McGhee stated Honorary Alderman Bailey had spent 4 decades as a councillor and was very much respected

across all parts of the county. He was regularly looked to for advice and humour and he had found him to be very good and fair.

- The Leader of the Minor Opposition, Councillor Brendan Glynane paid tribute to Honorary Alderman Bailey's chairmanship which had been very robust. He referred to his real sense of history and the way in which he spoke so proudly about Chester Farm. He was the best person for promoting history and would be sadly missed.

Council then observed a minute's silence in memory of Honorary Alderman John Bailey.

The Chairman announced that Councillor Joan Kirkbride was making available Christmas Cards in aid of the Nene Valley Care Trust and at his invitation, Councillor Kirkbride stated she knew all councillors took their role as a corporate parent very seriously. These children had traumatic lives and the Nene Valley Care Trust had been set up by Honorary Alderman Priscilla Padley to assist children as they moved from council care into independent lives. The cards which would be available in the Princess Alice Rotunda during lunchtime could be ordered and delivered in time for Christmas.

The Royal and Derngate theatre were also offering tickets to the pantomime, asking for a donation of £10 towards the cost.

Finally, the Chairman announced that he had raised approximately £5,000 towards his own charities and invited people to join the 100 club and buy tickets for a chance to win a hamper of local produce.

54/16 Petitions:

Honorary Alderman Marie Dickie presented a petition reminding Council that in 2013 it promised the people of Northampton a heritage gateway. A public open space and open parkland. She felt they had changed their mind without consultation with Northampton Borough Council (NBC) or the Friends of Northampton Castle and she felt this 'u-turn' was not acceptable. A local group had held a referendum and received endorsement by Northampton Borough Council; the Council's partners in providing the heritage gateway project. To date they had received 750 signatures on their petition, the majority of which had been received through the website 'Change.org'. Many of these had also left comments which she invited councillors to view. The Council had stated the area was not suitable for an open space and referred to the park as 'abandoned'. She felt it was time that the Council remembered it was here to represent the public and she understood they had to make what were sometimes difficult decisions.

RESOLVED that: Council accepted the petition from Honorary Alderman Marie Dickie.

55/16 Opposition Priority Business:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor John McGhee proposed the following motion:

"That this Council requests central government to develop and initiate a national integrated health and care strategy, as a matter of urgency, removing the obstacles in the path of those moving from the NHS to community-based care through putting in place an effective and equitable funding regime.

The Labour Group understands the financial pressures that this government has placed on Northamptonshire. The county has a proportion of elderly people in its population above

the national average of 18.1% and this ageing population will continue to rise. Yet the county is not funded accordingly.

Doing nothing but make service cuts was never a viable strategy and the county council must act now, leading by example and by working with partners, forge an integrated health and care strategy.”

In moving the motion, Councillor McGhee stated the motion was intended to be non-political and he wanted to work across all political parties for the good and wellbeing of Northamptonshire residents. He felt the £280million shortfall in Northamptonshire’s health and social care budgets could be partly overcome by encouraging the NHS and Clinical Commissioning Groups to work together to ensure residents received the best possible treatment and care.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Mary Butcher who asked how long it would take to get local residents to where they should be. She felt working together would make it happen and make Northamptonshire one of the best counties in the country.

Councillor Sylvia Hughes then proposed the following amendment:

“That this Council through the Health and Wellbeing Board requests central government to develop and initiative a national integrated health and care strategy, as a matter of urgency, removing the obstacles in the path of those moving from the NHS to community-based care through putting in place an effective and equitable funding regime.

The Council understands the financial pressure place on Northamptonshire. The county has a proportion of elderly people in its population above the national average of 18.1% and this ageing population will continue to rise. Yet the county is not funded accordingly.

Doing nothing is not an option, the county council must act now, leading by example and by working with partners, forge an integrated health and social care economy.”

In proposing the amendment Councillor Sylvia Hughes reserved her right to speak.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Bill Parker who felt it suggested something that would enable everyone to work together as one team and for the benefit of the county.

Councillor John McGhee announced he would accept the amendment.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was considered to be an extremely important matter. Integrated care and support on a national basis was person centred, co-ordinated care. It was considered to be the right time to work together to ensure this.
- It was suggested a member of the Labour Group be invited to join the Health & Wellbeing Board.
- The Sustainability & Transformation Plan (STP) would be made to work in the interests of all residents. The Health sector were not keen to have any democratic oversight of the STP which is why the Health and Wellbeing Board was involved.
- It was felt the issue was one of trust. Working together and trusting that each of the partners was doing all they should to put the patient first and not politics.
- It was noted the Health & Wellbeing Board included representatives from all of the partners and worked to a strategy which represented the best hopes and desires of those involved. Beneath this was a local plan which had been contributed to by all the partners. The Board had also recently held a national conference looking at its

achievements including reviewing the idea of healthy work places, something no-one else in the country was doing. In this, the third year of the 2020 steps, the county had registered 43million steps. The Healthier Child programme was working in all schools and through Octago and First for Wellbeing, services were provided in many innovative ways. They also had new approaches to both adult and children's services and it was felt they were moving quickly towards solutions.

- It was noted many projects were managed jointly and worked very well. Health scrutiny was looking at the issue of delayed transfer of care (previously referred to as bed blocking).
- It was noted that funding for care had reduced by 11% in the past 13 years whilst funding for health had risen by 71%. Ministers were always informed closing a hospital was a major issue but social care was provided by local councils and concerns were raised that hostility therefore was always directed to local councils. The cost of a bed to the health service was more than £2,000 per day and that money could provide a lot more care in the home and it was felt an equitable and fair funding regime was required to resolve the issues. The Council therefore needed to be more vigorous in expressing its needs to provide social care.
- Concerns were raised that the Council should be scrutinising the zero based budgeting proposed by the Council and ensuring there were funds to invest to save as there were many innovative ways in which to ensure people were looked after and cared for. There was no need in some opinions to wait for government as this often left Councils disappointed.
- It was felt there was a funding crisis for the Council particularly in the area of adult social care and integrating its work with the NHS. Although this was a national issue, Northamptonshire was considering to be suffering more than most partly due to the rising number of elderly residents.
- Some felt that it was the Council's responsibility to find solutions for all of the issues presented in this area. National integrated services moving forward would save money, time and energy and produce better outcomes for those the Council wished to look after.
- Democratically elected members on the Health & Wellbeing Board ensured that everyone could be represented. The significant change required was a diverting of funds that were currently spent in hospitals to Councils. Hospitals needed to re-organise themselves to free up the funding that was required by local Councils to provide social care. Many of those experiencing a delayed transfer of care would ultimately have to pay for their social care and there was a general need for people to understand this need.
- It was felt building relationships across organisations was what made things work. There was a need to change the mind-set of those in the NHS, the Council and the voluntary sector to ensure adequate care was provided.

