

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

3 July 2023
5.30 - 10.05 pm

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Baigent (Vice-Chair), Bennett, Bick, Gawthrop Wood, Holloway, Sheil, Young, Davey (Executive Councillor) and S. Smith (Executive Councillor)

Also present virtually: Councillor Anna Smith

Officers:

Chief Executive: Robert Pollock
Chief Operating Officer: Jane Wilson
Assistant Chief Executive: Andrew Limb
Chief Financial Officer: Caroline Ryba
Economic Development Manager: Jemma Little
Assistant Director, Assets and Property: Dave Princep
Committee Manager: Chris Connor
Producer: Gary Clift

Also present virtually:

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson
Director of Enterprise and Sustainable Development: Fiona Bryant
Director, City Services: James Elms
Deputy Head of Finance: Neil Krajewski
Head of Climate, Environment and Waste: Bode Esan
Waste Policy Officer: Dee Wood

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

23/85/SR Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

23/86/SR Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
------	------	----------

Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Gawthrope-Wood	23/94/SR	Personal: Had investments in Social Organisations.

23/87/SR Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23/88/SR Public Questions

There were no public questions.

23/89/SR To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Finance, Resources and Transformation

The decision was noted.

23/90/SR Approval of funding for the construction of Cherry Hinton Hub

The decision was noted.

23/91/SR The Leader to invite Cllr Anna Smith, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Board representative for Cambridge City Council and Deputy-Mayor for the CPCA, to provide an update on the work of the Combined Authority

Matter for Decision

The Officer presented a report to the Scrutiny Committee providing an update on the activities of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Board since the last meeting of the Scrutiny Committee on 27 March 2023.

Decision of the Leader of the Council

To note the update provided by the Council's representative on the Combined Authority Board, Councillor Anna Smith on the issues considered at the meeting of the Combined Authority Board held on 31 May 2023.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Council's representative on the Combined Authority Board provided a verbal report.

- i. There was a new Chief Executive, Rob Bridge.
- ii. CA (Combined Authority) ran an induction programme for all new and returning Committee Members.
- iii. At the CA March Board meeting a report was heard from Audit and Governance where the independent chair reported that there was increased confidence in CPCA (Cambridge & Peterborough Combined Authority) and improvements were noted.
- iv. Had to postpone the vote on the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. Hoping to discuss at the next board meeting in July.
- v. The Government had announced further devolution measures, this had been flagged to the Board. Would provide further details when they arose.

The Council's representative on the Combined Authority Board said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan vote was deferred at the last Board meeting because there were issues raised by the Leader of Peterborough City Council and it had not been possible to resolve these in advance of the Board meeting.
- ii. The Local Transport Plan currently in existence would stand until a new local transport plan was passed.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

23/92/SR Collection Changes - The Future of Waste Collections

Matter for Decision

- i. Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service (GCSWS) is responsible for collecting domestic waste from 131,000 households and commercial waste from more than 2,000 businesses across Greater Cambridge.
- ii. Due to growth in the number of households served, collection rounds have expanded at a significant rate since they were last reviewed in 2017 and are forecast to increase further, resulting in the need to review and optimise routes.
- iii. Reduction, reuse, and recycling are the top priority choices in UK government policy for waste. The Government has published a recycling target of 64% by 2035 in its Resources and Waste Strategy. This presents a challenge to Waste Collection Authorities due to the stagnation of recycling rates, and increased pressure because of impending legislation designed to increase recycling (see Appendix A). It is therefore essential that collection services are efficient prior to implementing these national changes.
- iv. Results from a route optimisation exercise conducted by GCSWS demonstrate that the Council has an opportunity to deliver efficiencies and improvements to collections, whilst accommodating the significant rates of past and future growth.
- v. The service has also taken the opportunity to explore the feasibility of delivering collections within a four-day week to understand the potential benefits to staff wellbeing, sickness levels, and recruitment and retention rates, as well as a more streamlined service for residents and a modest reduction in carbon emissions due to less overall travel times and bank holiday changes.
- vi. Appendix A sets out further information on the emerging policies affecting the UK waste industry and GCSWS contexts.

