

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 18 January 2016
5.00 - 9.30 pm

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

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

Director of Business Transformation: Ray Ward

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Revenue and Benefits: Alison Cole

Benefits Manager: Naomi Armstrong

Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

Head of Legal Services: Simon Pugh

Head of Specialist Services: Paul Necus

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Safer Communities Section Manager: Lynda Kilkelly

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/86/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Baigent and Councillor Abbott attended as the alternate.

16/87/SR Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

16/88/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of the 12 October 2015 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

16/89/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.

16/90/SR Record of Urgent Decisions taken by the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

5a Record of Urgent Decisions taken by the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: 130 Cowley Road

The decision was noted.

16/91/SR Review Of Use Of The Regulation Of Investigatory Powers Act

Matter for decision

The report presented a review of the City Council's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA).

Decision of the Leader

- i. Reviewed the Council's use of RIPA as set out in paragraph 5.1 of the Officers report.
- ii. Noted and endorsed the steps described in paragraph 7.1 and Appendix 1 of the Officer's report which ensured that surveillance was only authorised in accordance with RIPA.

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 Legal Services.

The Committee noted that the incorrect Executive Councillor had been referred to within paragraph 1.1 of the Officers report, the report should have referred to the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Legal Services confirmed that no changes were proposed to the policy and the City Council had not used investigatory powers regulated by RIPA since February 2010.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/92/SR Public Spaces Protection Order - Action to Control Touting.

Matter for decision

The report detailed a review of evidence of anti-social behaviour by punt and tour touts in the City and considered the proposal in principle to make a Public Spaces Protection Order.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved in principle the proposal to make a Public Spaces Protection Order in the form set out in Appendix A
- ii. Authorised Officers to publicise the proposed Order and to carry out the necessary consultation required under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.

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 Safer Communities Section Manager.

Ms Glasberg addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She was a resident of Newnham and was interested in the beauty of the City.
- ii. There was a clear problem with the number of touters but questioned whether a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) was the only answer.
- iii. If companies failed to obtain a licence to punt then this should be a matter for the Courts.
- iv. The proposed PSPO plan covered a large area which included important green spaces.
- v. Enforcement of a PSPO would require a lot of signage, which would need to be prominent. There was already a lot of street clutter and no review of signage had been undertaken.
- vi. The environmental impact assessment within the Officer's report stated that there would be a nil impact and this was incorrect as this was only based on carbon footprint.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The environmental impact assessment needed to include local as well as wider impacts.
- ii. A consultation exercise would be undertaken on the proposed PSPO.
- iii. The Order would address the issue of punt touts in the City Centre not the licensing of punts on the river. It was considered that intervention was necessary.
- iv. Held off proposals of a budgetary nature until the meeting tonight had taken place.
- v. If the PSPO was taken forward, signage would be required to inform people of the Order.
- vi. Existing signage was not clear for members of the public to access the river and this would be improved.

Mr Whyte addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. He was a member of the public who knew both sides and had lived in Cambridge all of his life.
- ii. The issue with punt touts was a seasonal issue.
- iii. Questioned if permits like those issued for buskers could be used, so for one strike get a warning and for a second strike lose the permit.

- iv. A balance needed to be reached, he did not want a total ban, this seemed heavy handed but control of the numbers of punt touts was acceptable.
- v. Punts run by Independent punt companies made up 6% of river usage.
- vi. Touting created student seasonal employment.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The points that had been made would be considered.
- ii. Issues regarding touting used to be on Bridge Street however the issue was now across the City centre.
- iii. It was a judgement whether the issue with touting was so serious that action needed to be taken.

Mr Kovacevick addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. Owned an Independent Punt Company.
- ii. Stated that his company may have to close down if the Council's plans came into fruition.
- iii. Questioned the maximum costs anticipated for enforcement and legal costs regarding challenges and signage.
- iv. Questioned who was accountable for the PSPO.
- v. Questioned why byelaws were not sufficient enforcement mechanisms.
- vi. Questioned whether the PSPO was the Council's only plan or if other further action was being considered.
- vii. Had applied for a licence since 2012 but had always been refused.
- viii. A PSPO was different to a byelaw, there was no evidence to support a PSPO.
- ix. Had tried to contact the Council to discuss the issue and questioned what efforts had been made to contact Independent Companies.