In response Councillor Sylvia Hughes noted all of those in the Chamber were supporting the motion which was the most important thing. The Health and Wellbeing Board was the greatest example of trust and working together in partnership.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was unanimously accepted.

56/16 Business Items (including Budget & Policy Framework items, Appointments & Annual Reports):

(a) Appointment of the Council's Chief Financial Officer

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Heather Smith proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating that earlier that year LGSS had brought in a

new partner: Milton Keynes Council. At this point they were already aware of the need for a finance director for Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) and they were delighted to have Damon Lawrenson return. This report proposed his appointment as the Section 151 Officer on an interim basis whilst Council advertised for a permanent holder of the post.

The report was seconded by Councillor Robin Brown.

Councillors commented that Damon appeared to be the sort of person you would need for this post. He had recently presented to the Finance & Resources Scrutiny Committee on zero based budgeting and appeared to be very confident of being able to deliver anything he put in place.

In response Councillor Smith thanked Council for its support for this proposal.

RESOLVED that: Council appointed the NCC Group Finance Director as the Council's Chief Financial Officer (Section 151 Officer) with immediate effect.

(b) Monthly Capital Report (MCR) new capital scheme approval:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Robin Brown proposed this report (copies of which had been previously circulated).

The report was seconded by Councillor Matt Golby who stated he was pleased to second the report which included 2 schemes at Moulton College and Tresham College which should assist to move forward post 16 education in Northamptonshire.

Councillors commented as follows:

- More information was requested on the invest to save scheme for doctors and keeping families together.
- More information was requested on the pot hole catch up fund which was important to constituents where the roads were in a very bad state.
- Happiness was expressed at the money that was being provided for Tresham College which it was hoped would assist it to improve.
- In response to a query it was confirmed that the sum of £711,000 was new money which had been received from Government towards fixing pot holes and all councillors had nominated road and pathways to be fixed in their area.
- It was requested that some form of traffic calming was included in the scheme for Moulton College.
- It was noted that it took some time from when a councillor reported a pot hole to when it was mended.
- The Council was congratulated on its new method for repairing pot holes which was considered to be very effective.

In response Councillor Brown stated that further information could be discovered on the various projects through the reports to Cabinet.

RESOLVED that: Council:

1) approved the inclusion of the following 8 new capital schemes:

- **Civica Icon totalling investment of £267,000;**
- **Darsdale Farm Phase 2 – totalling investment of £550,000**
- **Kilsby Traffic Calming, totalling investment of £200,000**
- **Moulton College LGF Allocation, totalling investment of £3,500,000**
- **Tresham College LGF Allocation, totalling investment of £11,400,000**

- **Malcolm Arnold Academy Highways work, totalling investment of £132,000**
 - **Highways Maintenance Incentive Fund, totalling investment of £856,000**
 - **Pothole Action Fund, totalling investment of £711,000; and**
- 2) noted the 2 following further schemes which fall below the de minimis level requiring formal approval:**
- **Fire Vehicle Security Garages, totalling investment of £15,139**
 - **Adoptions Invest to Save – Home extension, totalling investment of £70,000**

To enable their formal entry into the Council's Committed Capital Programme following Cabinet and Capital Investment Board (CIB) recommendations as detailed in Section 7 of the report.

(c) Updates to the Constitution:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Robin Brown proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it was a very comprehensive report which identified significant changes. These changes were required as part of the move towards a federated model and ensuring scrutiny had the opportunity to be involved in the organisations.

The report was seconded by Councillor Allen Walker who congratulated the Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services on their work on the report. The Councillor Services & Governance Working Group which included representatives from all parties had also reviewed this work. He referred councillors to various parts of the report that related to scrutiny, decision making, delegation, protocols and access to information which detailed how councillors would be involved with the new companies.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was felt consistency was required in that the report referred to a company or other body on which Council was the majority shareholder but the constitutional amendments stated 'company'.
- It was noted that Article 16, Section 1.12 could refer to bodies that could provide third party sub-contracting. This would give the Council more distant and difficult control over what exactly was undertaken. It was also queried what would happen if one of those bodies began over-spending their budget. Could Council direct them to stop and what would happen to the service provided?
- It was noted that officers used to be requested to attend scrutiny groups to discuss matters and it was felt this had been most helpful. Councillors were now concerned that their presence had to be requested via the head of paid service.
- It was also suggested that in light of the Council's current financial situation that the figure that denoted a key decision should be £250,000 or £300,000 and not the £500,000 stated in the constitution.
- The need to ensure scrutiny was fully supported was noted particularly as the Council was forming so many new companies. Any scrutiny committee or group should be able to seek the information required to ensure a decision was fully scrutinised.
- It was noted that one councillor's concerns that the Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services were fully involved had been fully allayed.
- It was noted scrutiny had arranged 4 excellent workshops to look at the next generation model and the ability to scrutinise them had been there. It was felt scrutiny had undertaken a good job in ensuring the organisations delivering the work could be brought to account.

In response Councillor Brown stated that the level of a key decision in terms of finance was a discussion the Councillor Services & Governance Working Group had discussed. He felt the constitution did enable the Chief Executive to be held to account.

