

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 12 October 2015
5.00 - 9.00 pm

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Sinnott (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Benstead, Bick, Hipkin, Holt, Sarris and M. Smart

Leader of the Council: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Councillor George Owers

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset

Director of Environment: Simon Payne

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Estates and Facilities: Trevor Burdon

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba

Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye

Head of Specialist Services: Paul Necus

Corporate Manager: Fran Barrett

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Transformation Programme Manager: Brian O'Sullivan

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

15/69/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Cantrill, Councillor C. Smart attended as alternate.

15/70/SR Declarations of Interest

Item Number	Councillor	Interest
15/76/SR	Cllr Benstead	Member of GMB

15/71/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the 13 July 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

15/72/SR Public Questions

The Chair proposed that these be taken at the start of the relevant agenda item.

Re-ordering of the agenda.

Under paragraph 4.2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, the Chair used his discretion to alter the order of the agenda items. However, for ease of the reader, these minutes will follow the order of the agenda.

15/73/SR Future of Park Street Car Park**Matter for Decision**

The report proposed the shape of the above ground development of Park Street Car Park to include mixed development consisting of an underground car park of 250 spaces, with social and market housing for sale and rent above ground and commercial outlets including a modern cycle park.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Supported the redevelopment of Park Street car park to incorporate:
 - A 250 space underground car park
 - Above ground a mixed development of market, intermediate and social housing, including the option for commercial rental on the ground floor, in conjunction with cycle parking.
 - the same or greater number of cycle parking spaces
- ii. Supported a strategy to mitigate the impact of the redevelopment during construction works that included:
 - further consultation and liaison over the detailed plans and for the redevelopment with key stakeholders, including businesses in Bridge Street and the vicinity of Park Street car park
 - continuing consultation and involvement through Cambridge BID
 - regular project updates
 - exploring ways to reduce the length of time of construction, including possible re-opening of the underground car park while work continues on the construction of the commercial and housing property above ground, and re-opening in time for the 2018 Christmas shopping period

- seeking possible provision of public use of the car park under Castle Court 7 days a week during the construction (as well as the weekend use of the Shire Hall car park), and a possible shuttle Bridge St bus service to and from Castle Court and Grafton East car parks.
 - Liaison with the companies providing scheduled bus services to see if routes can be diverted via Bridge Street
- iii. Instructed the Head of Property Services in liaison with the Head of Strategic Housing to:
- Evaluate a further option for a housing mix of 40% social and 60% intermediate housing (the latter funded from the council's general fund for investment return).
 - Establish a realistic assessment of the capacity of the site for above ground development, request the Urban Design Team to prepare a full planning brief, analysing its context and constraints in order to enable development value to be optimised within the planning guidance.
 - Explore the preferred mechanism to secure the redevelopment of the site to maximise the opportunities to provide affordable housing on the site within the constraints of financial viability, and to report back in the next committee cycle
 - Explore the preferred housing schemes, to enable the council to decide whether to build the social housing itself or to sell it to a registered provider, and to report back in the next committee cycle.
 - Explore the council developing the project itself, producing the social housing as outlined in the report but retaining and letting out the remaining housing.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Specialist Services.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Sought clarification regarding cycle provision and whether the redevelopment would provide the same amount of cycle parking as was currently provided.

- ii. Sought clarification what investigations had been undertaken in relation to the capacity of other car parks whilst construction of the new development was in progress.
- iii. Questioned the number of cycle parking spaces.
- iv. Expressed concern that the housing proposal was driven by a desire to offset the cost of developing the car park.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Specialist Services said the following:

- i. Confirmed the number of cycle parking spaces would at least match the number of spaces currently provided by the existing development.
- ii. Initial meetings had looked at the possibility of a shuttle bus during the construction period whilst Park Street car park was not available.
- iii. The capacity of cycle parking provision may be able to be increased but this was dependant on the layout of the development.
- iv. The development must take into account budgetary pressures of the Council.

Councillor Bick proposed the following amendment to the officer's recommendation at 2.3 (additional text underlined):

In recommendation 2.3 insert before (d)

In addition to those above ground options described in the report, also evaluate a further option for a housing mix of 40% social and 60% intermediate housing (the latter funded from the council's general fund for investment return).

