

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 July 2019
5.00 - 8.50 pm

Present: Councillors Davey (Chair), Bick, Dalzell, Green and Davies

Executive Councillors: Herbert (Executive Councillor for Strategy and External Partnerships) and Robertson (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson
Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway
Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb
Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré
Benefits Manager: Naomi Armstrong
Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba
Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep
Head of Shared Internal Audit: Jonathan Tully
Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

19/28/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Todd-Jones. Councillor Davies was present as the alternate.

19/29/SR Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made.

19/30/SR Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February, 25 March, 22 May 2018 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

19/31/SR Public Questions

A representative from GMB Union made the following comments in relation to the Building Cleaning contact (agenda item 11):

- i. Expressed concern that there was no internal bid for the Building Cleaning contract.
- ii. They had carried out a survey which showed that staff were not happy and felt poorly treated, no training had been offered to staff. Asked what the council were doing to monitor staff training to make sure that staff morale was kept up.
- iii. Asked for confirmation that the council would pay no less than £10 per hour and stated that this should be included within the tender specification.
- iv. Asked why the cost of labour and overheads would be higher for the council to deliver the service than competitors.
- v. Commented that if the council did not go out to tender then it could use the money saved in procurement costs to bring the service back in-house.
- vi. Would like to see this service brought back in-house.
- vii. Asked the committee to consider an in-house bid and keep all options open and to include the requirement to pay staff £10 per hour.

The Strategic Director said the following:

- i. Regarding the poor treatment of workers under the building cleaning contract; the council needed to be interested but responsibility for the workers lay with the contractor.
- ii. It was important that the council monitored the contract effectively.
- iii. The procurement regulations prevented the council submitting an in-house bid for the building cleaning contract.
- iv. The new Head of Transformation role was not appropriate to manage the day to day business of the building cleaning contract.
- v. Bringing Cambridge Live in-house was a different matter; the council intervened to protect services to the public as these were at risk of being lost.
- vi. If the council delivered the building cleaning services itself, the increased costs would need to be off-set somewhere else. Specialist cleaning equipment would need to be purchased as the council does not own this and was provided by the current contractor.

The Head of Environmental Services clarified that the saving on the building cleaning contract of £180,000 was over the 4 year period of the contract and was not a saving of £180,000 for each year of the contract.

A representative from Unison made the following comments:

- i. Was concerned about the treatment of staff who undertook the building cleaning contract. There was poor morale amongst staff, this showed in the quality of service provided, she would continue to monitor and would report back on this.
- ii. Felt the building cleaning contract could be brought back in-house and this was why the contract costs were being challenged.
- iii. Morally there should be a requirement within the building cleaning contract specification to pay staff a minimum of £10 / hour and contractors should be required to do this too.

The Strategic Director said the following:

- i. Under the 2015 procurement regulations the council itself could not bid for the contract.

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.

19/32/SR Annual Report 2018/19 on the Corporate Plan

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out progress made during 2018/19 on implementing the objectives set out in the Corporate Plan 2016-19.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Strategy and External Partnerships

- i. Noted the achievements during third year of the Corporate Plan 2016 to 2019 and agreed the annual report be published.
- ii. Agreed to the annual report being reported alongside the annual complaints report, to one committee in future years.

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.

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

- i. Commented that the report was drafted from the glass half full perspective and the report needed to contain more information. For example Appendix A on p49 of the agenda referred to the requirement to provide 40% affordable housing. The delivery of 40% affordable housing was expected from all developers and not just the council when it was developing a site. Commented that the 'Dual Diagnosis Team' had ceased to exist. Referred to recycling rates (on p68 of the agenda) which were over 50% and questioned if this was the City Council's recycling rate or whether it was a joint recycling rate with South Cambs District Council (SCDC) as SCDC tended to have a better recycling rate. Commented that it would be better to have a rolling average to compare the recent figures with.
- ii. Referred to p67 of the agenda and the investment in solar panels.

The Head of Corporate Strategy said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. He would liaise with the Planning Service to find out whether all developers delivered 40% affordable housing on development sites.
- ii. It had been a couple of years since the shared waste service had been operating so recycling rates for SCDC and City had been combined for some time.
- iii. He would liaise with the Head of Environmental Services regarding the queries relating to Streets and Open Spaces.

The Chief Executive referred members to p66 and p76 of the agenda which contained information about the Council's own emissions.

The Strategic Director confirmed that further funding has been identified by the Council and hoped that the service would be up and running again soon.

The Benefits Manager stated that the council had moved away from council tax benefit to a council tax reduction scheme following the introduction of universal credit.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/33/SR Combined Authority Update

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided an update on the activities of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority since the 25 March Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Strategy and External Partnerships

- i. Noted the update provided on issues considered at the meetings of the Combined Authority held on the 27 March and 29 May and 26 June 2019.