RESOLVED that: Council (with the exception of Councillor Adam Collyer) agreed:

- 1) The changes to the constitution as set out in Section 4 and the appendices to the report; and**
- 2) That these changes take effect immediately and agree that the Monitoring Officer be delegated authority to make these amendments, any associated conforming amendments and to republish the Constitution.**

(d) Annual Report by the Northamptonshire Safeguarding Adults Board (NSAB):

At the Chairman's invitation, the Head of Service for Adult Safeguarding and Quality within Social Care, Maureen Campling introduced the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) on behalf of the Independent Chairman who was unable to attend that day stating the following:

- The Head of Service felt the most significant thing within the last 12 months was that in April 2015 the NSAB had been placed on a statutory footing. There were 3 core duties for safeguarding adults and a strategic plan for each financial year which set out objectives and how they would be achieved. They had made use of all available intelligence when undertaking the plan.
- Northamptonshire had embedded the majority of the key requirements over the past 5 years including the publication of the report, undertaking of case reviews, including all partners and ensuring there were clearly designated leads for all the agencies across the partnership.
- Much greater emphasis was placed on carers and service users and Northamptonshire embraced the involvement of service users and carers.
- 3 new forms for reporting abuse had been introduced and the Local Government Association and Director of Social Services had extended the programme for safeguarding which included 6 principles on safeguarding including empowerment, proportionality, partnership work, accountability, prevention and protection. This fundamentally changed the way safeguarding was delivered in Northamptonshire and all care management and social work teams were now working directly with adult protection in a similar way to colleagues in children's safeguarding.
- The report included contributions from 3 key partners being the Northamptonshire Police, the local authority and the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). Each of these had strategies for delivering safeguarding.
- There were also contributions from the NICE sub-group who assisted to deliver the work of the board.
- For the first time in 6 years there had been a slight reduction in notifications of adult safeguarding but there had also been an increase in the types of abuse investigated.
- The 3 main reasons for abuse were neglect, acts of submission, physical abuse and financial abuse. The overarching thing was that 50% of all cases investigated were substantiated around neglect. 35% were located in a residential care setting. 38% showed a key risk for individuals was within a residential or key hospital setting.
- The person most likely to be abused was a white female aged 85 or over and living in a residential setting.
- The new Independent Chair of the Board came from a background of safeguarding for adult social care and health responsibilities.

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Bill Parker proposed this report stating he considered it to be a comprehensive report.

The report was seconded by Councillor Andre Gonzalez de Savage who stated 19 different organisations had been involved with it which also covered the Council's fire and rescue teams.

Councillors commented as follows:

- A plea was made that the phrase 'hard to reach groups' was not used in the report as this actually referred to groups that the Council and its partners had failed to reach.
- The highlighting of self-neglect was welcomed as councillors were worried that many people refused to engage with services.
- Concerns were raised that 65% of incidents took place in the home and it was felt more resource was required to ensure people did not become socially isolated.
- Queries were raised regarding Northampton's high referral rate and benchmarking undertaken was queried.
- The inclusion of slavery was also welcomed.
- It was felt there was a need to ensure those in communities knew how to contact and report issues particularly those relating to scams on the telephone.
- With the next generation council concerns were raised that there would be a need to ensure all those in the community were protected by careful monitoring of those organisations visiting people in their own homes.
- It was noted that more issues within communities related to those with mental health issues and there was a need to similarly scrutinise those offering support in this area.

In reply the Head of Service for Adult Safeguarding and Quality confirmed domiciliary care was not reflected in the report as this was subject to the monitoring of both the Local Authority and the Care Quality Commission. Many of those organisations were not required to have a framework but the Council usually only heard about them when issues occurred. Information was passed across all agencies through the communications sub-group who were looking at various advertising over the forthcoming months. The Quality Assurance Board which met every month received regular reports via the CQC. Where there was provider failure, the Council was responsible for stepping in to resolve the issues. The Quality Assurance Team provided staff at any time to assist homes that had issues. The Council worked well with the CQC and did gather a lot of intelligence.

The Chief Executive confirmed directors reported to him as well as the Chair of the various Boards. He also often met with portfolio holders to tackle issues.

In reply Councillor Parker thanked the officers for their answers to queries.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the Northamptonshire Safeguarding Adults Board (NSAB) Annual Report 2015-16.

(e) Annual Report by the Northamptonshire Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB):

At the Chairman's invitation the Independent Chairman of the Northamptonshire Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB), Mr Keith Makin introduced the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) highlighting the following:

- The NSCB had been on a statutory footing for some years and this was his third year of him presenting to the Council.
- The Annual Report showed very real progress against quite a low position. Ofsted had judged Children's Services as being inadequate in 2013 and the relationship between the NSCB and the Improvement Board had been critical in improving that rating to being 'Requiring Improvement'.
- There was still a long way to go and the development of partnership working had been very good resulting in a lot more focus on outcome and impact. The report

contained a lot of information on how improvements in safety of children in the county had been achieved. It also demonstrated how the Board was engaging with children and young people to assist them to understand what their rights were.

- There had been a concentrated effort focussing on activities with multi-agencies which really drilled down into experiences of families and children and gave the Board real knowledge about the lives of children.
- There were plans to develop further to good close work with the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- They were currently working on developing much closer relationships with the Safeguarding Adults Board and looking at ways of joining up the business support relationships.
- Their catchphrase was 'think family' with many support workers looking at the whole family. The Board had many discussions on the future of council services and partner services in light of reducing budgets and had been working more closely with the Corporate Parenting Board.
- One difficulty had been a big turnover of staff within Children's Services and regular changes of support staff had a huge impact on children's lives.
- There had been many attempts to address the high level of referrals, some led by the Board in conjunction with the Improvement Board. They now worked closely with the new Director for Children's Services and the Board had real oversight on this.
- Ensuring early help offered to families was taken up was another aim.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Matt Golby to propose the report who stated it looked back across what he considered to be a landmark year. He acknowledged there was a lot to do but also the good areas of work noted by Ofsted particularly in learning, development, policies, procedures and communication. He felt that partnership was really good and the NSCB would pick up the work of the Improvement Board. There was evidence of impact in each area covered in the report and it was good to see that an excellent safeguarding conference in the summer had been completely full.

The report was seconded by Councillor Suresh Patel who stated it set out the actions taken to progress forward improvements. It also set out priorities for 2016-17 with an aim to include all members of the Board.