Decision of The Executive Councillor for Climate Action and Environment

- i. To note the round optimisation process and revised number of routes as set out at paragraph 33.
- ii. To note the impact that past and future growth and legislative changes will have on the collection service.
- iii. To approve the trial of a four-day week waste collection service for three months from September 2023 to be funded by existing operational budgets within the service, with a report on the outcome of the trial presented to Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee in the Autumn of 2023.
- iv. To note that South Cambridgeshire Cabinet approved a trial on 15 May 2023.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Head of Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service introduced the report.

The Head of Greater Cambridge Shared Waste Service said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Expected to see a drop in sickness rates due to an increase in officer overall well-being because of an extra day of rest for crews due to the 4 day week trial.
- ii. Expected a reduction in agency costs. At peak times last year, the service was using upwards of 30-40 agency staff. Currently there were 10-12. Feedback regarding that number was that people had been attracted to working there due to potential 4-day work week trial. This would be closely monitored and information would be reported back to the Committee on findings.

- iii. Did not expect to see the full impact to the service within the three month trial, however, would be able to see if there were any issues that arose during this time period.
- iv. Had no control over what workers did on their non-working day and whether they would take on extra work. However, pay scales had improved and hoped anyone taking on extra work would be limited. Any outside/additional work by staff had to be disclosed to the Human Resources team. This was strictly monitored to ensure that drivers and crews were not overworked.
- v. There were no capital costs if the trial did not succeed and officers would revert back to a 5-day work week.
- vi. If it was necessary to go back to a 5-day work week, there was a plan in place to do so.
- vii. 4-day work week routes had already been optimised.
- viii. During the first four weeks of the trial, while the drivers are learning the new routes, there would be backup capacity to ensure any missed bins would be collected.
- ix. Waste staff would work 30 plus 2 hours during the 4-day week trial. When working hours would be equalised with office-based staff was to be determined.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Action and Environment said the following in response to Members' questions.

- i. Thought the larger cost savings would be seen mostly via office-based staff it was important that all staff need to be treated equally.
- ii. The previously scheduled route optimisation and 4-day work week would be taking place at the same time. The advantage of this to the public was that there would only need to be a change once.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/93/SR Place Group Resource for Key Projects

Matter for Decision

The Place Group brings together leadership and management of the Councils corporate estate, property investments, responsibility for delivering new council, affordable homes and estate regeneration. The Place Group is tasked with delivering some key programmes and projects for the Council in addition to those currently undertaken including:

- i. Delivering the asset management plan to meet the Net Zero Carbon (NZC) and Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) objectives through a combination of retrofit, redevelopment and disposal
- ii. Rationalisation of the Council's office and civic accommodation through the Corporate Space Strategy
- iii. Refurbishment of the Market Square
- iv. General Fund Redevelopment Programme for commercial property

To achieve these, initial change to some roles and additional resource is required as set out in this report. Funding will be from General Fund Reserves initially but costs capitalised once capital plan items are brought forward and approved.

These projects will support improving sustainability, how we engage with and the services we provide to our customers and communities and generate new income streams and capital receipts.

The scale of the projects is as set out in 3.9 below and previous reports on these programmes and projects.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:

To recommend to Full Council approval of funding for additional resource as set out in Section 4 (a) 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 Assets & Property Assistant Director introduced the report.

The Assets & Property Assistant Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. These were high value schemes therefore salary levels were set at levels that Officers deemed to be appropriate to attract the right people for the roles being created.
- ii. There was extensive financial information in the background reports and the appendices which set out the various schemes and profit margins.
- iii. The office accommodation report set out expected costs, capital receipts and income from letting parts of the Guildhall or Mandela House.

The Leader of the Council said the following in response to Members' questions:

- iv. It was less about income and more about the ability to deliver what was promised at the October 2022 Strategy and Resources Committee which was to get the Guildhall up to standard, and to also look at Mandela House. Unless staff were in place would not be able to do the job properly. Therefore, it was very important to have new staff in place to get going on the project. This was one of the most major pieces of work that would be done at the Council in the coming 4 - 5 years.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/94/SR Social Impact Investment Fund or Organisation**Matter for Decision**

This report presents the case for the Council to support the establishment of Greater Cambridge Social Impact Investment Fund (working title; referred to as ‘the Fund’), an independent social impact investment fund to help address inequality in line with the Council’s “One Cambridge Fair for All” vision. The Fund will do this by investing in opportunities to improve the lives of our most vulnerable communities and achieving measurable improvements in homelessness & rough sleeping, social mobility, youth employment, and health and wellbeing.