In order to establish a realistic assessment of the capacity of the site for above ground development, request the Urban Design Team to prepare a full planning brief, analysing its context and constraints in order to enable development value to be optimised within the planning guidance.

On a show of hands this was agreed unanimously

Councillor Robertson proposed the following amendment to the officer's recommendation 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 of the officer's report (additional text underlined).

2.1 To support the redevelopment of Park Street car park to incorporate:

- a) A 250 space underground car park
- b) Above ground a mixed development of market, intermediate and social housing, including the option for commercial rental on the ground floor, in conjunction with cycle parking.
- c) the same or greater number of cycle parking spaces

2.2 To support a strategy to mitigate the impact of the redevelopment during construction works that includes:

- a) further consultation and liaison over the detailed plans and for the redevelopment with key stakeholders, including businesses in Bridge Street and the vicinity of Park Street car park
- b) continuing consultation and involvement through Cambridge BID
- c) regular project updates
- d) exploring ways to reduce the length of time of construction, including possible re-opening of the underground car park while work continues on the construction of the commercial and housing property above ground, and re-opening in time for the 2018 Christmas shopping period
- e) seeking possible provision of public use of the car park under Castle Court 7 days a week during the construction (as well as the weekend use of the Shire Hall car park), and a possible shuttle Bridge St bus service to and from Castle Court and Grafton East car parks.
- f) Liaison with the companies providing scheduled bus services to see if routes can be diverted via Bridge Street

2.3 to instruct the Head of Property Services in liaison with the Strategic Housing to:

- a) Explore the preferred mechanism to secure the redevelopment of the site to maximise the opportunities to provide affordable housing on the site within the constraints of financial viability, and to report back in the next committee cycle
- b) Explore the preferred housing schemes, to enable the council to decide whether to build the social housing itself or to sell it to a registered provider, and to report back in the next committee cycle.
- c) Explore the council developing the project itself, producing the social housing as outlined in the report but retaining and letting out the remaining housing.

On a show of hands this was unanimously agreed.

The amended recommendation was therefore put to the vote:

2.1 To support the redevelopment of Park Street car park to incorporate:

- a) A 250 space underground car park
- b) Above ground a mixed development of market, intermediate and social housing, including the option for commercial rental on the ground floor, in conjunction with cycle parking.
- c) the same or greater number of cycle parking spaces

2.2 To support a strategy to mitigate the impact of the redevelopment during construction works that includes:

- a) further consultation and liaison over the detailed plans and for the redevelopment with key stakeholders, including businesses in Bridge Street and the vicinity of Park Street car park
- b) continuing consultation and involvement through Cambridge BID
- c) regular project updates
- d) exploring ways to reduce the length of time of construction, including possible re-opening of the underground car park while work continues on the construction of the commercial and housing property above ground, and re-opening in time for the 2018 Christmas shopping period
- e) seeking possible provision of public use of the car park under Castle Court 7 days a week during the construction (as well as the weekend use of the Shire Hall car park), and a possible shuttle Bridge St bus service to and from Castle Court and Grafton East car parks.
- f) Liaison with the companies providing scheduled bus services to see if routes can be diverted via Bridge Street

2.3 to instruct the Head of Property Services in liaison with the Strategic Housing to:

- a) In addition to those above ground options described in the report, also evaluate a further option for a housing mix of 40% social and 60% intermediate housing (the latter funded from the council's general fund for investment return).
- b) In order to establish a realistic assessment of the capacity of the site for above ground development, request the Urban Design Team to prepare a full planning brief, analysing its context and constraints in order to enable development value to be optimised within the planning guidance.

- c) Explore the preferred mechanism to secure the redevelopment of the site to maximise the opportunities to provide affordable housing on the site within the constraints of financial viability, and to report back in the next committee cycle
- d) Explore the preferred housing schemes, to enable the council to decide whether to build the social housing itself or to sell it to a registered provider, and to report back in the next committee cycle.
- f) Explore the council developing the project itself, producing the social housing as outlined in the report but retaining and letting out the remaining housing.

