

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 21 November 2024
5.30 - 8.05 pm

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Gawthrop Wood (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bennett, Bick, Young and Todd-Jones

Executive Councillors: Davey (Leader) and S. Smith (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Officers:

Chief Financial Officer, Corporate Group: Jody Etherington

Assistant Director (Development): Ben Binns

Customer Service Development Manager: Tony Stead

Committee Manager: Dan Kalley

Meeting Producer: Boris Herzog

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/29/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Sheil and Councillor Griffin attended as alternate. Councillor Todd-Jones provided apologies for lateness.

24/30/SR Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.
Councillor Davey	24/32/SR	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycling Campaign.

24/31/SR Minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2024

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/32/SR Public Questions

Question 1:

'What commitment can the Council make to delivering the full upgrade of the market square given that there is currently only money identified for the resurfacing. Proposals have come forward from CCC for over 30 years for renovations to the market square none of which have been forthcoming'.

Executive Councillor response for questions 1 and 3:

- i. Full Council approved the committing of funding to a further consultation in 2025.
- ii. In the autumn of 2025, a planning application was planned to be submitted to deliver the market square vision.
- iii. A business plan was due to be completed which would set out the costs of works beyond phase 1 (which was the market square re-surfacing works) and the options for funding phase 2.
- iv. The business plan would also set out the decant arrangements for the market and the package of support for the market traders. The Project Team would continue to engage with the market traders throughout the next stage of the project as the details were worked up.

Supplementary Question:

- i. What assurances could be given that lessons had been learnt from other local authorities who had gone through similar situations (examples given: Northampton and Peterborough) and that the Council would work with the market traders to deliver something which worked for everyone.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The Council carried out a public consultation and advised that the market traders were a significant proportion of people who responded to the consultation.
- ii. Advised that there was a separate Traders Liaison Group, which traders were welcome to attend.
- iii. The market proposals were being progressed and the size of the market was not proposed to be reduced. They did not know where that idea had come from.
- iv. The Council would consider lessons learned from other Local Authority's experiences.

Question 2:

While we understand the need for a plan to raise funding, we traders believe this vision plan will be setting the market project in stone. As it stands, this vision plan is not feasible on countless points, for example the footprint for the

permanent stalls needs to be far larger, (please see notes from trader's meeting on 11th Nov and traders subsequent 36 questions sent in to ccq team on 14th+15th Nov). This is showing a great lack of understanding of the everyday running of the market and business needs of the individual stalls. This vision plan will be informing the RIBA 2 design stage. As it is inadequate to meet the business needs of the traders, and therefore a successful market, please can you adjust this vision plan, firming it up with points grounded in reality, before going through to the next RIBA design stage.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Advised that nothing was set in stone, the project had reached the end of the concept stage which was RIBA Stage 2.
- ii. The Project Team noted feedback from the Market Traders arising from the meetings referred to. There would be an opportunity up until the end of the detailed Stage 3 work for feedback. There would be continuous engagement with the market traders monthly as they progressed through the detailed work.
- iii. Advised that the 36 questions which had been sent into the Project Team would be responded to as part of a 'frequently asked questions' document, which would be published on the Civic Quarter Project website as soon as practicable. Noted that some responses to the questions had been provided at a meeting held on the 18 November 2024.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Asked why there was a lack of practical detail within the project.
- ii. Had attended meetings with the Executive Councillor and the Project Team but did not believe the project would meet the Trader's needs.
- iii. Believed the proposal for 27 permanent stalls was shrinking the market and was a huge issue for Traders. Did not feel that this issue was being discussed satisfactorily at meetings.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The next stage of the project was where the fine details would be worked out.
- ii. Heard the speaker's view on the number of permanent stalls.

Question 3:

The papers for this decision only propose to commit to phase 1 of what appears to be an open-ended project, with phase 2 only being committed to once further funds become available.

What assurances have you been given that make you certain that funding will become available for phase 2?

And who is going to be held liable for compensating businesses which suffer loss of trade or even go out of business as a result of the work on phase 1?

Does the budget for this project include an emergency stipend for traders in the event their businesses become temporarily inoperable at times during the work?

Does the Council have liability insurance to cover compensation for interruption of business as a result of phase 1? If so can we please see the certificate?