Councillors commented as follows:

- The Board reflected the way in which things had changed in the last year with improved partnership working. The Independent Chairman was thanked for his support in that as were the Police for the way in which they signed up to the Board
- Concerns were raised that staff in Children's Services were being asked to take voluntary redundancy which could lead to losing expertise and the NSCB should be encouraging the Council to keep that expertise.
- A plea was made that the NSCB investigated bullying within schools. It was then further suggested that scrutiny could also review how schools dealt with bullying.
- The Board was congratulated on the way in which it had dealt with the issue of Female Genitalia Mutilation.
- Concerns were raised regarding the turnover of staff as instability of workforce made children even more vulnerable.
- Further concerns were raised regarding Northamptonshire's high rate of referrals and the fact that the number of out of county placements was increasing. Some queried how many of the out of county placements were unaccompanied asylum seeking children.
- It was suggested that more could be done in schools in education about sexual harassment and sexual violence.

- A further query was made as to which safeguarding measures were in place to ensure unaccompanied asylum seeking children did not get into trouble.

Queries on the report were answered as follows:

- The Independent Chairman worked with the Chief Executive every 3 months to ensure all the plans in place were safe and robust.
- There had been a focus on bullying and the Board provided information to all schools in the county. There had also been a focus on developing sexual health with children in schools.
- Ofsted appeared to consider the MASH to be working very well. Something the Independent Chairman would agree with. The team were paying particular attention to early help and there were some changes currently being made within the MASH.
- Unaccompanied asylum seeking children were very important and schools were being asked how they were integrating them. There had been a particular spike in the number in Northamptonshire.
- The Independent Chairman gave his apologies for the omission of Corby in the report.
- Ofsted rated the Council at approximately 3.5. 3 years previously it had been at minus 4.
- As far as he was aware, the Council did not employ any consultants in this area of work. They had collaborated with the Lowdown who had a lot of challenge from schools

In reply Councillor Golby stated voluntary redundancies did not affect front-line staff. He would be ensuring the issue of bullying was investigated and through the MASH he hoped to be able to ensure early direction to the correct service was improved. He noted the county was the fourth highest in the country in terms of unaccompanied asylum seeking children and they needed to ensure the children were most appropriately placed quickly.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the Northamptonshire Safeguarding Children Board (NSCB) Annual Report 2015-16.

(f) Empowering Councillors & Communities Scheme – Annual Report of the Scheme for the Financial Year 2015/16:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Robin Brown proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating that whilst not all councillors had taken full advantage of the scheme, it was a real opportunity for councillors to have a real impact in their divisions. He personally distributed all of his money through his parish councils who had an audit facility thus ensuring the money was used correctly.

The report was seconded by Councillor Graham Lawman.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted that councillors had used the funding to provide various things including a Christmas lunch for people who would otherwise have been alone and to provide table tennis equipment for a local youth club.
- It was noted that some years previously the Labour Group had suggested this funding be made available in different amounts to each division depending on need within that division and some still supported this suggestion. Others felt it only right and fair to have the same money per division regardless of any perceived needs.
- It was also noted that sometimes a very small sum enabled a club or organisation to flourish and grow and develop new services that in turn attracted new funding.

- Some felt this fund better enabled them to get out into their communities and understand better what was there.
- It was noted some councillors had not spent all of their funding because they had missed a deadline.

In reply Councillor Brown noted all appeared in favour of the scheme but he was concerned about the suggestion from the opposition group. He also noted that the level of funding that year had not been reflected in the recent media reports and reminded members they had until the end of the year to spend their fund.

RESOLVED that: Council endorsed the annual report of the Empowering Councillors Scheme for the financial year 2015/16.

(g) Annual Reports by the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) Local Pension Board and the Firefighters' Pension Scheme (FPS) Local Pension Board:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Allan Matthews proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) who stated the purpose of the Local Pension Boards was to scrutinise and challenge the Pensions Committee.

At the Chairman's request the Monitoring Officer, Laurie Gould confirmed that both Local Pension Boards had been set up under the Pensions Act 2013 and had an overseeing role and to act as a critical friend to the 2 authorities. Serious issues would be reported to the Pensions Regulator.

The report was seconded by Councillor Graham Lawman.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was hoped the reports would assist members to understand the work of the Boards and Pensions Committee, particularly as the Pensions Committee had responsibility for a large sum of money.
- It was noted the Board had also considered a confidential item presented to the Annual General Meeting of the Pensions Committee.

The Chairman of the Local Pension Board (Local Government Pension Scheme LGPS) answered queries on the report as follows:

- Investments were the remit of the Pensions Committee.
- The confidential item came to the Board from the Pensions Committee to view in a scrutiny capacity.
- A report would be presented to Full Council later that year.
- The Pensions Committee could confirm whether money was invested in tobacco companies.

The Chairman of the Pensions Committee, Councillor Graham Lawman confirmed the Annual Report from the Pensions Committee would be presented to Council at its next meeting. The Local Pension Board was responsible for reviewing administration and not investments. The Pensions Committee did have an investment policy and had no direct investments in tobacco companies. It could however invest in funds that did some form of investment in this way. Central Government was expected to shortly issue some guidelines for investments and a new Ethical Standards Policy would be written once these new guidelines had been received. He thanked the Local Pension Board who acted as a critical friend to the Committee.

The Vice-Chairman of the Pensions Committee confirmed the Pensions Committee did its utmost to look after the money of all the scheme's pensioners. The Committee consisted of councillors, representatives from borough and district councils, members of the scheme, unions and local colleges/universities. He felt Councillor Lawman was an admirable chairman and he thanked officers who had worked on the ACCESS pool group which had been formed in response to Central Government's wish to reduce the number of committees to 10 in terms of investment.

In reply councillor Matthews commended the report.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the first annual report of the Local Pension Boards.