Options for the Fund’s purpose and structure were considered in a feasibility study, drawing on the experience of other places, and by co-designing the proposed model with social impact experts, local charities and social enterprises, potential social investors, and philanthropists.

A Fund Development Board is now in place. It has the appropriate expertise and experience to support the development and establishment of the Fund, including advising on the appropriate legal and governance arrangements. An initial investment of £0.2m is requested from the General Fund reserve to provide the necessary resources to develop the Fund and to fundraise.

In principle approval is also sought for a further £0.8m, bringing the Council’s potential investment in the Fund’s development and financing to £1m. A £0.8m contribution should only be made on condition sufficient progress has been made to secure funding from other sources, in line with the ambition to establish a £6-15m social impact fund.

Progress on the development and fundraising for the Fund will be reported to the Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources by the Fund Development Board and will be brought back to the Strategy & Resources Committee to provide updates at key stages and in advance of any key decisions.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:

To recommend to Full Council:

- i. The allocation of £200,000 development funding to support the establishment of Greater Cambridge Social Impact Investment Fund (‘the Fund’) and enable fundraising over the next year.

- ii. To agree 'in principle' a further £800,000 contribution to the Fund once it is established, subject to progress made to secure funding commitments of £5m from other parties, and that officers will provide advice in relation to this decision at a later date.
- iii. To note that i) and ii) are one-off financial contributions from Reserves with the objective of leaving a lasting legacy from additional business rates collected due to the growth of the Cambridge economy.
- iv. To note that activity to establish the Fund will be overseen by a Fund Development Board; that the £200,000 development funding will be managed by the Economic Development Manager, Cambridge City Council in line with council policies; and that progress will be reported by the Fund Development Board on a regular basis to the Executive Cllr for Finance and Resources and will be brought back to the Strategy & Resources Committee to provide updates at key stages over the next year.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Economic Development Manager introduced the report.

The Economic Development Manager and the Chief Executive said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Working with Innovate Cambridge and Cambridge Innovation Capital about how the fund can provide a vehicle for tech investors to re-invest profits they make from the city.
- ii. Had discussions with Cambridge Ahead who had an Environmental Social Governance (ESG) group that had expressed support for the establishment of the fund. Including offers of pro-bono support around the fund itself.

- iii. The vision for the fund was to have a mix of different funders including institutional funders like Big Society Capital.
- iv. Not just about the public sector, it was about using public sector monies to leverage in opportunities that were not currently being taken advantage of.
- v. The role of Members is up for discussion and would be finalised and firmed up with the establishment of the fund.
- vi. Regarding the governance of the fund, part of the seed funding and the next phase of work would be to look at the legal structures and the governance of the fund itself.
- vii. Looking into various options and if the council agreed to be a full investor, it might expect to have a seat on the Board with other investors.
- viii. The pitch to funders was about the social return on investment they can gain through investment. There was also a financial return, however likely a smaller return than a commercial fund investment.
- ix. The funds vision was about putting investment into things that could provide ongoing returns on investment and become self-sustaining.
- x. There would be an investment committee to look at each instance on an individual basis. Would not wish to create a dependency from this fund.
- xi. The Board would be a development board. The actual governance of the fund would be something that needed to be worked out in the future.
- xii. This work had been taken as far as it could internally and now required someone to own it and lead conversations with corporates, philanthropists and other social investment funds.
- xiii. Had convened an investor discussion workshop and received positive responses. However, without more capacity and having someone who was a specialist to assist with developing the project, it was beyond Officers ability to get to the point to leverage in additional wealth from Cambridge.
- xiv. Large businesses in Cambridge recognised that unless they gave back to the local community in a visible and impactful way then their legitimacy was undermined. The Council's role was pivotal in getting the project off the ground, giving it direction and giving it a set of directives.