The Executive Councillor responded to question 3 as part of the response to question 1 (see above).

Supplementary Question:

- i. Noted the Executive Councillor referred to a package for market traders in their response to question 1. Their question was about what compensation / insurance / liability there would be if the market proposals were not successful.
- ii. Asked what information could be given about the package of support for market traders whilst any redevelopment took place.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The next stage of the process was the preparation of a business plan. This would consider the decanting process for the market and the support package for market traders.

Question 4:

I read with great disappointment the proposals from the architects and consultants regarding the proposed alterations of The Guildhall - one of the series of proposals that feels at odds with what the ambition the Minister for Housing is proposing for a massively-expanded city.

Furthermore, it doesn't appear that the consultants involved read, let alone addressed any of the points I made in my submissions during the consultation processes even though they are on record stating that they would respond to these. (See blogpost at <https://cambridgetownowl.com/2024/01/04/can-the-development-of-the-civic-quarter-revamp-the-guildhall-in-time-for-florence-ada-keynes-mayoral-centenary/> for the specifics).

Did the consultants provide any estimates on the costs and the potential revenues for each of the concepts I came up with for the guildhall including:

- A rooftop cafe
- Separating the large assembly hall into two floors
- Adding two additional meeting rooms above the old court room and adjoining room
- Lifting the council chamber up to rooftop height and creating a new state-of-the-art corporate meeting theatre conferencing room in the void below?

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Advised that all of the submissions made by the speaker had been responded to.
- ii. The analysis undertaken by the commercial advisors indicated that the use of the fourth-floor space within the Guildhall would be better served by extending the office floorspace. Noted the proposed provision of café space on the ground floor.
- iii. A key aim of the Council was to increase the number of events held in the large and small halls, however believed splitting the large hall into two levels could limit the number of events which could be held.
- iv. The question around additional rooms above the old court room had been explored in detail and one of the key reasons why it was not proposed was because of structural implications, which would cause harm to the cultural heritage of the building and require high-cost expenditure.
- v. The cost of lifting the council chamber would also be significant in terms of cost and heritage implications. It was hoped that under the proposals the council chamber could be celebrated and improved to make it a multifunctional space.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Wanted to address comments to the Minister for Housing. The project was commenced under the previous Government. Felt the lack of space for Local Government functions in the new proposals was something they found frustrating.
- ii. Urged Councillors to tell the Minister for Housing that the proposals for Local Government functions did not fit in with the Minister's vision for the future Cambridge and the Minister needed to get their advisors and Civil Servants to come up with a better structure which matched the ambition he had for the expansion and growth of Cambridge.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Noted there were proposals to explore Unitary Council status.
- ii. In relation to the redevelopment of the Guildhall, the proposal was to retain the civic rooms and facilities and to have flexibility with office space to respond to the use required by the Council.
- iii. Noted that cultural spaces also needed to be brought forward alongside residential etc development. This was why the Corn Exchange and Market Square redevelopment proposals were proposed.

Question 5:

There is a minimum of 33 market traders that currently trade for 5 or more days on the market. These traders use 54 permanent pitches between them in the form of single, double and triple pitches. The concept design only proposes 27 permanent stalls, which leaves a shortfall of 27 pitches. Can you explain why this has not been taken into consideration?

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The concept design set out proposals for 91 market stalls in the square. The stall space for trading would be the same / slightly larger than at present. The concept design proposed 27 permanent stalls under the canopy and 64 demountable stalls.
- ii. If the proposals were taken forward, would work with Market Traders to identify suitable new stalls, permanent and demountable, which would be sturdy enough in all weather conditions. The designs would be stress tested and would work with market traders before a final decision is made.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Did not believe the Executive Councillor response was good enough. The numbers of stalls may work on paper but could not see how this could happen in practice. Advised that many of the Market Traders would be unable to operate from demountable stalls.
- ii. Understood that the stall sizes would remain the same, but 33 traders used 54 stalls. Most people used countertop layouts therefore the provision of 27 permanent stalls would lead to a large shortfall in trading space.
- iii. Nobody wanted to work from a demountable stall.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Had listened to the public speaker's comments, which would be a key issue for discussion and resolution.