(h) Corporate Parenting Board Annual Report 2016:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Matt Golby proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating he took his role of Chairman of the Corporate Parenting Board very seriously. They continuously raised the bar for children and care leavers. He thanked everyone for their commitment and attendance at meetings. There was still much to do but the latest Ofsted report included some very positive comments particularly in terms of how data was used to support these children. The sub-groups of the Corporate Parenting Board had undertaken a lot of work ensuring the care leavers through the Care Leavers Charter and the voice of the child was heard. Young people regularly addressed the Board. He also looked forward to working with the new Director of Children's Services.

The report was seconded by Councillor Suresh Patel who considered the role of corporate parent to be a core responsibility of all councillors. The Children in Care Forum met regularly with the Board to ensure their voices were heard. He drew councillors' attention to appendix 4 to the report which included a poster designed by the children. He felt there was a lot still to achieve but good progress was being made.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that just as the Council's Children's Services were improving, members of staff were being made redundant. Further concerns were raised that some members of staff had voiced concerns that the Council might not improve further by the time of its next Ofsted inspection
- It was suggested the reports should be more outcome focussed. There was also a need to understand why numbers were so high in Northamptonshire.
- A concern was raised regarding the Shadow Board and what had happened to it. A further concern was raised about the Children's Rights Service moving from Russell House back to its old site.
- Concerns were raised about the hiatus caused when services were changed as this hiatus had a bad effect on looked after children.
- Concerns were also raised about the number of care leavers who became pregnant as they were or just after leaving care
- In noting Northamptonshire had a high population of unaccompanied asylum seeking children concerns were raised about what happened to them as they left care. Did they go into further education and what provision was made for them?
- It was felt the Corporate Parenting Board had become much more business-like, more focussed and it needed to become more effective. The new Director of Children's Services had recently stated she intended to keep to the budget set, something that was vital in the current financial situation. She was also keen to reduce the Council's reliance on agency workers.

- Some felt all that had been recently learned should have been embedded before any redundancies were sought from the service.

In reply Councillor Golby confirmed there had been a need to invest significantly in Children's Service in order to move forward and make progress. It was now time to look at re-structuring and develop the new trust to protect the most vulnerable children in the county. The Council currently provided one of the most expensive children's services in the country so there was a need to ensure the improvement journey continued but at a lower cost. He agreed with the need for stability and confirmed much was being undertaken to recruit permanent social workers.

RESOLVED that: Council noted:

- 1) the Corporate Parenting Board Annual Report 2016; and**
- 2) that Councillor Golby would provide answers to the following questions following the meeting:**
 - **Where were the Children's Rights Service to be based?**
 - **How were care leavers supported to ensure pregnancy was a life choice?**
 - **What was being undertaken to ensure new systems were embedded prior to asking staff to take voluntary redundancy?**

(i) Health and Wellbeing Board Annual Report:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Sylvia Hughes proposed the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) who stated she was astounded by the work of partners and colleagues. The Board enabled key leaders from across the Northamptonshire health and care system to work to improve health and wellbeing in the county and promote integration of services. All were promoting the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) which identified health, wellbeing and care need across the county to produce a strategy for addressing them. The Board took a lead in refreshing the Northamptonshire health and wellbeing strategy and owned the work of the Concordat. They had been very successful and the Northamptonshire Police were also very involved in the operation. They worked in partnership with health on the Sustainability & Transformation Plans (STP) which would be the key to health and wellbeing of the county. The Board would be the key overview and scrutiny body for this. The Board arranged a number of development sessions each focussing a half day on a key theme and inviting key stakeholders to participate. During 2015-16 these sessions included data sharing, improving public health outcomes and integrated care closer to home. Organisations involved included the local CCGs, operating plans, citizens and media. There were challenging times ahead and it was important for the Council to continue support to the Board.

The report was seconded by Councillor Matt Golby who was pleased to see that the Board had the main oversight of the STP. He felt the Health and Wellbeing Strategy consisted of a fantastic collection of all the strategies across health in the county. He felt the development sessions were an excellent opportunity for people to get involved and tackle important issues

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted there were 5 areas in the Concordat in red and 2 of these were in the area relating to carers. Carers were considered by some to be the most important people for providing day to day living support for patients.

- Carer's VOICE were recommended as they had recently provided a very good presentation to MIND. They were non-statutory but were very important in supporting patients.
- Concerns were raised that no outcomes or benchmarks were included in the report to enable those reading it to ascertain where the Council had started and how things had progressed.
- A request was made to hear the Board's aims for the next 5-10 years and how it aimed to address issues around obesity, alcohol and smoking cessation
- The Board was congratulated on what it had achieved over the past 12 months, in particular Professor Nick Petford had been instrumental in assisting the Board to develop a strategy which had been accepted by all members of the Board.
- It was noted the strategy set an outcome for the county which was very different to the current financial situation. The Board also now met 6 times a year and the new Chairman was thanked for ensuring the developmental sessions had impact.
- Some felt the real test was having to change the way in which they worked, particularly in partnership which for some could be uncomfortable. It was noted there was a lot of bureaucracy within the NHS and an incident was cited whereby a councillor requiring a short procedure had to complete a form which was forwarded elsewhere for approval before he could come in for the actual procedure.

In reply Councillor Hughes agreed that carers were a fundamental pillar. She also confirmed a lot of effort had been taken to ensure the development of the STP was of the finest quality. Outputs were recorded in the JSNA and details of corporate performance were received by the Board.

RESOLVED that: Council:

- 1) Agreed to continue to support the Health and Wellbeing Board as a statutory body; and**
- 2) Received the Health and Wellbeing Board's Annual Report.**

57/16 Cabinet Business:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Heather Smith presented her report (copies of which were circulated at the meeting) stating she was meeting the Government Minister in connection with migration alongside the Chief Executive of the East Midlands Council. The County had 25 more Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children than it should have under the Government formula and she would be discussing this with the Government Minister also. The Council currently had almost 140 unaccompanied asylum seeking children under the age of 18 and a large cohort within the leaving care cohort. They were supported and usually performed well in higher education.

The Chairman then referred Council to the list of written questions and answers (copies of which were circulated at the meeting) and took supplementary questions to those as follows:

- It was felt there was a need to enter and begin using the new HQ before renting any parts of it out to third party users. The costs of the building would be managed no differently to other buildings the Council maintained.
- The Leader of the Council had not reviewed the hiring out of premises that were part of the PFI for Schools contract.
- Instead of writing indexation the Leader could have written cost of living increase which was always moving and never stayed the same for any length of time.