The Leader made the following points:

- i. As Leader the responsibility for the PSPO sat with him.
- ii. The issue with punt touts was changing the nature of the City centre.
- iii. A byelaw and PSPO were enforcement instruments which needed to be consulted on; people's views would be assessed and the proposals considered following a consultation.
- iv. There were other ways in which punt touts could operate, for example online.
- v. The river could be sign posted better from the City centre.

- vi. No one had tried to contact him regarding this issue. He was happy to meet Independent Operators.

Mr Searle addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- i. Was a Kings Parade Operator.
- ii. Questioned if consideration had been given to licensing Kings Parade operators.
- iii. Asked what thought had been given to those who will become unemployed if the proposals were approved.
- iv. If people are not allowed to sell tickets it will put people out of business.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The main issue was about anti-social behaviour and he was not commenting about punting on the river.
- ii. The proposal may challenge how people conduct their business, however all comments, including alternative proposals put forward as part of the consultation would be considered.
- iii. As an example 50 punt touts were counted on one day.

Mr Sugden addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- i. Was a Director of a Punt Operator based in Garret Hostel Lane.
- ii. Questioned the commercial interests of the Council.
- iii. Questioned whether the Council considered the act of punting unacceptable.
- iv. Stated if touting was banned in the City centre then all touting should be banned.
- v. Thanked the Leader for agreeing to meet with them.
- vi. Questioned what the definition of touting was and asked if touting in itself was considered to be anti-social.
- vii. Pushed for a collaborative way forward.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Commented that he was not proud of the City when tourists and the general public were accosted by punt touts.
- ii. Recognised that punting was of vital interest to the City.
- iii. The City Council owned La Mimosa punt station and had financial arrangements with Quayside. These interests were relatively minor.
- iv. 33 complaints were evidence of anti-social behaviour, the definition of touting would have to be carefully considered.

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

- i. Noted the revised PSPO plan which has been circulated in advance of the Committee meeting.
- ii. There was a long standing issue regarding touting behaviour.
- iii. Signage of the PSPO would be a major issue.
- iv. Questioned how the PSPO would address tout operators and intermediaries.
- v. Enforcement of the PSPO would be required and questioned where resources for this would come from.
- vi. Hoped stakeholders would be included in the consultation exercise.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Legal Services confirmed that the City Council did not have the power to introduce a licence system for punt touts.

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

- i. An open consultation would be conducted and any views on the issue would be welcome.
- ii. Committed to bring signage forward as part of a future report.
- iii. The City Council was not focussed on a particular operator, it was a wider issue.
- iv. The Police had confirmed their support to resolve the touting issue and enforcement would be undertaken jointly between the Police and the City Council.
- v. The consultation would be made available on the Council's website.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/93/SR Shared Finance Services**Matter for decision**

The report provided an update on the plans to create a shared finance service between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and sought further approval for further work.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Noted the success of the current interim arrangements to share the Head of Finance and other housing finance staff; and agreed to make these permanent to support the development of the shared service.
- ii. Supported further work to develop the finance shared service, as outlined in the report and noted that the final structure of the service would be determined after the implementation of the replacement financial management system.
- iii. Noted that a further report, which included a business case would be brought back to the Committee in due course.

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.

The Committee noted that there were substantial savings to be made through shared services.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/94/SR Corporate Plan 2016-19**Matter for decision**

The report presented the Corporate Plan which set out the strategic objectives for Cambridge City Council for the years 2016-19. This replaced the seven separate portfolios which had been used in previous years.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved the Corporate Plan 2016-19 subject to the section referring to transport and the City Deal being amended to broadly cover environmental, emissions and public realm issues and that Officers should circulate this amended version to members of the 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 Head of Corporate Strategy.