Question 6:

The Civic Quarter design report states that the proposal will 'rationalise' cycle parking around the market. The emerging plans indicate that roughly half the current on-street cycle parking spaces in the area will be lost.

The report mentions the possibility that the spaces lost will be replaced by additional 250 spaces in an expanded Grand Arcade Cycle Park. While this expansion would be welcome, it would only raise the Cycle Park capacity to the number that was originally secured through planning when the Grand Arcade was built, but never delivered by the developer nor enforced by the city council as the planning authority.

The report acknowledges that demand for cycle parking in the Civic Quarter area is already high and that is before the changes to the Guildhall, Corn Exchange and Market Square which will increase its attractiveness as a destination. If the city council is serious about ensuring that as many of these visitors travel by sustainable transport as possible, it must adopt a more ambitious approach to cycle parking. This project should enable many more people to cycle, but in its current form, it achieves the opposite.

As many public questioners made clear in the Liaison Group meeting, spaces close to the market are vitally important, especially for those with mobility issues. Over half of respondents to the public consultation said they accessed the area by cycle. The Civic Quarter needs a comprehensive cycle parking strategy that significantly increases the overall cycle parking capacity in the area – including, but not limited to an increase in capacity in the Grand Arcade – and considers the creation of additional cycle hubs at key access points. Will the city council commit to significantly increasing the number of cycle parking spaces in the city centre by urgently developing a city centre parking strategy?

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Noted the availability of cycle parking spaces in the city centre was an important issue which would be considered as part of the next phase of the project in conjunction with CamCycle.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Asked what data gathering had been undertaken regarding the mode share of travel into the city centre as part of the project to help inform projections for the future. Most of the responses to the consultation survey advised that they cycled into the city centre.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. Detailed survey work needed to be undertaken and would be undertaken as part of the public realm proposals and consultation.

Question 7:

Over the past 6 to 8 years we have had consultation after consultation on the market square. Consistently the Council has ignored the views of the public, who have consistently voiced their concerns and opposition regarding the broad sweeping proposals that the council have been promulgating. Cambridge residents use and want to keep their market, and are not fooled by blandishments that it is an aim of the council to keep the 7 day a week market.

The Council has separated their 'stakeholder groups' from the market traders. We can only surmise that this is so that many Cambridge residents, without detailed knowledge of the market will be fooled by the Council stating that night is day.

But Cambridge residents can see that the market is being run down. Making it abundantly clear that proposals for the market square, being put forward by the Council, will destroy our market.

Even more worrying the Council has consistently ignored everything that the traders have told them, in consultation after consultation.

This current plan from the council to make a canopy that will only cover 27 permanent stalls makes a totally mockery of any claim from the council that their aim is for a vibrant 7 day a week market.

We need our council to give real and acted upon, consideration to the views, questions, issues and concerns raised by both Cambridge residents, as well as by the market traders.

We call for, and ask that the consultation planned for Spring 2025 will finally and actually do this.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The consultation over the summer had over 800 responses from the public and stakeholders including the market traders. The responses would be published.
- ii. Noted that market traders had raised security and anti-social behaviour as key issues during the consultation.
- iii. The design of the market reflected feedback from the consultation and Planning Officers.

- iv. Two stakeholder groups had been set up to coordinate the large number of stakeholders. There were a variety of interests and views.
- v. The Civic Quarter Liaison Group was open to all and covered the whole scope of the project i.e.: the Guildhall, Corn Exchange, market and public realm.
- vi. The Market Traders Group was by invitation to the market traders who had a licence issued by the council and focussed in more detail on the market operations and specific impacts for this group.
- vii. Had answered a public question earlier regarding the 27 permanent stalls and advised there would be no loss of trading space compared to present levels. There was further work to be undertaken which would feed into the consultation in the spring.

Question 8:

I ask the Committee not to accept recommendations 1,2, 1.4 and 1.5 in the Civic Quarter Update report. While supporting the Council's proposed financial commitment, and aspirations for the Guildhall and Corn Exchange, there are still major issues to be resolved, particularly in relation to the Market Square and the overall public realm, before proceeding to the detailed design stage.

The issues raised by both the Council's process and the content of the proposals are too wide-ranging and complex to be fairly covered within a 3-minute question, response, and 2-minute follow-up.