- There was an agreement with the Northamptonshire Enterprise Partnership to undertake enterprise activities through a grant funding process similar to that administered by the Northampton Community Foundation.
- Moving rapidly to a unitary council would cost a significant sum of money which the Council did not currently have. The Leader of the Council would consider unitary authorities once next generation council was embedded in.

Verbal questions were answered as follows:

- The Leader of the Council looked forward to working with scrutiny on the issue of delayed transfer of care within the county's local hospitals.
- The Leader of the Council knew no more than anyone else with regards to the direct impact on the Council of Brexit. The Council had no intention of asking people who were already working in this country to leave.
- She would be only too happy to meet with Northampton Town Sanctuary to discuss services and issues.
- There was a massive pressure on school places and the Council was arranging building on as many school sites as possible. There was a lot of migration into the area and trying to place vulnerable children in a system that was already under great strain was not easy. It was noted the support network in Northampton was not necessarily available in other areas of the county that did not have the same pressures.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the report by the Leader of the Council and responses to questions raised both prior to and during the meeting;

58/16 Report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee, Councillor Jim Hakewill proposed his report (copies of which had been previously circulated) thanking his predecessor, Councillor Judy Shephard for all of the work she had undertaken on behalf of and in support of scrutiny. Overview and scrutiny had reviewed many of the issues affecting the Council with varying degrees of success in the recommendations it had made to decision makers. They welcomed many senior officers and politicians to meetings to answer queries and discuss a way forward. He felt scrutiny was truly shaping the way the county worked and thanked all of those who had attended meetings. He concluded by stating his role within scrutiny was one of the most satisfying he had ever had.

The report was seconded by Councillor Dudley Hughes who stated the Children, Learning & Communities Scrutiny Committee had welcomed Lesley Hagger to the Council and looked forward to inviting other officers in the future.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised regarding the budget and the fact that the Finance & Resources Scrutiny Committee had been informed the previous day that there would be no change in the way it was prepared and scrutiny would not have a role until after the budget had been set. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee was asked if he agreed that this was perhaps disappointing and there were other ways in which scrutiny could become involved in the budget.
- It was felt specific consideration should be given to scrutinising the STP as it would provide the opportunity to ensure funding was provided where resources required it. It was further suggested that this be undertaken as a separate meeting outside of the usual cycle of meetings.

- Queries were raised regarding a decision on leasing or buying outright fire appliances and the purchase of protective clothing and equipment used by firefighters.

In reply Councillor Hakewill stated the following:

- Most of the questions raised could also have been directed to the Chairmen of the various scrutiny committees at any time and councillors were encouraged to do this rather than wait for a Council meeting, particularly if the issue was an urgent one.
- He agreed that scrutiny of the STP could be helpful and he would ask that the Health, Adult Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny consider it in their work programme.
- He did not agree that the information regarding scrutiny of the budget was disappointing and stated there had been a very productive Finance & Resources Scrutiny Committee the previous day at which the Portfolio Holder and Finance Director had been present.
- Comments regarding the fire service and its protection clothing and equipment and lease or outright buying of fire appliances would be passed to the Environment, Development and Transport Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED that: Council noted the Report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee and responses to questions raised at the meeting.

59/16 Motions submitted by Councillors under Rule 13.1:

(a) Motion submitted by Councillor Chris Lofts:

The Chairman then invited Councillor Chris Lofts to submit the following motion:

“Council notes with concern the damning judgement by the external auditor, KPMG that the Council does not have proper arrangements to ensure it took properly informed decisions and deployed resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people. The auditor considers this a significant failing and has commented that of the 28 authorities audited, only 3 are judged in this negative way.

Liberal Democrats have no confidence that the current administration is capable of managing the council’s finances as it has repeatedly set budgets that it knows cannot be delivered. The auditor has now confirmed this view.

We propose, therefore that Council has no confidence in the ability of the Conservative Administration to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes for taxpayers and local people as stated by the external auditor.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Lofts stated that for the past 4 years he had taken an active role in scrutinising the budget. As part of that process he and other members had raised grave doubts about the budgets they had been asked to approve. They had often witnessed in-year cuts to services and major changes to the budget. Concerns were raised regarding the current financial situation which was considered to be worse than it had been in August. In noting the Council was aiming to achieve savings through the new federated models it was also noted that the expected savings from the Children’s Trust would not be realised in the current year. It was further noted that moving to the new HQ would achieve savings but the costs of this move had not yet been divulged. He also noted that previous budgets had always been balanced but this was a legal requirement. The External Auditors in the current year had criticised the Council for not delivering a sound approach on value for money and the Council was now placed in the bottom

quartile of councils. He therefore had no confidence in the Administration's ability to protect public services.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Brendan Glynane

Councillors commented as follows:

- Some felt the External Auditors had not provided the Council with a bad report and some were confident in the Administration and Officer's ability to balance the budget.
- Bringing forward a balanced budget could be at the cost of the residents of Northamptonshire.
- Concerns were raised that the relevant papers had not been prepared in time for the publication and were provided late for the Audit Committee meeting.
- Concerns were raised that the external auditors had refused to sign off the accounts on quality as the freezing of council tax had been detrimental to the Council. It was also felt the way in which consultants, interims and part-time staff were employed was at an enormous cost to the Council.
- It was noted that the Council had a national reputation and in some cases this was for possibly being the first Council set to go bankrupt. Concerns were then raised that savings from the next generation model could be received too late to improve the Council's financial situation.
- Concerns were raised that Council services could be reduced in order to achieve a balanced budget.
- Some felt many considered the services they currently received to be better than they had in the past. It was felt the Council had in the past 5 years been able to balance the budget whilst investing in services to ensure they were to an acceptable standard. More money than ever before had been allocated to Children's Services during the past 3 years.
- It was noted the Conservative Party had been in Administration for 12 years and some felt that during that time mistakes had been made.