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 Chief Executive.

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

- i. Referred to p95 of the agenda, which noted that the non- statutory spatial framework had been withdrawn. Asked whether this would impact on the City Council's Local Plan process.
- ii. Referred to p97 of the agenda and queried whether the work being done on skills by the Combined Authority was the same as that done by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP).
- iii. Expressed their view that the City Council did not need to be part of a Combined Authority to bid for Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF).
- iv. Expressed concern regarding the speed and progress of Combined Authority projects. From March 2019 a significant number of projects

that the Combined Authority was involved with were still at an early stage.

- v. Commented that the Combined Authority had spent a lot of money on consultants and that limited progress appeared to have been made 'on the ground'.

The Executive Councillor said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Understood that the non-statutory spatial framework was due to go back to the Combined Authority Board in September. This was not a binding document. The Combined Authority needed to be clearer what its ambitions were regarding housing.
- ii. Work undertaken by the Combined Authority on skills was a wider skills strategy, they were putting more funding into further education. Their growth company was going to bid for a further £2 million funding. The GCP tended to focus more on apprenticeships.
- iii. Commented that if members looked in detail at large HIF bids, only a Combined Authority were allowed to bid for this level of funding. ie: over £100 million. The City Council would not have been able to bid for that level of funding had it not been part of a Combined Authority.
- iv. The Combined Authority had big ambitions; some delays were as a result of the amount of time that Central Government was spending on Brexit. There was no dialogue regarding Cambridge South train station, this was meant to be completed by 2025 but Central Government and Network Rail were silent. Cambridge needed the Cambridge South train station and proof could be given by the success of Cambridge North train station.
- v. To be effective in securing funding, the Combined Authority still needs to do much more work on prioritising projects.

The Committee noted the update.

The Executive Councillor noted the update.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/34/SR 2018/19 General Fund Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - S&EP

Matter for Decision

The report gave a summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2018/19 (outturn position). The report outlined the revenue and capital budget variances with explanations. It outlined specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2019/20.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Strategy and External Partnerships

- i. Agreed to carry forward requests totalling £651,630 revenue funding from 2018/19 to 2019/20, as detailed in **Appendix C**
- ii. Agreed to carry forward requests of £437k capital resources from 2018/19 to 2019/20 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in **Appendix D**.

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 made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. Noted that savings were budgeted for but that these weren't quite achieved.
- ii. Questioned what stopped savings being made as part of the support services review.

The Head of Finance said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Savings were expected to be made on support services through contracts and procurements; some savings were delivered but unfortunately they were not able to achieve as many savings as had been budgeted for.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/35/SR 3Cs Shared Service annual reports - ICT, Legal and Internal Audit**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report summarised the performance for the 3Cs ICT, Legal Shared Services and the Greater Cambridge Shared Internal Audit Service during 2018/19.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Noted the content of the report.
- ii. Agreed to bring a report to the next Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee regarding proposals for the joint scrutiny of shared services

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 Strategic Director.

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

- i. Asked whether there were plans to reapply for the Lexcel accreditation for the Legal Service.
- ii. Asked about the weakness of customer feedback for Legal Services and what percentage of staff responded to the request for feedback.
- iii. Referred to p121 of the agenda and two significant ICT service disruptions and queried whether the correct key performance indicators (KPIs) were in place.
- iv. Noted across the shared services that there were issues with recruitment.
- v. Noted that the Legal Services had made savings of £200,000 and commented that the service had been doing well in difficult times.

The Head of Legal Practice said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Legal Services were unable to apply for the Lexcel accreditation because there was a requirement for separate systems that the service was unable to achieve. It was however a good exercise to undertake to check their standards against.

- ii. Legal Services had a 30% client satisfaction survey return rate. As part of the intelligent client process he wanted to encourage more officers to provide feedback on the service regardless of whether this was good or bad.
- iii. Acknowledged that there was an issue with recruitment, but that this wasn't limited to the council. He was working with the Head of HR to try and make jobs as attractive as we could.

The Head of ICT said the following in response to members' questions:

- i. Although there had been outages these were not significant in the overall delivery of the service.
- ii. The Council Anywhere project was underway and there were no specific KPIs for this project. Acknowledged that this project had encountered delays but the project was being carefully managed by officers.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. He was trying to get the shared services reports standardised.
- ii. Asked for reports to provide information on savings for each council for future reports.
- iii. Acknowledged that the service outages did mean that staff were not able to work effectively for several days.