- xv. Funding would be needed for an Executive Director role. Initially they would most likely be employed by Cambridge City Council until the fund was off the ground.
- xvi. The fund would be an independent body/separate legal entity. Employees would be employed by the fund and not the Council.
- xvii. Board members would be giving their time on a pro-bono basis.
- xviii. Antony Ross OBE who lives in Cambridge is a renowned social investor for Bridges and was providing his time pro-bono to assist.
- xix. In response to advice from a Member that it may be more advantageous to register as a Community Interest Company or Charitable Incorporate Organisation rather than a company limited by guarantee the Economic Development Manager advised that she would take advice on board and make enquiries.
- xx. Had done a lot of research, spoken to social sector organisations and potential investors. There was demand for this project. Reputational risk was being managed by engagement with stakeholders and social sector organisations. As part of the governance arrangements there would be due diligence processes around the approval of projects.
- xxi. There were risks involved however Officers were gaining evidence to ensure that the project was successful.
- xxii. If everything went well would be in a position to start investing at the start of the 2024-25 financial year. The commitment was in the report, and Officers would bring back updates to Committee about timings regarding the Council's goals.
- xxiii. The Board was keen to develop a relationship with Members and would return to Committee with updates regularly. Would invite Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources to an upcoming meeting.
- xxiv. The initial £200,000 investment would provide capacity to develop the project.
- xxv. One of the biggest gifts the Council could give would be a capital investment.
- xxvi. Would come back to S&R Scrutiny Committee, timeframe would need to be discussed, perhaps in the Autumn. Private briefings were also a possibility.

- xxvii. Have had two all member briefings already about the project. The determination of the governance, legal structure, regulatory implications, and subsidy regime needed to be worked on still.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/95/SR 2022/23 General Fund Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances

Matter for Decision

This report presents, for all Portfolios:

- i. A summary of actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2022/23 (outturn position)
- ii. Revenue and capital budget variances with explanations
- iii. Specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2023/24.

The outturn report presented reflects the Executive Portfolios for which budgets were originally approved (which may have changed since, for example for any changes in Portfolio responsibilities).

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:

- i. To carry forward requests totalling £1,391,800 of revenue funding from 2022/23 to 2023/24, as detailed in Appendix C. These are carry forward requests in excess of £50k. Requests up to and including £50k which total £176,070 are approved via delegated authority to the Chief Financial Officer.

- ii. To approve additional budget in 2023/24 of £80k to the Climate Change Fund funded from reserves, as detailed in Paragraphs 3.6 to 3.8 below.
- iii. To approve the allocation of £200k from the General Fund reserve to establish Greater Cambridge Impact (GCI) as detailed in Paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 below.
- iv. To approve the allocation of £218k in 2023/24 from the General Fund reserve to fund the additional resource required to enable the delivery of key programmes and projects within the Place Group. The allocation required will increase to £267k in 2024/25 and £281k 2025/26 onwards as detailed in Paragraphs 3.11 below.
- v. To carry forward requests of £81,444,000 of capital resources from 2022/23 to 2023/24 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 Chief Finance Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. General policy was to move business rates growth into reserves. This was because there was always risk in relation to the amount of business rates growth that would be received. This had achieved a high level of reserves and had enabled the Council to look at reserves as a source of capital funding for the Place Group schemes, for example reserves could be used as capital schemes are brought forward for the modernisation and decarbonisation of the Guildhall, Market Square, and other significant projects. This meant that these projects could be carried out without having to borrow to do so.

- ii. While the Council held high levels of reserves at the moment, they would also be used going forward while going through the Transformation programme. The Council currently has a policy of maintaining £7 million in the General Fund reserve as a prudent minimum balance.
- iii. The Settlement Funding Assessment was funding from Government which came mainly from Business Rates. That figure was dependant on the allocation of funding from the Government. The expectation is that level will continue until the fair funding review is implemented. We are expecting this to be 2026-2027.
- iv. Appropriations from earmarked reserves included a variety of items, including grant funding. The final budget was in line with the outturn position, that is as planned. Therefore, the amounts would vary year on year depending on level of grants the Council received and the use of earmarked reserves.
- v. It had been difficult to get take up of Sustainable Warmth Grants. There had also been a lack of available contractors. There was a possibility that the grant money would need to be repaid to the Government for what was remaining in due course. There were Officers working in this area in hopes of minimising that.
- vi. A detailed report would need to be written reporting on how agile the Council had been regarding the Sustainable Warmth Grant. That report would need to be written by a different department, and likely go to a different committee, most likely Housing Scrutiny Committee.
- vii. Regarding variances in the budget, this was reviewed monthly. There was a quarterly report produced covering both revenue and capital. This report was presented to the Executive, the Leadership Team, and the Senior Management Team.
- viii. Regarding budgets, when the budget was set at the beginning of the year Officers avoided tweaking it too often because it then became difficult to understand the forces that were impacting the budget. Budgets were adjusted at budget setting time based on proposals put forward.