In reply Councillor Lofts thanked councillors for their comments. He felt that the Administration had not made proper arrangements for the tax payers and local people.

RESOLVED that: Upon a recorded vote of 27 against and 18 for the motion was rejected.

(b) Motion submitted by Councillor Jill Hope:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Jill Hope moved the following motion:

"Council notes that the air quality in parts of Northampton reached very high levels of pollution during the summer. Poor air quality impacts on the health and wellbeing of residents, visitors and workers in the town. Council has rightly committed to improving the wellbeing of the population of the county and Liberal Democrats firmly believe we have a duty to promote improvements to the quality of air in Northampton. Low Emission Zones play a major role in forcing highly polluting traffic away from sensitive areas. To date no such zones have been established in Northampton despite the real threats to health posed by traffic related pollution.

Council notes that the lead in producing an Air Quality Strategy lies with Northampton Borough Council and that they are currently consulting about a new strategy.

Council resolves, therefore, to respond to the NBC consultation urging the Borough Council to implement Low Emission Zones in relevant areas of Northampton. Council

further resolves to actively support these zones by working with the Borough Council to make these zones effective.”

In moving the motion Councillor Hope stated her division had some of the worst traffic pollution in the county and whilst the Council was not responsible for air pollution, she was asking it make representations to the Northampton Borough Council because the issue was so serious. Dirty air assisted to cause road traffic collisions and she referred to the road junction in St James close to the Thomas Becket public house. There were many accidents at this point that she felt the rising levels of nitrous dioxide affected people's judgement in this area. She felt toxicity levels in the county had been too high for too long and she would like specific action to be taken to address this.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Sally Beardsworth who referred to the Kingsthorpe corridor as another area of high pollution. Asthma, lung disease and various other ailments were suffered by those using the area and she was asking the Council to keep their promise not to sell parts of the land it owned on the Buckton Field site. She felt traffic was particularly bad when leaving Northampton after 4.30pm.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Some felt air quality was a subject everyone should be concerned about. It was noted lower emission zones often resulted in the removal of traffic which in many places was not possible. It was felt more should be done to reduce the level of traffic on the roads such as including cycle lanes.
- It was noted that traffic congestion was high on the list of issues for school councils. Many pupils felt air pollution affected their ability to play sports and the Northampton Borough Council claimed they did not test air pollution around the schools. It was then suggested the Council could put pressure on the Northampton Borough Council to undertake this. It was noted that there had been a rise in the number of people suffering from asthma which would be a life threatening disease and many hospital admissions were for those suffering from the afore-mentioned diseases, particularly children. It was also felt other parts of the county such as Wellingborough also suffered where there was a lot of traffic.
- Some felt the motion should have been taken to the Northampton Borough Council as this Council could not pre-suppose something that had not yet happened. It was also noted that the Council was feeding into the consultation by the Northampton Borough Council in other ways, such as through its Highways Department.

In reply Councillor Hope thanked those who agreed with her and felt some really valid points had been raised. She confirmed that the motion was not pre-empting the result of a consultation but asking for the Council's view to be put forward as part of the consultation.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

(c) Motion submitted by Councillor Brendan Glynnane:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Brendan Glynnane proposed the following motion:

“Council notes and welcomes the recent announcement by Government that it will guarantee EU funded economic development activity until 2020 should the UK leave the EU before this date. However the assurances are limited and in general only apply to funds approved by the EU ahead of this year's autumn statement.

As the driving force behind Northamptonshire's Economic Development strategy Council believes that the overall financial impact on the county of leaving the EU should be at least neutral.

Council therefore resolves to write to the Government and to engage with the local MPs saying that the Government should ensure that, following Brexit, Northamptonshire receives investment at least equal to that planned to be provided by EU programmes."

In moving the motion Councillor Glynane stated he considered it to be quite concerning and that Brexit could cost the Council a lot of money. He noted £54million came to the Council from Europe. He also noted that the Local Government Association (LGA) was pressing Government to ensure money already agreed would still be found when the country left the EU. The motion was asking Council to write to MPs to ensure Northamptonshire received investment at least equal to what would have been provided by EU programmes.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Sarah Uldall,

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that this motion suggested the British public had voted wrongly in June.
- In confirming the motion was concerned with ensuring Northamptonshire received all the money it had been promised, it was also noted that Northamptonshire was always underfunded and this money was desperately needed.
- Some felt that as Article 50 had not yet been triggered, there was little the Council could do. It was then noted that Northamptonshire had the highest employment in the East Midlands, was very entrepreneurial and enterprising and would continue to promote ideas to the Government.
- It was noted the Leader of the Council had already written to Central Government to make it clear what was required in Northamptonshire. A copy of this letter could be circulated to all councillors following the meeting.

In reply Councillor Glynane stated he was pleased that a letter had been forwarded the previous week and he looked forward to hearing the response to that letter when it was received.

RESOLVED that: Council:

- 1) agreed with the sentiment of the motion and noted that a letter had been forwarded from the Leader of the Council to Central Government regarding the issue of retaining funding promised by the EU prior to the vote to leave the European Union; and**
- 2) noted that a copy of the letter forwarded to Central Government would be forwarded to all members of the Council.**

(d) Motion submitted by Councillor Adam Collyer:

At the Chairman's invitation Mr Colin Bricher addressed Council stating he was sad that what he described as a 'hot potato' had not yet been resolved. Despite the border, this development had been approved by Daventry District Council when it would most affect Northampton. In 2011 he had suggested re-routing the A5199 direct to Mill Lane but this did not appear to have been given any real consideration nor had his suggestion of a light rail system along the Brampton Valley Way. He noted the road out to Brixworth was narrow and dangerous and he urged Council to approve this motion.

The Chairman then invited Ms Angela Walters from the Whitehills & Spring Park Residents Association to address Council who referred to a new relief road which was planned at the end of the junction at the Windhover Public House. She felt the bulk of the traffic would turn right in Harborough Road and on to the Moulton Park Industrial Estate which would require it to pass Lindsay Avenue which was a residential street of approximately 60 houses. She also felt ambulances from the Ambulance Station would have no chance of a fast response in either direction and the bus service would be equally disrupted. She felt the Kingsthorpe Corridor was now full of traffic lights, crossings and traffic which needed to be diverted away from Kingsthorpe by an orbital road in tandem with the relief road. She urged Council to attempt something to alleviate the situation rather than add to it.