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)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/36/SR Review of Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Discounts

Matter for Decision

The officer's report outlined proposals for a consultation process for the review of the local Council Tax Reductions Scheme.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed outline proposals and consultation process for the review of the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme

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 Benefits Manager.

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

- i. Noted the challenges faced by the service with the roll out of Universal Credit.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/37/SR Annual Treasury Management (Outturn) Report 2018/19**Matter for Decision**

The Council was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003, to produce an annual treasury report reviewing treasury management activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for each financial year.

This report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code) in respect of 2018/19. Both these publications have been revised by CIPFA and references to these documents are to the 2017 Editions.

During the 2018/19 the minimum requirements were that Council should receive:

- An annual strategy in advance of the year
- A mid-year treasury update report and;
- An annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy.

In line with the Code of Practice on Treasury Management all treasury management reports have been presented to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee and to Full Council.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Recommended to Council to approve the report which included the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2018/19.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance.

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

- i. Queried whether the New Homes Grant was included within the figure contained on p145 of the agenda.

The Head of Finance said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The New Homes Grant was revenue but there was the ability to use it for capital.

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)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/38/SR Building Cleaning Contract Procurement**Matter for Decision**

The existing building cleaning contract is due to expire June 2020, the Executive Councillor's approval was sought to re-procure the service.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Asked Officers to develop proposals for the new contract on the feasibility of paying at least £10 / hour to contracted staff; to ensure that the evaluation of the current contract is used to inform the specification

for the new contract; and to prepare a stringent contract monitoring plan for Year One of the next contract

- ii. Approved the re-procurement of the Building Cleaning contract, subject to best value considerations.
- iii. Delegated to the Head of Environmental Services authority to take decisions to determine the specification, evaluate tenders and award one or more contracts for cleaning in consultation with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokes.

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 Environmental Services.

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

- i. Expressed sympathy with the comments made by the unions during the public question slot. Having read the report could not see why the recommendation could not be approved and the Executive Councillor asked to do some further investigation, the main issue seemed to be management. Commented that with a 0.6 FTE (full time equivalent) post and 5 client managers there should be sufficient capacity to manage the contract in house. An in-house bid should be permitted.
- ii. Questioned if the capacity pressure changed as the tender had been split into 5 different lots.
- iii. Expressed concerns regarding a desire to sub-contract to make savings as there was no requirement to require sub-contractors to pay £10/hour to staff.
- iv. Commented that the previous contract was able to have an in-house bid because people were employed by the council as this service was currently contracted out, an in-house bid could not be submitted.

The Strategic Director and Head of Environmental Services' said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Under the 2015 procurement regulations the council itself could not bid for the contract.

- ii. Commented that significantly more resource would be required to manage the building cleaning contract if it was undertaken in house than 0.6 FTE.
- iii. The different lots had been proposed because the cleaning contract was specialist work and might enable more people to be able to submit a bid. The current contractor sub-contracted parts of the cleaning contract due to the specialist nature of the work.
- iv. The current procurement policy required the council to pay the real living wage, if they changed the requirement for this contract it could have a dramatic effect on other contracts which would be coming up for re-procurement in the coming years.
- v. Had the ability to make an assessment if the service was in –house whilst the procurement proceeds but this came with risks. The issue was to do with capacity to do the work and how this would fit into the management structure of the council, 4 years after the service was contracted out. Staff would be on different terms and conditions and it would take time to harmonise these. Performance Management would also require managerial time.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. He wanted to make sure that the contract was monitored properly.
- ii. When the contract was let in 2015, the existing contractor came on good references but did not live up to these immediately. Strict contract management needed to be in place.

The Executive Councillor proposed an additional recommendation to become new (i) to:

- i. Ask Officers to develop proposals for the new contract on the feasibility of paying at least £10 / hour to contracted staff; to ensure that the evaluation of the current contract is used to inform the specification for the new contract; and to prepare a stringent contract monitoring plan for Year One of the next contract.

On a show of hands the Committee unanimously approved the amendment.

The Committee approved the recommendations:

- Unanimously to endorse recommendation i
- Unanimously to endorse recommendation ii
- By 3 votes to 2 to endorse recommendation iii.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/39/SR Insurance Services Contract

Matter for Decision

The existing Insurance Services contract is due to expire 31 March 2020, the Executive Councillor's approval was sought to re-tender the service in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Authorised officers to undertake the re-tendering and award of the Council's Insurance Service contract for an initial 3 years to 31 March 2023 with the Council's option to extend the contract for a further period up to 2 years to 31 March 2025, subject to the preferred tender price being with 10% or less of the approved budget and if necessary to seek the approval of the Strategic Director to any additional expenditure.
- ii. Authorised officers to review the Local Government Mutual offering to establish if this is a viable alternative to the traditional insurance arrangements, the review will also include the Local Government procurement arrangements as the Local Government Mutual will not participate in a formal tender exercise.