Ms Blythe addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. Questioned how the aspirations of the corporate plan could be developed so residents could actively support officers not only in protecting the green infrastructure and public realm but also identifying solutions to climate change.
- ii. Questioned whether a key performance indicator for City Deal schemes should include resident satisfaction.
- iii. The investing and improving transport section did not include environmental issues or public realm.
- iv. With reference to climate change, questioned whether there should be a key performance indicator which measured emissions which affects residents, children and schools.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Believed that one plan was better than separate portfolio plans so that the thread of the local plan and transport issues could run through the plan, the Joint Director of Planning would strengthen this role.
- ii. The City Deal would respond to City Deal queries.
- iii. The Council had a number of low emissions vehicles.
- iv. Air quality was a measurement of emissions and this was included within the Corporate Plan.
- v. The focus was not to end car journeys but during peak periods to reduce the number of cars and large vehicles coming into the ring road area.

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

- i. As the Corporate Plan was a 3 year programme questioned how much effort would be put into reviewing and checking it.
- ii. Questioned whether an additional performance indicator regarding transport, air quality and quality of life could be included.
- iii. Other Scrutiny Committees did not have the opportunity to scrutinise the plan and it should be debated at Council.

The Chief Executive advised that the Corporate Plan would be appended to the Budget Setting Report (BSR) for the Council meeting. The Head of Corporate Strategy advised the Committee that he had taken advice from the Head of Legal Services who had confirmed that the decision on the Corporate Plan was an Executive Decision

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

- i. It was envisaged that an annual report would be brought back to Committee and a significant review would be undertaken next year as the Council faced significant financial pressure.
- ii. Agreed that the section referring to transport and the City Deal within the Corporate Plan should be amended to broadly cover environmental, emissions and public realm and that Officers should circulate this amended version to members of the committee.

The Committee resolved by 8 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/95/SR Strategy and Transformation Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets**Matter for decision**

The report detailed the revenue and capital budget proposals for the Strategy and Transformation portfolio 2015/16 to 2019/20 and which were included in the Budget Setting Report.

Decision of the Leader**Review of Charges**

- i. Noted that none required formal approval within this portfolio (so no Appendix A).

Revenue

- ii. Considered the revenue budget proposals shown in Appendix B.

Capital

- iii. Considered the capital budget proposals shown in Appendix C.
- iv. Adjusted the capital funding for 2c (iii above).

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.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/96/SR Finance & Resources Portfolio Revenue and Capital Budgets

Matter for decision

The report detailed the revenue and capital budget proposals for the Finance and Resources portfolio 2015/16 to 2019/20 and which were included in the Budget Setting Report.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources**Review of Charges**

- i. Approved the proposed charges for the portfolio's service and facilities shown in Appendix A of the report.

Revenue

- ii. Considered the revenue budget proposals shown in Appendix B.

Capital

- iii. Considered the capital budget proposals shown in Appendix C.
- iv. Adjusted the capital funding for 2c (iii above).

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.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/97/SR Carbon Management Plan 2016-2021**Matter for decision**

The report detailed the Council's new Carbon Management Plan which provided the blueprint for reducing energy and fuel consumption and carbon

emissions across the Council's estate and activities over the next five years (between 2016/17 and 2020/21).

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the new Carbon Management Plan and tasked officers to deliver the carbon reduction projects set out in the plan subject to an amendment within the first sentence of paragraph 6.7 of the Carbon Management Plan so that it reads: We anticipate that overall the Council could reduce its carbon emissions by around 15% from 2014/15 levels with an aspirational target figure of 20% by the end of 2020/21.

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.

Mr Eva addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. Welcomed the Officer's report.
- ii. At the COP21 Paris Climate Change conference, the target for reducing average global temperature increases to 1.5°C was agreed, we were already at an increase of 1°C, therefore we either need to do twice as much to reduce temperature increases or take action twice as fast.
- iii. Cambridge aspired to be a zero carbon city by 2030.
- iv. The City Council should aim for a 10% reduction of emissions per annum.
- v. Unless drastic action was taken now then there would not be the same community/city in the future.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. Referred to p71 and paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 of the Officer's report which stated that the Council was not currently aware of further economically viable technologies which would allow the Council to reduce its emissions by more than 15%.
- ii. He did not want to promise to deliver a reduction in emissions which the Council would not be able to deliver.