The Scrutiny Committee considered the amended recommendations and endorsed them unanimously.

The Leader approved the amended recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/74/SR Fleet Maintenance

Matter for Decision

The report proposed an approach for the future vehicle maintenance and vehicle management for the City Council and for Shared Waste Service.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved the proposal to establish a fleet maintenance and management facility at Waterbeach.
- ii. Agreed the principles for the provision of fleet maintenance and management services to SCDC (Shared Waste Service) and delegated authority to negotiate and agree full terms to the Director of Environment and delegated authority to the Head of Property Services the power to complete a lease for 10 years with a 7 year break clause.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Corporate Project Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Welcomed the better management of services.
- ii. Questioned whether South Cambridgeshire District Council required their taxi's to be tested twice a year.

In response to Members' questions the Leader said the following:

- i. Confirmed was aware of the need to consult with the Taxi trade.
- ii. Confirmed that the issue of testing taxi vehicles twice a year could be raised with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/75/SR Future Location of Archive of City Council Decisions and Records**Matter for Decision**

The report proposed the move of the City Archives to the County's proposed new record office at Ely.

Decision of the Leader

Agreed to the City Council archives being moved to the County Council's proposed new record office at Ely, as part of the Cambridgeshire archives subject to the County Council confirming its plans to relocate the Cambridgeshire Archives there.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Corporate Strategy.

In response to the report the Committee commented that the building in Ely was ideal especially as the digitisation of the records by the County Council was to continue.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Corporate Strategy confirmed that the Cambridgeshire Collection was not part of this decision.

In response to Members' questions the Leader said the following:

- i. The City Council had been fortunate that the County Council had maintained the City's archives following the decision in 1975. Archiving was a profession and something which the City Council did not have expertise in. Thanks were given to the County Council for the archiving undertaken as it made a big difference to the protection of the City's history.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/76/SR Mill Road Depot Stores - Future Options**Matter for Decision**

The report summarised proposals for the re-location of the materials stores service from Mill Road Depot in preparation for plans to vacate and dispose of the site by 2017.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved the proposal to invite competitive tenders (market testing) for the possible future provision of a stores service by external providers.
- ii. Authorised the Director of Customer and Community Services to agree, following consultation with the Executive Councillor, the Director of Business Transformation, Chair, Spokes of the Committee, to new arrangements for a relocated Stores Service based upon the outcome of a full cost / quality comparison between a retained in-house service and the results of formal market testing.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Estates and Facilities.

Mr Kevin Roberts addressed the Committee and made the following points on behalf of GMB:

- i. A full value for money report should be undertaken but the timescales did not permit this.
- ii. The consideration of the new location should be done as part of the accommodation strategy.
- iii. Members of the GMB were concerned at the language used within the Committee report as it seemed to promote and look to outsourcing rather than looking at in-house options.
- iv. The number of changes to managers in the service had, allowed the service to become old fashioned.
- v. Wanted to make sure that there was a level playing field for GMB members.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

The outsourcing of this service was not a foregone conclusion, the City Council was looking for the best deal financially. The advantage of outsourcing a service was that other people took the risks whereas the advantage of retaining a service in house was the knowledge of staff.

In response to Members' questions the Leader said the following:

- i. If there were new ways of working internally this would be a comparator for an external provider.
- ii. The building maintenance department utilised the largest area of Mill Road Depot.
- iii. Whichever choice was made, the City Council was committed to the Building Maintenance Team.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/77/SR CCTV Shared Service Annual Report

Matter for Decision

The report summarised the progress of the shared service between Huntingdonshire District Council and the City Council for CCTV, considered the operational and financial performance and the key plans for the year ahead.

Decision of the Leader

Resolved to note the report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Specialist Services.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. The graph on p121 of the agenda pack showed the information the wrong way round.

- ii. It was also requested that in future reports, the graphs were broken down between Huntingdonshire and Cambridge City.
- iii. Questioned whether the deployment decision as listed in the report was correct as it stated the decision was taken in consultation with the Leader. It was understood that these decisions were not meant to be political and officers made the decision based on specific criteria.
- iv. CCTV cameras in East Chesterton had been deployed to great effect and had reduced levels of anti-social behaviour.