The proposals in their present form do not have a publicly-agreed brief. They lack key information particularly in relation to the Market Square and the public realm. These are essential considerations given the choices needing to be made between the many existing and proposed demands on limited spaces. Consequently, and contrary to the impression given in the report, the project has still not met RIBA stage 1 "agree a brief and establish that it can be accommodated on the site".

This being the case I ask you to:

- 1) amend recommendation 1.2, to holding a further public consultation in Spring 2025 on the brief for the project, prior to proceeding to detailed design.
- 2) amend recommendation 1.5 to publishing, prior to the above, details of the Council's vision for the Market, including balance of trade, how it plans to manage and promote the market, and how the Council plans to make the market more attractive to potential traders.

3) additionally, and concurrently with the publication of the vision for the Market, to publish, for public consultation, details of the Council's proposals for events in the Guildhall, Corn Exchange, Market Square and public realm. To include the space and time requirements of these events in terms of servicing, set up and take down.

Second part – to be included as follow-up of not within 3 minutes

Shockingly, Council officers have twice tried to exclude me (a market customer, Cambridge resident, and historic environment professional with decades' knowledge of the market) from Civic Quarter meetings organised for the traders. It was only at the insistence of the traders (at this most recent Council liaison meeting) that I have been he allowed to stay. This did enable me to hear both vital details of the proposals and traders' concerns that need to be publicly aired and discussed if solutions are to be found.

From the first stages of the Market Square project (6 to 8 years ago) the Council has taken a wholly misguided "divide and rule" approach. Identified stakeholders and public have been consulted separately, with no opportunity for developing mutual understanding of needs and concerns, or for cross-fertilisation of ideas.

This has been, and continues to be totally counterproductive, particularly so for the Civic Quarter where multiple users and interests have to be accommodated within limited space and time. Yet throughout the Market Square project, and now the Civic Quarter project, separate workshops have been held on individual topics. What is even more shocking is that feedback promised at these workshops was not provided prior to publication of the Consultation report.

Executive Councillor response:

- i. The Market Trader's Group was a closed group and was set up for traders only as they had a legal relationship with the Council. It was a space where Traders could raise issues and concerns about the project.
- ii. Noted that under Chair's discretion and with the agreement of the Market Traders that the public speaker had been allowed to attend the Market Trader's Group meetings.
- iii. Market Traders views had been published as part of the market engagement report.
- iv. The response to question 7 (above) set out that the Civic Quarter Group was open to anyone to participate in and that the Market Trader's Group had been set up specifically for market traders.

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

24/33/SR Combined Authority Update

Matter for Decision

The information report provided an update on the activities of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Board. Therefore, there was no decision to be made by the relevant Executive Councillor.

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 Councillor A Smith.

In response to Members' questions Councillor A Smith said the following:

- i. There were strict rules about how the Combined Authority could consult on the bus franchising consultation. Acknowledged the form wasn't easy to complete. Noted there was a summary regarding what the consultation was about and that there were two versions of the consultation which could be completed either a shorter or a longer version.
- ii. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Business Growth Company Limited was being wound up because it was set up to support a time limited project 'Growth works', which had concluded its business at the end of December 2023. The company potentially could have supported other projects, but these were being managed in-house by the Economy and Growth Team at the CPCA.
- iii. There were many ways in which the £10.6 million Government bus funding could be used. The CPCA had been required by auditors to set out how the CPCA could fund bus franchising itself, however this did not restrict the CPCA to have to fully fund bus franchising. The business case set out where other sources of funding could come from.

- iv. Noted that in future it might be useful to invite lead officers from the CPCA to attend future Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committees to discuss other areas of CPCA work.

The Chair thanked Cllr A Smith for their update report.

24/34/SR Annual Complaints Self-Assessment

Matter for Decision

The self-assessment process was a new statutory requirement. Its purpose was to check that the Council's complaints process is compliant with the Codes of Practice for the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman and the Housing Ombudsman.

Part of the new requirement was that the assessment is presented and then published on the Council website. This focused on the process the Council used and did not cover reporting on actual complaints received.

Going forward this self-assessment would be scrutinised alongside the Annual Customer Feedback Report so that information on both the process and on complaints and feedback received was presented at the same time.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved the self-assessment for publication

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

This was a statutory requirement therefore there were no alternative options to consider.