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

- i. Welcomed the report and was glad to see that carbon management remained an on-going focus at the Council.
- ii. Having a target reduction was important, so that lessons could be learnt through achieving or not achieving the target.
- iii. The Officer's report stated that like for like equipment would be purchased however this could not always be the case as the same equipment may not be available.
- iv. Questioned how the carbon management process would work when the Council shared its services with other authorities.
- v. Debated whether the Council should aspire to achieve a 15% or 20% reduction in its emissions.

Councillor Cantrill proposed that the Council should reduce its carbon emissions by 20%.

On a show of hands this amendment was lost 3 votes to 6 votes.

An amendment within the first sentence of paragraph 6.7 of the Carbon Management Plan was proposed so that it reads (additional text underlined):

We anticipate that overall the Council could reduce its carbon emissions by around 15% from 2014/15 levels with an aspirational target figure of 20% by the end of 2020/21.

On a show of hands the amendment was endorsed unanimously.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/98/SR Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2016/17

Matter for decision

The report provided the Committee with details of the review of the Council's 2015-16 scheme and proposals for the continuation of the agreed current scheme rules for the financial year 2016-17.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed to continue to administer the Cambridge City Council – Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2013 (Persons who are not Pensioners) as approved by Council on 19 January 2015.
- ii. Agreed to invoke the Council's right under paragraph 42(2) of the scheme to set the applicable amounts in Schedule 1 in line with the annual uprating of applicable amounts, which would shortly be laid by Parliament as an amending statutory instrument to the Regulations;
- iii. Agreed to invoke the Council's right under paragraph 48(10) of the scheme to prescribe the amounts of non-dependant deductions annually and to increase the amounts set in sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) by 1.5% as shown in Appendix 1.
- iv. Agreed to retain the Family Premium in the schemes Applicable Amount and review for 2017-18;
- v. Agreed to retain the End of Calculation Deduction as set out in paragraph 49A of the scheme as "zero" per cent;
- vi. Agreed to continue with the current position regarding discounts for empty dwellings and second homes.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

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

The Committee received a report from the Head of Revenues and Benefits.

The Committee welcomed the strategy as it supported those who were disadvantaged and who were more likely to be adversely affected.

The Executive Councillor referred the Committee to paragraph 7.6 of the Officers report which highlighted that whilst the power to set the scheme rested

with the City Council, the financial impact was shared with precepting authorities.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/99/SR Universal Credit Delivery Partnership Agreement

Matter for decision

The report considered the Delivery Partnership Agreement with the Department of Work & Pensions which was needed for the provision of services required as a consequence of the roll-out of Universal Credit.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Authorised the Chief Executive to enter into these arrangements provided she was satisfied that the full terms of the agreement were acceptable.

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 Revenues and Benefits.

The Head of Revenues and Benefits confirmed that the Council's digital inclusion strategy targets support towards people who do not have access to a computer.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/100/SR Ethical Investment Report**Matter for decision**

The report summarised the issues around developing an ethical investment policy for inclusion in the Treasury Management Strategy and proposed wording for such a policy.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the insertion of the following in the Council's 2015/16 Treasury Management Strategy

“Cambridge City Council notes the risks to both the planet and Cambridge from climate change and the need to show leadership in advocating a fossil-free future, including its investments. Where consistent with our fiduciary responsibilities the Council will avoid direct investment in institutions with material links to environmentally harmful activities including fossil fuels.

Cambridge city Council, in making investments through its treasury management function, full supports the ethos of socially responsible investments. We will actively seek to communicate this support to those institutions we invest in as well as those we are considering investing by:

- Encouraging those institutions to adopt and publicise policies on socially responsible investments.
- Requesting those institutions to apply those deposits in a socially responsible manner.

Counterparties will be advised of this statement”.