The Leader of the Council said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. When quarterly budgets were reported they were reviewed by the Executive who would raise any issues they may have at that time.

- ii. If there was to be interrogation over each individual item in the budget, when reviewing the budget setting process this was something that could be considered. The Leader stated he would speak to the Chief Executive about this after the meeting.

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

- i. Regarding Sustainable Warmth Grants, the Council had been in contact with BEIS about how the scheme was set up and eligibility, this had proved to be a barrier. Ministers had responded and extended these schemes. This scheme is managed by Cambridge City Council for all of Cambridgeshire. BEIS had extended the timeline in which the money could be used. This was now being focused on by Officers. There was a better supply chain in place, and it was being advertised better. It was important that the money was spent.

The Director of City Services said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Bereavement services had reduced income due to increased competition in the market and the local area. However, the service was still making a profit. There was currently work being done to see what the future of the service would be.
- ii. Regarding the new City Services directorate, would be looking into garage and crematorium services.

Committee Manager Note: Regarding Warm Home Grants

The rephasing of the grant fund is not for the full amount, but only applies to a much lower amount of the funding that has already been committed to jobs.

For clarity, all funding was due to be spent by March 2023. However DESNZ granted a "managed closure" extension which allowed us to carry over funding for jobs already in the pipeline, and where these jobs could be completed on site by end of April 2023 for off gas properties and end of September 2023 for on gas. The total spend and number of properties in this managed closure has already been signed off by DESNZ. We can not use this rephasing of the budget to bring in new jobs, only complete those in the pipeline. Therefore our

focus for this funding is to work with the contractors to get these final properties completed by the deadlines agreed.

Any new leads and engagement activity is being fed into alternative and new funding streams (i.e. ECO and HUG Phase 2)

We have already returned the majority of the identified underspend, and should currently just hold the equivalent of the estimated value of work to cover the manage closure (+20%). However I am not sure if this is return already made is reflected in the reports. Karen and Joanna Taylor were looking into it.

On this basis there is no scope to spend more of this particular funding, apart from ensuring all jobs in the pipeline are completed on time which we are managing on a daily basis.

Provided by Justin Smith, Environmental Projects Team Leader after the conclusion of the meeting.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/96/SR Annual Treasury Management Outturn Report 2022/23

Matter for Decision

The Council is 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 meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2021 (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2021 (the Prudential Code) in respect of 2022/23.

During 2022/23 the minimum requirements were that Council should receive:

- i. an annual strategy in advance of the year;

- ii. a mid-year treasury update report; and
- iii. an annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (this report).

In line with the above Codes of Practice, all treasury management reports are presented to both Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee and to full Council.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:

To recommend this report to Council, which includes the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2022/23.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

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

- i. Regarding the decarbonisation of the Treasury Deposit, Officer were discussing with Treasury Management advisors about their expertise. There was increasing information that was available. It was difficult to receive this information on a consistent basis. This was a developing area rather than a definitive way forward. Would keep the Committee advised going forward.
- ii. There were appropriate reasons to lend money to other Local Authorities. Would liaise with the Chief Financial Officer about a better way of communicating better to the public about loans being repaid.
- iii. In response to why the net revenue was a minus number, the Officer stated that this was because net financing costs were currently negative as income the Council received in respect of its investing activities exceeded the cost associated with the financing of capital expenditure

- iv. When the Council compared its commercial income to its net revenue stream, net commercial income was equal to 52% of the net revenue stream. This reflected the assets held by the Council which generated commercial income, including car parks and investment properties. The outturn percentage was higher than the budgeted figure as the net revenue stream was lower than originally budgeted in 2022/23.
- v. The 'Authorised Limit' of £450 million was based on a review of the capital programme and an assessment of what borrowing would be required to deliver the upcoming capital programme. The figure was subject to regular review.
- vi. The Operational boundary was determined based on a review of the capital programme and an assessment of what borrowing would be required to deliver the upcoming capital programme. The figure was subject to regular review. The difference with the authorised limit was that the operational boundary could be exceeded in extraordinary circumstances and usually for a short period of time only. The authorised limit cannot be exceeded.
- vii. The upper limit fixed variable splits the value of the interest receivable/payable on the Council's investments and borrowing according to whether the underlying instrument had a fixed or variable rate of interest