Councillor Adam Collyer then proposed the following motion:

“The current serious traffic congestion and pollution levels will increase well beyond the capacity of Kingsthorpe to absorb them if any further development takes place on the County Council land at Buckton Fields without the completion of the North West Bypass from the A428 to the A5199 and the North Northampton Orbital Road from the A5199 to the A43.

The Council therefore resolves not to sell any of the County Council land within Buckton Fields unless and until these road schemes are committed.”

In moving the motion Councillor Collyer thanked councillors and members of the public for agreeing Northampton desperately needed this bypass. He noted there were great challenges across the county, particularly the Kingsthorpe area of Northampton. Earlier that year a consultation had begun on the route of the bypass but he was disappointed to note from the most recent cabinet meeting that a new consultation would begin resulting in a 9 month delay to the building of the relief road. The new housing was therefore potentially being built on Buckton Fields before the road. His motion therefore was seeking Council's committal to building the road before any of the land it owned was sold.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Christopher Groome.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted that on 8 December 2011 Council approved a motion that it would only consider selling the land when the strategic infrastructure was in place. The consultation which would end in the first half of 2017 would result in the agreement to a route that would receive substantial funding from the developer of Buckton Fields.
- It was noted that eventually the decision would come back to Daventry District Council as Northampton Borough Council could only identify a 3.5 year plan and not a 5 year plan.
- Some felt anything that would assist the Kingsthorpe corridor would be good. It was noted 2 major bits of work had been undertaken in this area and there was nothing else that could be done to improve it.
- It was noted the Council had a fiduciary duty to sell assets to provide funding for capital schemes. It was not stipulated when land was sold, where the proceeds would be spent and it was noted many schemes took some time to come to fruition.
- Some felt ensuring proper provision was made for traffic was the responsible thing to do in this case.
- It was noted many other parts of the county suffered from poor congestion and it was felt by some that as a third party funder in this instance, the Council should be considering what was best for these areas.
- Some felt the Council had a long standing commitment to honour in that it would not sell the land until the infrastructure was in place. It was also felt that the areas of

congestion and poor air quality around the town of Northampton were possibly caused by the lack of a proper orbital network around the town.

- It was suggested the issue should be referred to the Environment, Development & Transport Scrutiny Committee for a full debate. There was clearly a demand and need for the orbital road and the Council was very proud of what had been achieved already.

In reply Councillor Collyer stated he considered it to have been a very interesting debate and he thanked Councillor Shephard for reminding him that the Council had already agreed to only consider selling the land once the commitment to the infrastructure was in place. The motion was not concerned with setting council policy but he felt it was exactly the correct place to consider policy.

RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

60/16 Urgent Business:

There was none.

61/16 Exempt Items:

There were none.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 4.20pm.

Jenny Rendall
Democratic Support

Chairman's Signature:-

Date:-



NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

| Recorded Votes for Council: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Date of Meeting: 6 October 2016 | | | | | |
| Item No: 11 (a) – Motion submitted by Councillor Brendan Glynane. | | | | | |

| Surname | First Name | For | Against | Abstain | Absent |
|--------------------|-------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|
| Beardsworth | Sally | √ | | | |
| Bell | Paul | | | | √ |
| Brackenbury | Wendy | | √ | | |
| Brookfield | Julie | √ | | | |
| Broomfield | Jim | | | | √ |
| Brown | Michael | | | | √ |
| Brown | Robin | | √ | | |
| Butcher | Mary | √ | | | |
| Clarke | Michael | | √ | | |
| Collyer | Adam | √ | | | |
| Coombe | Elizabeth | √ | | | |
| Eales | Gareth | √ | | | |
| Glynane | Brendan | √ | | | |
| Golby | Matthew | | √ | | |
| Gonzalez de Savage | Andre | | √ | | |
| Groome | Christopher | √ | | | |
| Hakewill | James | | √ | | |

| Surname | First Name | For | Against | Abstain | Absent |
|--------------|------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|
| | | | | | |
| Hales | Eileen | √ | | | |
| Hallam | Mike | | √ | | |
| Harker | James | | √ | | |
| Heggs | Stanley | | | | √ |
| Hills | Alan | | √ | | |
| Homer | Sue | | √ | | |
| Hope | Jill | √ | | | |
| Hughes | Dudley | | √ | | |
| Hughes | Sylvia | | √ | | |
| Irving-Swift | Cecile | | | | √ |
| Kirkbride | Joan | | √ | | |
| Larratt | Phil | | | | √ |
| Lawman | Graham | | | | √ |
| Lawson | Derek | | √ | | |
| Legg | Stephen | | √ | | |
| Lofts | Chris | √ | | | |
| Longley | Malcolm | | | | √ |
| McCutcheon | Arthur | √ | | | |
| McGhee | John | √ | | | |
| Mackintosh | David | | | | √ |
| Matthews | Allan | | √ | | |
| Mercer | Andrew | | √ | | |
| Meredith | Dennis | √ | | | |
| Morris | Ian | | √ | | |
| Osborne | Steve | | √ | | |
| Parker | Bill | | √ | | |

| Surname | First Name | For | Against | Abstain | Absent |
|---------------|------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|
| | | | | | |
| Patel | Bhupendra | | | | √ |
| Patel | Suresh | | √ | | |
| Roberts | Russell | | | | √ |
| Sawbridge | Ron | | √ | | |
| Scott | Bob | √ | | | |
| Scrimshaw | Mick | | | | √ |
| Shephard | Judy | | √ | | |
| Smith | Heather | | √ | | |
| Stone | Danielle | √ | | | |
| Strachan | Winston | √ | | | |
| Tye | Michael | | √ | | |
| Uldall | Sarah | √ | | | |
| Walker | Allen | | √ | | |
| Waters | Malcolm | | √ | | |
| | | | | | |
| Totals | | 18 | 27 | 0 | 12 |