Scrutiny Considerations

Before the report was introduced the Chair confirmed that an addendum to the report was provided to members and published on the Council's website that clarified elements of the report, providing more context on the reason the report was being presented to committee.

The report was presented by the Customer Services Development Manager. It was explained to the committee that this was being presented due to a new statutory code from the Housing Ombudsman, introduced on the 1 April 2024, to monitor the Council's compliance with this new code. This needed to be

published on the Council's website on an annual basis, having been through members. This would be presented in future alongside the Annual Customer Feedback Report. It was essential that this was approved by the deadline of 29th November 2024 so that the Council stayed compliant with the code.

A smaller report relating to housing complaints would be presented to the Housing Scrutiny Committee.

Overall, on reviewing this new code with the Council's complaints processes it was deemed that the Council was largely compliant overall with some minor tweaks to the process being undertaken. Once the report was published the Council would be fully compliant with the new code.

The Customer Services Development Manager responded to questions from members:

- i. This new code applied to any authority that signed up to the Housing Ombudsman Service. The new code referred to Landlords, but this was wider and referred to the Council as a whole. The language would be updated going forward to make this clear.
- ii. Officers would look to make it clearer what was a service request against what was deemed a complaint against a service the Council provided. For example, when the Council had a request come in for the first time this was different from a request that the Council had already been made aware of and not actioned, the Council would then deem this as a complaint. For clarification the Council had adopted the recommendation from the Housing Ombudsman on what was a complaint.
- iii. The Council had a triage team that reviewed complaints as they were made and would recategorize these if they were a service request, or vice-versa.
- iv. Further information would be provided to members over what was classed as a service request.
- v. Training could be provided to members should they wish to receive this

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Leader of the Council approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader of the Council.

24/35/SR Treasury Management Half Yearly Update Report 24/25**Matter for Decision**

The Council has adopted The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management (Revised 2021).

The half-year report was prepared in accordance with the Code and covered:

- An economic update for the first half of the 2024/25 financial year.
- A review of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy.
- The Council's capital expenditure, as set out in the Capital Strategy, and prudential indicators.
- A review of the Council's investment portfolio for 2024/25.
- A review of the Council's borrowing strategy for 2024/25; and
- A review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2024/25.

Cash and investment balances at 30 September were £105 million. The balance was forecast to gradually reduce over the remainder of the year as existing balances were used to fund General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital expenditure.

Interest receipts for the year were projected at £6.6 million which was £3.1 million higher than the original budget. The variance was due mainly to sustained higher investment rates and higher cash balances being held for longer periods than expected.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. To recommend to Council the council's estimated Prudential and Treasury Indicators for 2024/25 to 2027/28 (Appendix A).
- ii. To note that no changes have been made to the counterparty list (Appendix B).

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 Finance Officer.

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

- i. The additional borrowing detailed on p113 of the agenda mainly related to the Housing Revenue Account programme and was dependent on whether the capital expenditure was incurred this year. It was anticipated that there may be some slippage if there were delays with redevelopment projects. The Council only borrowed funding when it needed to.
- ii. Liquidity instruments (referred to on p128 of the agenda) were treasury management investments used to manage day to day (short term) cashflow e.g. a deposit on demand / 3-day notice deposit.
- iii. The Council was limited in the progress it could make to decarbonise investments by the Statutory Investment Guidance that Local Authorities were required to follow and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code. Both of these statutory guidance documents required the Council gave priority to security of investments, then liquidity of investments, then yield and then environmental / social and governance (ESG) considerations.
- iv. The Council had a contract with Barclays Bank until 2026. A procurement exercise would be required to be undertaken before the end of the contract term for the services the contract delivered. The Finance Team were aware of the May 2024 motion referred to ([minute reference 24/55/CNL Agenda for Council on Thursday, 23rd May, 2024, 11.05 am - Cambridge Council](#)).
- v. Confirmed the figure contained within column GF / CFR 2027/28 in the table at paragraph 7.2 of the officer's report should be 106,185 and not 127,846. The correct figure had been used in Appendix A on page 120 of the agenda.

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.