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 who made the following comments:

- i. The Council invested in building societies.
- ii. There was guidance that the Council had to comply with in relation to investments which included the security, liquidity and yield of the investment.
- iii. It would be difficult to measure ethical considerations.

The Committee discussed what a socially irresponsible investment might be and discussed, as an example, Shell in Nigeria.

In response to Members questions the Head of Finance confirmed the following:

- i. The Council did not invest in equity or corporate bonds.
- ii. Regarding the investments discussed by the Committee, for example Shell in Nigeria, there would be financial arguments for the Council not investing rather than ethical reasons.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/101/SR Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement**Matter for decision**

The Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003, to produce an Annual Treasury Management Strategy Report. The officer's report complied with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (revised 2011). The Code required as a minimum, receipt by full council of an Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement – including the Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy – for the year ahead, a half-year review report and an Annual Report (stewardship report) covering activities in the previous year.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources to recommend to Council:

- i. The Annual Borrowing Statement at paragraph 4, the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy at paragraph 5 and the Council's Annual Investment Strategy as contained within paragraphs 8 & 9.
- ii. An amendment to the counterparty list to include Enhanced Cash Funds. A limit of £5m is recommended and has been updated within Appendix A as follows

Name	Recommended Limit (£)
Enhanced Cash Funds (Standard & Poor's: AAA/S1, Fitch: AAA/V1)	5m (in each fund)

- iii. Changes to the estimated Prudential & Treasury Indicators for 2015/16 to 2018/19 inclusive as set out in Appendix C.
- iv. That the following counterparty limits are required to come into effect on 1 April 2016 until further notice:-
 - Reduce HSBC's counterparty limit by £5m to £20m; and
 - Increase Barclays Bank plc counterparty limit by £5m to £25m.

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 reference was made to the additional recommendation circulated prior to Committee in relation to the Council's Banking Contract which was awarded to Barclays Bank with effect from 1 April 2016. The incumbent providers are HSBC. The new banking contract was engrossed by the Head of Legal Services on 13th January 2016.

As a result an additional recommendation (additional text underlined) to the Council's counterparty limits was required as follows:

The Executive Councillor is asked to recommend to Council that the following counterparty limits are required to come into effect on 1 April 2016 until further notice:-

- Reduce HSBC's counterparty limit by £5m to £20m; and

- Increase Barclays Bank plc counterparty limit by £5m to £25m.

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

- i. Questioned whether the credit ratings of the companies who tendered for the banking contract were taken into consideration as part of the procurement process for the bank contract.
- ii. In relation to enhanced cash funds, questioned what the risk was relative to other instruments.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the procurement process was there for a reason to ensure that inappropriate considerations were not taken into account as part of the evaluation process of the submitted bids.

The Head of Finance responded that the enhanced cash funds were variable asset value funds, the capital asset value was variable and designed for the public sector market. Officer's were conscious of the requirement for the funds to retain their value. The Council could not use investments for finance which would be needed in the short-term. Officer's were recommending the best rated funds.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations which included the additional recommendation.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/102/SR Office Accommodation Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report detailed an Office Accommodation Strategy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources.

- i. Approved Officer's recommendations.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee resolved to exclude members of the public for this item from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/103/SR General Fund Development Programme**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report detailed the General Fund Development Programme.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources.

- i. Approved Officer's recommendations.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee resolved to exclude members of the public for this item from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/104/SR Budget Setting Report 2016/17**Matter for decision**

The Budget-Setting Report (BSR) provided an overview of the review of the key assumptions. It included the detailed revenue bids and savings and set out the key parameters for the detailed recommendations and budget finalisation

to be considered at the meeting of The Executive on 21 January 2016. The Executive would make final budget recommendations to Council, for consideration at its meeting on 25 February 2016.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

General Fund Revenue Budgets [Section 5, p28 refers]

- i. Agreed any recommendations for submission to the Executive in respect of
 - Revenue Pressures shown in Appendix B(a) and Savings shown in Appendix b(b).
 - Bids to be funded from External or Earmarked Funds as shown in Appendix B(c).
 - Non Cash Limit items as shown in Appendix B(d).
- ii. Recommended to Council formally confirming delegation to the Chief Financial Officer (Head of Finance) of the calculation and determination of the Council Tax taxbase (including submission of the National Non-Domestic Rates Forecast Form, NNDR1, for each financial year) as set out in Appendix A(a).
- iii. Recommended to Council the level of Council Tax for 2016/17 as set out in Section 4 [page 25 refers].