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 unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/40/SR 2018/19 General Fund Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Finance and Resources**Matter for Decision**

The report presented a summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2018/19 (outturn position). The report gave an overview of the revenue and capital budget variances with explanations and outlined specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2019/20.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved carry forward requests totaling £85,080 revenue funding from 2018/19 to 2019/20 as detailed in Appendix C of the officer's report.
- ii. Approved carry forward requests of £3,116k capital resources from 2018/19 to 2019/20 to fund rephased net capital spending as detailed in Appendix D of the officer's 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 Finance.

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

- i. Referred to the £50k payment an ICT creditor on p186 of the agenda.
- ii. Acknowledged the savings which had been made by the Legal Services Department.
- iii. Queried whether the Property Department was under budgeting for income and being overly prudent which meant that services were proposed to be cut when they didn't need to be.

The Head of Finance said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Confirmed that no payment was due to the council from the ICT contract.

- ii. Budgeting for property income was not straight forward due to rent reviews and some rents that depend on the turnover of the tenant. An experienced Accountant works with the Head of Property Services to review the property portfolio annually to calculate budgets.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/41/SR 2018/19 General Fund (Overview) Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances

Matter for Decision

The report presented a summary of the 2018/19 outturn position (actual income and expenditure) for all portfolios, compared to the final budget for the year. The position for revenue and capital was reported and variances from budgets were highlighted. Explanations had been reported to individual Executive Councillors / Scrutiny Committees and were reproduced here.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i) Recommended to Council to carry forward requests totalling £923,000k revenue funding from 2018/19 to 2019/20, as detailed in Appendix C of the officers report.
- ii) Recommended to Council to carry forward requests of £14,539k capital resources from 2018/19 to 2019/20 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D of the officers 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 Finance. The Officer updated her report:

- i. Referred to p225 of the agenda and stated that the Mill Road cemetery access and main footpath rephasing should show a carry forward of £20,000 which had been omitted.
- ii. Referred to p194 of the agenda and the carry forward request contained in recommendation 2.b, this should read: Carry forward requests of £14,539k ~~£14,519k~~ capital resources from 2018/19 to 2019/20 to fund rephased net capital spending, as detailed in Appendix D of the officers report.
- iii. Referred to p195 of the agenda and the variance and increased use of General fund Reserves figure, this should read £1214k and not £1956k.

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

- i. Queried the Bereavement Service's loss in income and what the service's future plans were.
- ii. Commented that green burial sites were getting more popular and perhaps the council should look into this.
- iii. Referred to Appendix D to the report and the number of significant carry forwards on capital, this year it was £14 million and last year it was £10 million. Queried whether there was an issue on project delivery and whether the growing backlog meant there was no capacity to deliver projects.
- iv. Referred to p223 of the agenda and the vehicle replacement programme.

The Head of Finance said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Work on the A14 had led to a decline in demand for the crematorium service. This should recover when the road re-opened. The City Council expected some compensation from Highways England.
- ii. Income levels may not recover fully to pre-A14 work levels due to competition from another crematorium in the area.
- iii. The City Council Crematorium should benefit from A14 road works in the long term as it would be in a better location.
- iv. With regards to the query about rephasing, items are rephrased for a number of reasons, including those outside the control of the council. There were relatively few underspends which were released back into revenue.
- v. Treasury Management Capital loans were those due to be given to Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) and a local bond to Allia, this was where large rephasing on financial transactions had taken place.
- vi. The Head of Commercial Services was undertaking a review of the Council's fleet vehicles.

The Chief Executive commented that the Bereavement Service was looking at income generating options, for example potential investment in a café at the crematorium. The service would also look at developing their marketing practices and relationships that they had with funeral directors.

The Executive Councillor commented that most of the capital carry forwards were loans and bonds associated with the Cambridge Investment Partnership (CIP) and Allia.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/42/SR Property Review

The Officer's report set out a proposal entitled Property Review.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the officer's recommendation

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Scrutiny Committee resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to exclude members of the public 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

The Committee resolved (by 2 votes to 2 and on the Chair's casting vote) to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

19/43/SR Park Street

The Chair ruled that under 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 the late item from the Strategic Director be considered despite not being made publicly available for this committee five clear days prior to the meeting.

The Officer's report set out a proposal entitled Park Street.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the officer's recommendation

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Scrutiny Committee resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to exclude members of the public 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

The Committee resolved (by 3 votes to 0) to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

CHAIR