24/36/SR Civic Quarter Project Update

Matter for Decision

The Council was looking at proposals for investment in the Guildhall, Market Square, Corn Exchange and public realm, making them fit for a fast growing global city in the 21st century society, which residents could be proud of.

This report outlined investment proposals that included:

- Making the council's heritage buildings net zero, and improve biodiversity and water efficiency across the site.
- Improving accessibility and creating a welcoming new civic heart open to the public.
- Consolidating office space in the city and creating a working environment that supports staff retention, collaboration and enhanced productivity.
- Creating space for a cultural attraction within the Guildhall.
- Saving the council money by reducing running costs and creating opportunities for additional income.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Recommends that Full Council note the indicative capital cost budget of £55m as set out in paragraph 8.3 of the Officer's report and approves an allocation of £3m from the existing Civic Quarter reserve for stage 3 design costs and associated on-costs.

And subject to Full Council agreement approves the recommendations below outlined in the report that includes, Concept Design Report, Public Engagement Report and the Commercial Report for the Civic Quarter including to:

- ii. Note the outcomes from the first Public Consultation that took place to shape the outcomes of the Concept Designs and in response adds to the Market Square Design Principles that alongside other objectives which should bring a beneficial impact on the market itself, the project should support a substantial reduction of anti-social behaviour in the square and the achievement of an attractive public space outside of market hours.
- iii. Approve to proceed to the next stage of design with a planning submission in late summer 2025 for the Guildhall, Corn Exchange, Market Square and the associated public realm, carrying out a second public consultation in Spring 2025
- iv. Approve the allocation of a capital budget of £55m as set out in paragraph 8.3 of the Officer's report and delegated authority to the Council's Section 151 Officer to apply the agreed capital financing to the project in the most cost effective way.
- v. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer and Executive Councillor for Finance, and Resources to carry out a procurement process for the appointment of a contractor by Spring 2025
- vi. Approve the Civic Quarter Project team to work closely with the Corporate team, Market Operations team, Cultural Services team and

Market traders to develop a business plan by Spring 2025 which would include:

- a. Completion of the Terms and Conditions and the balance of trade work on the Market ahead of the proposed second public consultation for the Civic Quarter in Spring 2025.
 - b. An assessment of the revenue impact of decanting the Guildhall, Market and Corn Exchange.
 - c. A business plan for the operation of the future Guildhall, Market and Corn Exchange.
- vii. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer and Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources for the future use of Mandela House subject to review by Property Services.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

See Officer's report.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Assistant Director (Development).

Members noted the additional information which had been published following the agenda publication. This included:

- i. Revised Executive Councillor recommendations as follows

It is recommended that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources:

- 1.1 Recommends that Full Council notes the indicative capital cost budget of £55m as set out in paragraph 8.3 of the officer's report and approves an allocation of £3m from the existing Civic Quarter reserve for stage 3 design costs and associated on-costs.

And subject to Full Council agreement approves the recommendations below outlined in the report that includes, Concept Design Report, Public Engagement Report and the Commercial Report for the Civic Quarter including to:

- 1.2 Note the outcomes from the first Public Consultation that took place to shape the outcomes of the Concept Designs.