In response to Members' questions the Leader said the following:

- i. There had to be some active involvement from the Executive Councillor who was responsible for community safety in relation to CCTV cameras. Previously it was not clear who was accountable.
- ii. There had been no interference from the Leader in relation to the deployment of CCTV cameras and the Officers had followed the criteria for the deployment of CCTV cameras.
- iii. The sites for CCTV cameras cannot always be made publicly available as this would affect the ability to be able to detect crime.
- iv. A procedure to provide members with the new locations of CCTV cameras will be worked out.
- v. It was planned to replace CCTV cameras so that they were more light-weight and flexible.
- vi. Confirmed that suggestions where to site CCTV cameras usually came from the Police and Area Committees.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/78/SR Cultural Trust Project - Review of Implementation

Matter for Decision

The report detailed the post implementation review of the Cultural Trust project.

Decisions of the Leader

- i. Approved that the Transformation Programme Office report to the Members Working Group with findings from its Post Implementation Review.
- ii. Approved that the Transformation Programme Office implement lessons learnt from the Post Implementation Review to current and future projects.
- iii. Approved that future reports on Cambridge Live were made to the Executive Councillor for Communities; and the Community Services Scrutiny Committee
- iv. That the Members Working Group shared information with members of Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Transformation Programme Manager.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Commented that it was good news that a process had been put in place for lessons to be learnt from past experience and that progress reports would in future be delivered to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee.
- ii. Questioned whether the information that the Members Working Group discussed could be shared with the rest of the Committee members.

The following additional recommendation was proposed 2 (d) The Members Working Group shared information with members of Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

On a show of hands the additional recommendation was agreed unanimously.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Leader (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/79/SR Procurement of the Council's Electricity and Gas Supplies**Matter for Decision**

The report outlined the different options available to the Council to procure the Council's energy supplies from 2016.

Decisions of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed Option 5 for the City Council to enter into a "call-off" contract for the purchase of energy supplies under the terms of the Eastern Procurement Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) energy framework and delegate the final choice of tariff to the Director of Customer & Community Services, in consultation with the Executive Councillor and Head of Finance, with priority given to use of Green Energy Tariffs subject to costs being broadly comparable with alternative sources.
- ii. Agreed a contract period for the provision of electricity for four years with an option to review or change tariff each October, subject to prevailing market conditions and advice from ESPO at the time.
- iii. Agreed a contract period for the provision of gas for three years with an option to review or change tariff each October, subject to prevailing market conditions and advice from ESPO at the time.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Estates and Facilities. The Committee noted the revised recommendation sheet that had been circulated in advance of the meeting (which related to item ii and iii above).

The Committee made the following comment in response to the report:

- i. Questioned what the difference in cost was between green and non-green energy.

In response to the Members' question the Head of Estates and Facilities said the following:

- i. The difference in cost between green and non-green energy on current usage was approximately £2000.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the revised recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/80/SR Draft Climate Change Strategy 2016-2021

Councillor Hipkin left the Committee meeting before the vote was taken on this item.

Matter for Decision

The report presented a draft revised Climate Change Strategy for a five year period from April 2016 to March 2021.

Decisions of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed the draft climate change strategy attached to the report at Appendix A for public consultation.
- ii. Agreed the consultation approach set out in paragraph 3.12 of the report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

Dr Eva addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. There were obligations to reduce emissions as signatories to the Copenhagen Accord, the increase in global temperature should be below 2 degrees on the basis of equity therefore deep cuts in global emissions were required according to science.
- ii. The Council's Climate Change Strategy failed to lay out the scale of the dangers faced, ignored climate science, did not inspire citizens and failed to address issues of fairness.
- iii. Requested that the Council introduced a 10% reduction target per year for emissions into the Climate Change Policy.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Expressed concern at the change to the climate change objectives as they no longer seemed to seek high standards.
- ii. The Council could not promise to deliver a target figure for Cambridge when the Council did not have control over all the services provided in Cambridge.
- iii. Requested information on rainfall in relation to paragraph 2.5 of the officer's report.
- iv. Clarification was sought regarding paragraph 5.15 of the officer's report and what was meant by rapid charging infrastructure.
- v. Questioned whether the Executive Councillor would put a target on the first objective of the Policy.