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/97/SR Provision of Temporary Agency Workers from December 2023

Matter for Decision

- i. Temporary agency workers are used to ensure service delivery including; covering short term demands, for specific projects, managing peaks and troughs of service volumes, for seasonal work, whilst

- undertaking service reviews, covering the recruitment period for a vacant post, maternity or sickness.
- ii. A large volume of temporary agency workers (around 200 in 2023) are engaged for a short period for the Folk Festival.
 - iii. The Council currently uses a national framework contract created specifically to enable ease of procurement of agency workers, MSTAR3. Under this contract one provider takes responsibility for delivering services on behalf of the Council, currently engaging 67 individual agency suppliers. The alternative would be for the council to manage contracts with individual agencies.
 - iv. It is anticipated that the Council will continue to need temporary agency cover on an ad hoc basis in order to ensure appropriate continuity in service delivery and the report presents a recommended option for the future provision of temporary agency worker services with effect from 20 December 2023.
 - v. The report seeks approval to procure the services of a temporary agency worker provider under the MSTAR4 framework contract with effect from 20 December 2023.

Decision of the Executive Councillor for Finance & Resources:

To delegate authority to the Head of Human Resources, following agreement by the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources, to procure a Managed Service Provider for the provision of temporary agency workers through the national Managed Services for Temporary Agency Resources (MSTAR4) framework, with effect from 20 December 2023.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Head of Human Resources introduced the report.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/98/SR City Operations

Matter for Decision

October 22 Strategy and Resources (S&R) committee agreed that officers would progress work to assess savings opportunities available by bringing together similar skills and activity into distinct functions. City Operations is the first programme mobilised to deliver this work for Cambridge City Council's operational services.

Decision of the Leader of the Council:

- i. To agree the City Services Director should proceed with consultation and implementation of a revised management structure.
- ii. To support the exploration and implementation for an alternative delivery model for stores, recognising the TUPE implications for staff in this area (detailed further in Appendix 3).
- iii. To support the progression of the following projects:
 - a. Alternative Delivery Model for Stores
 - b. Greater use of Digital and Data
 - c. Pilot the change of core operating hours in Estates and Facilities.
- iv. To recognise the pipeline of activity over the next 12-24 months to achieve a financially sustainable City Services group that provides lean, reliable, responsible services delivered by teams who have the skills and empowerment to get the job done.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Director of City Operations introduced the report.

The Director of City Operations said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. People working core hours would be pushed into out of hours working provision.
- ii. A third-party provider would take on the entire stores provision from the Council. Three staff members would move over to the third-party provider.
- iii. With approval of this item, management structure would then move into the organisational change policy and provided oversight from that.
- iv. As part of the bidding process, potential third-party providers would be advised of the potential of a Sustainable Travel Zone (STZ).
- v. Regarding redundancies, wouldn't have a total number until consultation process was complete.
- vi. Regarding potential future price rises in materials, third party providers would need to abide by a fixed price contract.
- vii. There would be a review of responsive repairs once the management structure was in place.
- viii. Next step would be to engage with tenants and Members to get a rounded view of the repair service.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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.

23/99/SR Annual Performance, "State of the City" and Customer Feedback Report 2022/23

Matter for Decision

This report invites the Executive Councillor to note the contents of the Annual Report against the Council's Corporate Plan, the Annual Complaints and Customer Feedback Report, and the State of the City report.

Decision of the Leader of the Council:

- i. To note the Annual Report against the Council's Corporate Plan and associated KPI table.
- ii. To note the Annual Complaints and Customer Feedback Report.
- iii. To note the 'State of the City' report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Assistant Chief Executive introduced the report.

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

- i. The condensation, damp and mould figures were up to date and covered the period of 2022-2023.
- ii. Regarding homelessness rates, were going back to pre-Covid levels.
- iii. The rise in direct emissions from Council assets and activities had risen due to activities since Covid lockdown.

The Committee unanimously endorsed 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 10.05 pm

CHAIR