- 1.3 Approve to proceed to the next stage of design with a planning submission in late summer 2025 for the Guildhall, Corn Exchange, Market Square and the associated public realm, carrying out a second public consultation in Spring 2025
 - 1.4 Grant delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer to carry out a procurement process for the appointment of a contractor by Spring 2025
 - 1.5 Approve the Civic Quarter Project team to work closely with the Corporate team, Market Operations team, Cultural Services team and Market traders to develop a business plan by Spring 2025 which includes:
 - 1.5.1 Completion of the Terms and Conditions and the balance of trade work on the Market ahead of the proposed second public consultation for the Civic Quarter in Spring 2025
 - 1.5.2 An assessment of the revenue impact of decanting the Guildhall, Market and Corn Exchange
 - 1.5.3 A business plan for the operation of the future Guildhall, Market and Corn Exchange
 - 1.6 Note the review by the Property Team of property assets including Mandela House to generate a capital receipt to contribute towards the Civic Quarter project.
- ii. Amendments to paragraphs within the Officer's report as follows:
- Paragraphs 2.5.2 and 8.2.6
It is recommended that £4.5m is allocated as phase 1 to enable completion of a full roof replacement at the Corn Exchange, and this will be tabled for approval at Full Council in Autumn 2025. Approval of further funding beyond the initial £4.5m will remain subject to the agreement of the business plan. Any immediate emergency repairs required will be brought forward for approval as an out of cycle decision.
 - Paragraphs 2.6.2. and 8.2.4
It is recommended that an initial capital investment of £3m is allocated as phase 1 to enable the re-surfacing works of the Market Square, and this will be tabled for approval at Full Council in Autumn 2025. Approval of further funding beyond the initial £3m will remain subject to the agreement of the business plan.
 - Paragraphs 2.8.1 and 8.3
The overall estimated costs for the completion of the Guildhall and phase 1 of the Market Square and phase 1 of the Corn Exchange remain the same at £55m. With the updated recommendations, the estimate for design costs and associated on costs for RIBA Stage 3 is £3m (£2.5m design and survey fees plus £0.5m on costs). Approval is sought for this £3m at this stage. An updated cost estimate for design and associated

on costs beyond RIBA Stage 3 will be tabled for approval in Autumn 2025

- Paragraphs 2.8.2 and 8.9.1
Addition of the following milestones:
Full Council 28 November 2024
Full Council September 2025

The Assistant Director (Development) and Chief Finance Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. External finance / funding was easier to obtain when planning permission was in place. Could not confirm where the funding for the redevelopment would come from at this stage. This would be explored as part of the next phase of the project.
- ii. Noted concerns raised regarding the impact on market traders if the redevelopment work was undertaken in two phases. The current proposals were looking at what work could be done off-site to reduce the impacts on traders and to explore if the works could be done in one phase.
- iii. The confidential commercial report had a 5-year plan for the market. This showed a small increase in income through more efficient use of market stalls. The Council was aware of the concerns regarding business continuity for Market Traders resulting from the redevelopment proposals. Support packages for Market Traders would be looked at as part of the next phase of work when discussions could take place between officers and the contractor about the development proposals.
- iv. There was a confidential business plan for the Corn Exchange included within the agenda, which detailed costs and predicted revenue and indicated an increase in income because of the design changes. The next stage of the project would scrutinise these figures and explore if the figures could be improved.
- v. The urgent repairs to the Corn Exchange's roof were estimated to cost £180,000. Approval for this funding was proposed to be taken via an out of cycle decision.
- vi. The capital cost for the refurbishment of the Guildhall was estimated to be £41 million. It was estimated that the technical design costs would be £500,000-£750,000. With a capital project, costs were usually split between build costs, design costs and on-costs.
- vii. The report set out where the business plan needed further work. The report also set out where costs were excluded; and an example was decanting costs. Advised at RIBA 2 stage it was unusual to have certainty regarding costs, this would follow at the build / contract stage.

- viii. An allocation for the estimated capital costs for the Guildhall refurbishment had been included within the report.
- ix. The proposal in the report was to explore appropriate options regarding Mandela House for example refurbishment / lease / sale.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources and the Leader said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Currently the project had approval for a conceptual design. Approval was being sought at the next Full Council meeting to develop the proposals in more detail to RIBA stage 3 to submit a planning application. It is intended to return to Committee in Autumn 2025 for a decision on the final designs and business plan.

Councillor Bick proposed an amendment to the amended recommendation 1.2 (additional text underlined):

- 1.2 Note the outcomes from the first Public Consultation that took place to shape the outcomes of the Concept Designs and in response adds to the Market Square Design Principles that alongside other objectives which should bring a beneficial impact on the market itself, the project should support a substantial reduction of anti-social behaviour in the square and the achievement of an attractive public space outside of market hours.

On a show of hands, the Committee unanimously supported the amendment to recommendation 1.2. The Executive Councillor also accepted the amendment to recommendation 1.2.

Councillor Bennett proposed an amendment to recommendation 1.1 that the recommendation set out the detail of the costs contained within paragraph 8.3 of the officer's report rather than the recommendation referring to paragraph 8.3 of the officer's report. The amendment was not seconded and therefore the amendment fell and was not voted on.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 1 to endorse the amended 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 8.05 pm

CHAIR