In response to Members' questions the Strategy and Partnerships Manager said the following:

- i. The emission figures were provided by way of illustration.
- ii. The Cambridge emission figures showed the energy usage by domestic households, would need to check about emissions from people driving into the City with the Department for Energy and Climate Change.
- iii. Confirmed that the wording of the climate change objectives had changed but this did not mean that the Council was any less ambitious and the Council would still seek to set high standards.
- iv. Welcomed comments on the drafting of the document before the document went out to consultation.
- v. With regards to the commercial food waste collection service the Council ideally wanted businesses to reduce the food waste produced in the first place.
- vi. Confirmed that paragraph 5.15 of the report which referred to rapid charging infrastructure, was in relation to charging points for electric vehicles.

- vii. The Council had considered the use of photovoltaic solar panels on some of its buildings but following the Government's withdrawal of the feed in tariff subsidy was no longer able to pursue this.
- viii. A carbon management plan ran alongside the Climate Change Policy, this previously set a Council target of a 20% reduction over a 5 year period. There had been a number of issues in measuring energy usage data but now the Council had more reliable data. A revised Carbon Management Plan was due to come to Committee in January

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Cambridge was the fastest growing City in the region.
- ii. Noted the comments about imported carbon but the Council could not disconnect itself from people who travelled into the City.
- iii. Climate Energy, a company the City Council worked with for energy saving home improvements went into administration on 8 October 2015. The administrators were trying to find a buyer for the company. The Council would need to work with those individuals who were already having work done or had paid a deposit to ensure that these people had their work sorted out first.
- iv. Rainfall was covered within paragraph 2.3 of the officer's report.
- v. Congratulated the Strategy and Partnerships Manager for the work which had been undertaken on the draft Climate change Policy.
- vi. The Council had limited ability to influence beyond Cambridge.

The Committee resolved by 6 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/81/SR Temporary Agency Worker Provision from November 2015

Matter for Decision

The reported presented the recommended option for the future provision of temporary agency worker services with effect from November 2015.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

Delegated authority to the Head of Human Resources, following agreement by the Director of Business Transformation in consultation with the Executive Councillor, to procure a Managed Service Provider for the provision of temporary agency workers through the national Managed Services for Temporary Agency Resources (MSTAR2) framework with effect from 22 November 2015.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Human Resources.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/82/SR Treasury Management Half Yearly Update Report 2015/16 to 2018/19**Matter for Decision**

The Council adopted the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

The Code required as a minimum, receipt by Full Council of an Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement, which included the Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for the year ahead, a half year review report and an Annual Report (stewardship report) which covered activities in the previous year.

The half year report had been prepared in accordance with CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

To recommend the report to Council for approval which included the Council's estimated Prudential and Treasury Indicators 2015/16 to 2018/19.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance and s151 Officer.

The Committee made the following comment in response to the report:

- i. Sought clarification regarding paragraph 7.5 of the officer's report.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Finance and s151 Officer said the following:

- i. Rents were not paid over; reserves in the HRA fund would assist to fund any new build developments.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/83/SR General Fund: Mid Year Financial Review - October 2015

Matter for Decision

The report presented and recommended the budget strategy for the 2016/17 budget cycle and specific implications which were set out in the Mid-Year Financial Review document October 2015.

The report also recommended the approval of new capital items and changes to phasing and funding proposals of the Council's Capital plan.