Note that the Cambridgeshire Police and Crime Panel will meet on the 3 February 2016 to consider the precept proposed by the Police and Crime Commissioner, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Fire Authority will meet on 11 February 2016 and Cambridgeshire County Council will meet on 16 February 2016 to consider the amounts in precepts to be issued to the City Council for the year 2016/17.

Other Revenue

- iv. Recommended to Council delegation to the Head of Finance authority to finalise changes relating to any corporate and/or departmental restructuring and any reallocation of support service and central costs, in accordance with the CIPFA Service Reporting Code of Practice for Local Authorities (SeRCOP).
- v. Recommended to Council approval of the new remit for the “Invest for Income Earmarked Reserve” [page 22 refers].
- vi. Recommended to Council approval of the new remit for the “Office accommodation strategy fund” [page 25 refers]

Capital [Section 7, page 33 refers]

- vii. Recommended to Council the proposals outlined in Appendix D(a) for inclusion in the Capital Plan, or put on the Projects Under Development List, including any additional use of revenue resources required.
- viii. Recommended to Council the revised Capital Plan for the General Fund as set out in Appendix D(c), the Funding as set out in Section 7, page 37 and noted the Projects Under Development list set out in Appendix D(d).

General Fund Reserves

- ix. Noted the impact of revenue and capital budgets approvals and approved the resulting level of reserves to be used to support the budget proposals as set out in the table [Section 8, page 40 refers].

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 who highlighted a typographical error on p106 (Appendix F) of the Officer's report in relation to B3821 – Bid to keep Cambridge's streetlights on in partnership with the County Council, the bid offer should read £45,500 and not £45,550

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

16/105/SR Future of Park Street Car Park**Matter for decision**

The report addressed the specific requests for further work into the Park Street Car Park development made by the Leader in respect of tenure mix, preferred development option, opportunities to provide housing that is affordable and

whether to build the Affordable Housing itself or to sell it to a Registered Provider.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Noted the impact of different tenure mixes on financial return for the Council and that a final scheme for the redevelopment of the Park Street Car Park will be brought back to the Strategy and Resources Committee recommending a tenure mix, budget and development option.
- ii. Noted that the final scheme will have received prior scrutiny from the Council's Capital Programme Board and will be the subject of a Planning and Development Brief agreed with the Council's planning section.
- iii. Following this interim update, further recommendations and analysis will be brought forward in further reports, integrating proposals for
 - The development and funding model for Park Street, including projected costs, capital and revenue projections and budget.
 - The redevelopment content and the design for the new car park, housing, secure cycle parking and other elements
 - Detailed proposals for affordable housing and wider housing delivery, in line with decisions made to date.
 - The parking and transport mitigation strategy during the development period.
 - The delivery timetable and communication plan for the project including updates for the public dialogue with traders and organisations in the Bridge Street area before and during the project.

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 Strategic Housing and Head of Specialist Services.

The Chair proposed an additional recommendation (c) (additional text underlined)

Following this interim update, further recommendations and analysis will be brought forward in further reports, integrating proposals for

1. The development and funding model for Park Street, including projected costs, capital and revenue projections and budget.
2. The redevelopment content and the design for the new car park, housing, secure cycle parking and other elements
3. Detailed proposals for affordable housing and wider housing delivery, in line with decisions made to date.
4. The parking and transport mitigation strategy during the development period.
5. The delivery timetable and communication plan for the project including updates for the public dialogue with traders and organisations in the Bridge Street area before and during the project

On a show of hands the additional recommendation was unanimously agreed

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

Not applicable.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

CHAIR