Decisions of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed the budget strategy process and timetable for the 2016/17 budget cycle as outlined in Section 1 and Appendix A of the MFR document.
- ii. Agreed incorporation of the budget savings and pressures identified in Section 4 of the MFR document. This provided an indication of the net savings requirements, by year for the next 5 years and revised General Fund revenue, funding and reserves projections which was shown in Section 5 of the MFR document.
- iii. Noted the changes to the Capital Plan as set out in Section 6 of the MFR document and agree the new proposals.
- iv. Agreed changes to General Fund Reserve levels with the Prudent Minimum Balance being set at £5.13m and the target level at £6.16m as detailed in Section 7 of the MFR document.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance and s151 Officer.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Commented on p248-9 of the Officers report, and asked about the assumptions on staff turnover and whether these should be flexed upwards.
- ii. Queried the 2% assumption for inflation on p249 which had been retained, linked to the recurring £100,000 on p251.
- iii. Queried whether the table in the appendix on p271 could be expanded to include what the status of the item was.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Finance and the s151 Officer said the following:

- i. Referred to the employee turnover on p248, the assumption had been in existence for a while, it was a standard assumption which was used over the whole of the Council unless there were exceptional circumstances. No one had suggested the assumption was not valid.
- ii. Referring to the retained inflation rate of 2% on p249, this was the target that the Government and Bank of England were working to. Current inflation levels were well below this target so there is an opportunity for the Council to make a saving was taken. The saving reduced the base of the Council's expenditure and gave a recurring saving of £100,000 which would be spread over supplies and services.
- iii. Confirmed that the Projects under Development (PUD) list would in future include the status of items. Where s106 items were mentioned these had been through Area or Scrutiny Committee meetings as appropriate.

The Committee resolved by 6 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/84/SR Support for Inclusive Banking and Loan Services

Matter for Decision

The report discussed the proposed approach to further support and promote the services offered by Credit Unions in Cambridge.

Decisions of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed the two stage approach outlined in section 3.9a and 3.9b of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted the allocation of funding from the Shared Prosperity Fund to meet the costs outlined in paragraph 4a of the Officer's report. For the capital element of the project a full business case would be developed and presented to the Capital Programme Board for approval, delivery and inclusion on the Capital Plan.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Welcomed the project and expressed the hope that the project worked well.
- ii. Questioned whether there were any problems in recruiting volunteers.
- iii. Questioned how the Council's progress with the scheme would be measured.
- iv. Questioned whether there could be a pop up shop for the Credit Union service.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Communities, Arts and Recreation said the following:

- i. The Council was currently working with the Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service (CCVS) to recruit volunteers to assist with the project. The back stop position would be to employ people.
- ii. There was a target for 2000 new savers over a 3 year period. The Council would promote Credit Unions as a bank for everyone.
- iii. Confirmed that the Social Inclusion Officer would provide a pop up shop style service for the credit union.

In response to Members' questions the Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. Peterborough had 1000 people sign up to a credit union.
- ii. Emphasized that credit unions provided a useful purpose.
- iii. Described a jam jar account, which may be useful for some savers following the introduction of universal credit. In a 'jam jar' account, once money is paid into the account money gets siphoned off to pay for what the individual needs.
- iv. Credit Unions provide a very basic service which people take for granted.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

15/85/SR Staff Vacancies

Matter for Decision

The report analysed the underlying trends behind staff vacancies and expenditure for 2014/15.

Decisions of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources to note:

- i. The Council's staffing underspend information and trend analysis.
- ii. That the Senior Leadership Team will review the current list of temporary workers and vacancy list to determine whether to permanently recruit to these posts or to offer savings in time for the 2016/17 budget process.
- iii. That services are asked to review their agency worker budget for 2016/17.
- iv. That the Finance Department will review the wording used in Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee reports when referring to staffing underspends.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Human Resources.

The Committee made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Thanked the Head of Human Resources for the report.

- ii. It could be thought by members that there was a £2million underspend however when this information was looked at in conjunction with agency workers spend it could be seen that there was a £1million underspend.
- iii. Questioned whether reasons could be given with the S&R report outturn information, so that the information could be put into perspective, otherwise the only information that members had was the information in the tables. It was acknowledged that assistance would be required from services to provide this information.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Human Resources said the following:

- i. Confirmed that the Head of Finance was on board with the recommendations, that there was nothing absent from previous reports but it was acknowledged that better explanations could be provided.
- ii. Some roles were more difficult to recruit into than others. There was some flexibility where posts were appointed on pay bands at recruitment and also market supplements that could be offered.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted):

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIR