



To: Executive Councillor for Customer Services and  
Resources: Councillor Julie Smith

Report by: David Horspool, Director of Resources

Relevant scrutiny committee: Strategy & Resources 20/1/2014

Wards affected: All Wards

## DRAFT

### THE FUTURE DELIVERY OF BUILDING CLEANING SERVICES

#### Key Decision

#### 1. Executive summary

The future delivery of building cleaning services is being reviewed. At present most of the service is delivered by an in-house team with some small elements provided by commercial suppliers.

Consideration is being given to all options for the delivery of the service including hard market testing. If the Council agrees to carry out a procurement process, it is important that this will attract a competitive market and also achieve best value.

In order to understand more about the commercial building cleaning market, its attitude to how services might be delivered, the apportionment of risk and other factors that could contribute to the shape of any future procurement a 'Request for Information' (RFI) – commonly known as soft market testing - process has been undertaken.

This report outlines key information from the analysis of submissions to the RFI request together with a recommended way forward relating to future provision of the service.

#### 2. Recommendations

The Executive Councillor is recommended:

2.1 To approve the carrying out and completion of a procurement exercise for Building Cleaning Services on the following basis

- A contract term of five years (with a provision to terminate at the end of year 3 if performance is inadequate) with an option to extend by up to two further years, if the contractor is performing satisfactorily and the service can be shown to continue to provide best value to the Council, giving a maximum possible contract length of 7 years
  - A three lot structure with bidders being given the opportunity to bid for one, two or three 'Lots', with a discount on the tender price if two or three 'Lots' are won by the same bidder to provide a balance between giving opportunities for SMEs to bid and achieving best value from the contract
  - A fixed price for the first two years of the term and thereafter index-linked to an appropriate index
  - A price/quality split of 50% price/50% quality
  - Incorporation in the contract of incentive scheme to drive continuous improvement in the delivery of the service.
- 2.2 To approve giving the Director of Business Transformation authority to take delegated decisions in consultation with Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokes as required during the procurement process, including the items detailed in e) to i) of paragraph 4.1.
- 2.3 To make an in principle decision about whether or not the contract should include a condition requiring that the Living Wage is to be paid to staff delivering cleaning services to the Council subject to the outcome of the further work referred to in para 4.2.12 below.
- 2.4 To note an anticipated service start date of January 2015. Achieving this date depends on sufficient project resources being made available

### 3. Background

- 3.1 At its meeting on the 16 January 2012, the Strategy and Resources Committee considered a report from the Director of Environment entitled 'Procurement of Building Cleaning and Associated Services'. The Executive Councillor resolved to:
- (a) Approve the hard market testing of Building Cleaning and Associated Services through procurement.
  - (b) Support Option 1 (*tender for services on a City only basis*), as included in the officer's report, as the preferred method of procurement
  - (c) Take delegated decisions as required during the procurement process after minimum quality requirements had been discussed between the Executive Councillor and the Opposition Spokes.
  - (d) Approve a price/ quality split of 50% cost / 50% quality.
- 3.2 A Project Team including officers from Procurement, Legal, Human Resources, Internal Audit, Streets and Open Spaces and various service managers was formed to provide oversight and direction. ESPO were appointed to assist in the procurement process. Specifications are in the process of being finalised that will form the core of the procurement process for the following areas of cleaning:

- Administrative and Operational Buildings
- Communal areas of City Homes housing stock
- Multi Storey Car Parks
- Public Toilets
- Sheltered Housing Accommodation Schemes

3.3 The current in-house service involves 33 directly employed staff (30.26 FTE) within the Streets & Open Spaces Building Cleaning team, with an additional 11 agency staff. Some activities are currently provided by contractors. Any market testing exercise will involve the need to identify the number of staff deemed to be affected and their eligibility under the TUPE regulations.

Following a review of the procurement project to date, it was agreed in early September 2013 that it would be appropriate to carry out a soft market testing exercise to better understand the current views of the market in a number of key areas. In particular the team were keen to find out more about the market's views on how services might be packaged (as a single lot or several lots), options for service delivery, the apportionment of risk and other factors that could contribute to the shape of any future procurement.

A 'Request for Information' (RFI) document was issued on the 6 November 2013, with a closing date on the 6 December 2013. An advertisement was published inviting commercial suppliers to take part in the exercise and over 60 contractors were contacted directly to advise them that the RFI had been published. Thirteen contractors responded, varying in size from local SMEs to regional and national organisations. Respondents were told that information provided by them would be confidential to the Council.

3.4 The RFI asked 18 main questions (and a number of supplemental ones) under 11 headings:

- Contract length
- Structure of Service Schedule/ Lots
- Local and Social Value
- Living Wage
- Price and Payment
- Indicative price range
- Contract terms and risks
- Contract Management
- Approaches over method of delivery and service standards
- Sustainability
- General

A summary of the key aspects of the feedback from participants is outlined below:

### Contract length

There were a number of different views on the contract length, varying from 2 to 7/10 years. The average was for a 5 year contract with extensions in multiples of 2 years. Typical service mobilisation periods from contract award were between one and three months.

### Structure of Service Schedule/ Lots

Contractors were informed about the suggested 'Lot' makeup and also of services that are not currently within the scope of building cleaning. The majority of responses suggested that a single 'Lot' would be the most attractive to the market as allowing for economies of scale and overheads to be realised. It was acknowledged by some organisations that breaking the contract into 2, or even 3, lots would give the Council greater flexibility and provide increased opportunities for SMEs to bid.

If a multiple-lot approach were to be adopted, one possible solution that seems to provide a good balanced compromise was:

- Multi-storey car parks and public toilets
- Administration & operational buildings
- Communal areas/ Sheltered Housing schemes

### Local and Social Value

This part of the RFI was covered in detail in the majority of submissions. Contractors recognised that this area is becoming more important in order to win and retain tenders and as part of their 'corporate social responsibility'. Areas highlighted as relevant to the service included:

- Recruitment and training of staff from locality
- Community voluntary work
- NVQ's
- Apprenticeships
- Voluntary work
- Sourcing of local suppliers
- Charity work

### Living Wage

The majority of respondents stated that if the Council required the Living Wage it should be payable from the start of the contract and not phased in. Respondents wanted clear information in the PQQ and the tender document about any requirement to pay the Living Wage. A number of the respondents also stated that they either paid their workforce the Living Wage currently or they pay a higher amount. Other respondents indicated that, if the workforce was currently being paid the minimum wage and the Living Wage was introduced at the start of the contract, labour costs would increase *by between 8% and 21%*.

As the current in-house staff are currently paid at least the Living Wage, then those eligible for transfer under TUPE regulations would move on that basis, if a contract were to awarded to an external contractor.

### Price and Payment

The majority of contractors suggested that contract price should be paid in 12 equal monthly instalments with additional work paid for by: per m2; per item; per lump sum etc. Some reference was also made to possible gain-share arrangements in respect of any savings achieved on the contract price.

All contractors stated that as the majority of the contract costs are labour costs the index should be linked to wage rates (such as the Living Wage or to the Average Earnings Index or to the Consumer Price Index (CPI)).

### Indicative Price Range

A small number of respondents were willing to give estimates of likely costs (based on paying the Living Wage, but in the absence of detailed TUPE information). The costs given ranged from less than £300k to more than £1.25m a year. The extremes of the range are unlikely to be representative, and may reflect the level of information available to respondents at this stage – indeed a number of non-respondents to this aspect noted that they felt it would be too difficult to comment without further detailed information.

The majority of those who responded to this question suggested prices in the mid-value bands giving a broad indication of cost which would indicate the potential for a saving of at least £300k could be obtained from market-testing, compared with current service costs. Details of the responses together with financial details of current budgets is shown in (CONFIDENTIAL) Appendix B.

### Contract Terms & Risk

All respondents stated that the main risks on any procurement are:

- Pension
- Default/ termination provisions
- Terms and conditions of transferring staff (TUPE)
- Potential redundancy costs

Reducing or sharing the above risks will reduce the costs payable by the Council to the contractor.

### Contract Management

There were a number of varying views on this section, apart from them all stating that a dedicated contract manager would be required with a number of working supervisors. Also, if there is more than a single 'Lot,' and an increase in contractor numbers, management costs of both the contractor and Council would increase. Joint Venture / Partnership working were identified as other possible contract management models.

## Approaches to Methods of Delivery and Service Standards

All contractors commented on the need for the contractor and the Council to be flexible in its approach to the cleaning - routes and building cleaning resource optimisation; hours of work; reduced noise cleaning machines; overnight cleaning etc.

A theme running through the submissions was that if an area is not dirty it does not need to be cleaned, therefore an output-based specification, specifying the standards to be achieved, may be more appropriate in some locations; with, for example, cleaning heavily trafficked areas daily and others weekly.

### Sustainability

Contractors are using methods of cleaning, with consumables, materials, machines that are reducing the carbon footprint:

- Biodegradable cleaning materials
- Green label accreditation
- ISO 14001 accreditation (a number of contractors suggested this should form part of the PQQ and ITT)
- Daytime cleaning to use natural light
- Paper free
- Onsite laundry facilities for micro-fibre cleaning cloths

## **4 Comments and Conclusions in the light of the RFI analysis**

- 4.1 The submissions by the contractors were considered at a Project Group meeting on the 10 December 2013 and the following are proposed as recommendations for the structure of any future procurement of the Building Cleaning Service in light of the soft market testing:

The contract length should be set at five years (albeit with a provision to terminate at the end of year 3 if performance is inadequate) with an option to extend by up to two further years, if the contractor is performing satisfactorily, and the service can be shown to continue to provide best value to the Council.

- (a) The procurement should be carried out on the basis of a three lot structure.

The recommended lots are:

- Multi-storey car parks and public toilets
- Administration and operational buildings
- Communal areas/sheltered housing schemes

- (b) Contractors are given the opportunity to bid for one, two or three 'Lots', with a discount on the tender price if two or three 'Lots' are won by the same contractor – providing a balance of maximising opportunities for SMEs to bid against achieving best value from the contract.

- (c) The contract should be tendered on the basis of a fixed price for the first two years, and thereafter index-linked.

- (d) An incentive scheme to drive continuous improvement in the delivery of the service is incorporated in the contract

It is recommended that the following items are subject to final agreement in accordance with the delegations requested:

- (e) Determination of the social value objectives for the cleaning contract. Once these are identified in the OJEU notice and PQQ, the individual improvements that the contractor(s) can bring to the service will be identified by them in their tenders.
- (f) The apportionment of risk between the Council and Contractor.
- (g) Whether or not vehicles plant, equipment (and possibly rental of depot space) that the in-house team use are offered for purchase or free of charge (with appropriate allowances made in the price evaluation) to bidders.
- (h) The Project Team recognise the need to maintain maximum flexibility in the contract, given the potential for changes in the scale and nature of the services (e.g. introduction of shared service arrangements, outsourcing, changes to service levels, etc.). This is always a balancing act, as additional flexibility to the Council will be perceived as risk by tenderers and will therefore be reflected in the price offered. The contract will make provision for these potential major variations by the insertion of a contract change mechanism. ,
- (i) Attached at Appendix A is a 'Facility Update' which details the proposed scope of the works, i.e. those buildings that are included within the procurement process and those buildings that are not currently included. The approval of the inclusions and exclusions will provide the basis for finalising the specification and also the numbers and types of staff who are potentially affected by TUPE.

## **4.2 Living Wage**

- 4.2.1 In January 2013 the Council adopted the following policy "to encourage contractors to adopt the Living Wage through the Council's procurement processes". We therefore wanted to know about the market's response to the Living Wage in connection with the building cleaning contract. We presented the market with two options, payment of the Living Wage from the start of the contract or moving to the Living Wage or phased in at some stage during the life of the contract.
- 4.2.2 As identified above, the majority of contractors stated that the Living Wage should be paid from the start of the contract, if required, and not phased in.
- 4.2.3 If a market testing exercise resulted in a contract for the service being awarded externally, relevant Council staff (who are paid the Living Wage or above) would TUPE transfer to the new service provider. There might also be a small number of non-Council staff that would transfer, but the rates of pay for these staff are not known. We currently pay private sector companies approximately £250k pa for cleaning services; and if their workforce are paid at the minimum wage, and using

the 8% to 21 % range from para 3.4, the financial implication of introducing the Living Wage could be between £16k - £36k per annum in additional costs (or £0 for any private sector workforce that is currently paid Living wage or above)

4.2.4 Given the response of the market to the question of the Living Wage, the Council might opt to include a contract condition requiring the contractor to pay the Living Wage to those staff delivering the services to the Council.

4.2.5 Officers are aware that the imposition of a living wage requirement is becoming more common and, so far as we are aware, no legal challenges on this basis have been launched. However, there would still be a risk of a successful legal challenge even if the Council's decision is based on best value or social value.

4.2.6 The risk of successful challenge or judicial review may be reduced if the Council satisfies itself that there is a sound, best value justification for requiring the successful contractor to pay the living wage, i.e. that by doing so the Council would, in return, achieve a better value service than if the Living Wage was not paid. The justification would have to be relevant to the cleaning service and proportionate to the cost involved. Payment of the Living Wage could not be justified simply on the grounds that it is a socially or morally desirable thing to do.

4.2.7 In terms of the building cleaning contract, the primary best value benefits of paying staff the Living Wage are likely to be:

- Improved retention and continuity of staff.

The benefits of continuity of staff are twofold - improved physical and information security in offices and vulnerable areas such as sheltered housing and community centres and improved quality of services as staff are not constantly learning on the job.

- Easier recruitment of staff and less reliance on agency staff.

Since we started to pay the living wage to Council staff in April 2013, we have found it easier to recruit cleaning staff – mostly to replace agency staff (11 posts since April 2013). Successful recruitment reduces the time and money spent on repeat recruitment exercises and on agency costs.

- Better motivated staff leading to increased productivity.

Pay is one of the factors that motivates staff (but not the only factor).

- Better qualified/ experienced.

The Council's experience of paying the living wage is limited (less than 12 months) so direct evidence of the claimed benefits, apart from recruitment, is not available. However, evidence can be found in other authorities (e.g. Islington LBC) that have worked with the living wage for longer and studies by the Greater London Authority and Queen Mary's University have found that where a Living Wage has been introduced employers and employees (not exclusively cleaning staff) believe that paying the Living Wage has increased the quality of work and

employers have also reported a drop in absenteeism, improved recruitment and retention.

On the other hand a study carried out by the Scottish Parliament into the experiences of several Scottish authorities is less conclusive and recommends caution in the making a direct correlation between payment of the Living Wage and improvements in services/absenteeism

The criteria that we would have to use as measures of best value would include the quality of the service, the technical efficiency of the service and cost effectiveness.

4.2.8 There may also be scope for imposing a living wage requirement if this is done pursuant to the Council's obligations to take account of 'social value' in procurement.

4.2.9 The Social Value Act 2012 applies to all services contracts above the EU threshold. We are under a duty to consider how what is being procured might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of our area. Any improvement sought must be proportionate and relevant to the services being procured.

In some circumstances the payment of the Living Wage to workers employed by a contractor to deliver services to the Council may be seen as improving the social and economic well-being of any area and so the Living Wage is likely to be a relevant consideration under the Act if proportionality and relevance can be established.

As to relevance, building cleaning is typically low paid employment. The Council has objectives to prioritise the disadvantaged, strive for community well-being and a thriving local economy that benefits the whole community. Evidence given to the Scottish Parliament identified payment of the Living Wage as one measure to tackle poverty and reduce the cost to the local economy of the services required to support families in poverty. The Living Wage is not a magic wand and ultimately can only be part of a wider strategy, but it is a start and by adopting it for this contract, the Council would be setting an example to local employers.

Evidence was also given to the Scottish Parliament by some authorities that the living wage had the potential to have a beneficial effect on the local economy by increasing the spend potential of local families.

4.2.10 The inclusion of a suitably worded Living Wage contract clause would offer a number of advantages for the contractor. Contractors have stated in their submissions that the payment of the Living wage would attract and retain the best personnel as cleaning is an area where there is often a high turnover of staff. Retention of staff would assist in training and development of key members that would ensure that the cleaning would be carried out more productively and thoroughly. This is especially the case within the cleaning of the multi storey car parks, where the quality of cleaning of the parking areas directly affects the life of the membrane (normally 10 years, with a £200k replacement cost)

- 4.2.11 It is important that the multi-storey car parks are properly cleaned on a regular basis with a deep clean at least once a year (preferably two). This is necessary to maintain the integrity of the deck coating. If this becomes holed, water and salts can penetrate the concrete and rot the metal supporting bars. The deck surfacings should last 10 years but this can be reduced to 8 if adequate cleaning is not carried out. The coatings come with a warranty which is dependent on an appropriate cleaning regime (including materials). High quality specialist services will be required to ensure a suitable level of cleanliness is maintained in order to protect the Council's investment in its car parks.

It is, however, difficult to conclusively establish an evidential link between payment of the Living Wage to staff employed in delivering the specialist car park cleaning service and any financial savings (through protection of the car park infrastructure and warranties) that might result from additional quality in service delivery over and above that which would have been available without payment of the enhanced rate from a specialist service provider.

- 4.2.12 If Members so wish, an in principle decision could be made about whether or not contractors should be required to pay at least the National Living Wage to staff engaged in the delivery of the cleaning contract subject to the further detailed consideration of a best value and/or social value justification in this case.

## **5 Outline Business Case**

- 5.1 The estimated budget for 2014/15 is in the region of £1,715,240 (in house team and private sector costs). If a procurement exercise is undertaken the respondents submissions from the RFI indicate that a saving in the region of £300k p.a. could be achieved.
- 5.2 The above savings are based on the assumption that there would be limited savings achievable from internal recharges. However, work is already underway to determine the ability of services to reduce these cost so that further savings can be quantified. This work will depend on a number of factors, including the relative timing to other changes in demand for support services which would enable step-changes in cost of service provision to be achieved.
- 5.3 The initial financial analysis suggests that there is sufficient financial case for the market-testing of the service.
- 5.4 Any cost savings would become deliverable from the contract service delivery start date, which is projected to be by the start of January 2015 subject to adequate project resources being made available. On the basis of this, we expect the PQQ to be issued in March 2014, with tender issue in early June 2014, Tender return mid to late July 2014 and contract award in September 2014. This would allow three months for service implementation.

## **6. Implications**

### **(a) Financial Implications**

The financial implications of decisions about the future delivery of the cleaning service are set out above.

**(b) Staffing Implications**

If a decision is taken to market test the service and this exercise were to result in a contract with an external provider, the estimated number of Council staff that might be the subject of a TUPE transfer in the event that a contract is awarded externally are identified at para 3.3 above. These figures may vary if a Lot structure is adopted.

**(c) Equal Opportunities Implications**

An EQIA is currently being prepared that will inform the final form of the cleaning specification.

**(d) Environmental Implications**

There are no direct environmental implications as part of this report. However, if the in-house team is retained or if an external contractor is appointed to carry out cleaning works, there will be environmental implications due to the type and method of cleaning carried out. The PQQ and ITT will consider, in-depth, the service provider's policy on the environment.

**(e) Procurement**

If a decision is made to market test the cleaning service this contract will be above the European services threshold and will therefore be subject to the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (or any amendments to them).

**(f) Consultation and communication**

Consultation on the RFI (soft market testing) has been carried out with the Trade Unions, the private sector (also as part of the RFI process) and leaseholders. Further consultation will take place with Trade Unions, individual officers, the private sector, leaseholders and Housing Regulation Panel at appropriate points in the procurement process.

**(g) Community Safety**

A poor quality cleaning service to the public toilets, sheltered units, community centres etc. will impact on community safety and will therefore inform the development of the specification.

## **7. Background papers**

7.1 Building Cleaning RFI Advertisement

7.2 Building Cleaning RFI Questionnaire Form

## **8. Appendices**

6.1 Appendix A – Facility Update

6.2 (CONFIDENTIAL) Appendix B – Financial Issues

## **7. Contact Officer**

If you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name:	Paul Evans, Building Cleaning Procurement Project Officer
Author's Email:	Paul.evans@cambridge.gov.uk

## List of Facilities Covered

CATEGORY	INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE	NOT INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE
<b>Car Parks</b>	Grand Arcade Park Street Grafton East Grafton West Queen Anne Terrace	Adam and Eve Street Off East Road  Gwydir Street Off Mill Road  Castle Park Castle Street (Castle Court Business Park)  Abbey Road (Riverside)
<b>Public Toilets</b>	Arbury Court Barnwell Road Cherry Hinton Hall Cherry Hinton Rec Chesterton Rec. Chesterton Road Coleridge Rec. Drummer Street Gonville Place Jesus Green Kings Hedges Rec. Lammas Land Lion Yard Mill Road/Gwydir Street Nightingale Rec. Park Street Car Park Quayside Romsey Rec. Silver Street Victoria Avenue	Drummer Street (as this is managed by Adshel).
<b>Pavilions</b>	Cherry Hinton Recreation Ground Pavilion Chesterton Recreation Ground Pavilion Coleridge Recreation Ground Hobbs Pavilion Nightingale Recreation Ground Pavilion	Alexandra Gardens Bowls Pavilion; Barnwell Bowls Pavilion; Christ Pieces Bowls Pavilion; Newnham Bowls Pavilion; Trumpington Bowls Pavilion cleaned by Bowls Club Groups Jesus Green Rouse Pavilion not currently used Nunns Way Recreation Ground Pavilion and Trumpington Recreation Ground Pavilion cleaned by Resident's Groups.
<b>City Homes Offices</b>	North Area Offices South Area Offices	
<b>Sheltered Housing</b>	ANNESLEY - Block 1 - 6 All BRANDON COURT - Block 1 - 36 All DITTON COURT - Block 1 - 26 All FERNWOOD - Communal Area 13 - 18 All GREYSTOKE COURT - Communal Area 13 - 18 All	

CATEGORY	INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE	NOT INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE
	HEATHERFIELD - Communal Area 13 - 18 All LICHFIELD ROAD - Block 105 - 115 Odds MANSEL COURT - Block 1-27 NEVILLE ROAD - Block 27 - 37 Odds RAWLYN COURT - Block 1 - 26 All SCHOOL COURT - Block 2 - 22 All STANTON HOUSE - Block 1 – 32 TALBOT HOUSE - Block 1 - 28 All WESTGATE - Block 1 - 6 All WHITEFRIARS - Block 1 - 20 All	
<b>General Housing</b>	AINSDALE ALBEMARLE WAY ANCASTER WAY ANNESLEY ANNS ROAD ANSTEY WAY ARAGON CLOSE ARBURY COURT ARRAN CLOSE ASHBURY CLOSE ASHFIELD ROAD - ATKINS CLOSE BLISS WAY BORROWDALE BRACKLEY CLOSE BRACONDALE BRANDON COURT BRITTEN PLACE BROOKS ROAD BUDLEIGH CLOSE BURGESS HOUSE CARLTON TERRACE COCKERELL ROAD COLVILLE ROAD COOPER HOUSE CORONATION MEWS DANIELS HOUSE DAVY ROAD DENNIS ROAD DITCHBURN PLACE DITTON COURT EDGECOMBE EKIN ROAD EKIN WALK FANSHAWE ROAD FERNWOOD FISON ROAD FORDWICH CLOSE FRANCIS DARWIN COURT FULBOURN OLD DRIFT GIBBONS HOUSE GILBERT CLOSE GOLDING ROAD - GREEN END ROAD GREYSTOKE COURT HANSON HAWKINS ROAD HAZELWOOD CLOSE	

CATEGORY	INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE	NOT INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE
	HEADFORD CLOSE HEATHERFIELD HELEN CLOSE HIGHdene ROAD HILLS AVENUE LANGDALE CLOSE LARKIN CLOSE LICHFIELD ROAD MANSEL COURT MARKHAM CLOSE MINERVA WAY MOLEWOOD CLOSE MONKSWELL NEVILLE ROAD NEWMARKET ROAD NICHOLSON WAY NORFOLK STREET PERSE WAY RACHEL CLOSE RAWLYN COURT ROBERT MAY CLOSE RUSH GROVE RUSSELL COURT RUTLAND CLOSE SACKVILLE CLOSE SANDWICK CLOSE SCHOOL COURT SOMERVELL COURT SPENCER HOUSE STANTON HOUSE ST BEDES CRESCENT ST DAVIDS HOUSE ST KILDA AVENUE TALBOT HOUSE TAUNTON CLOSE TEMPLE COURT TENBY CLOSE TEYNHAM CLOSE TIVERTON WAY TREVONE PLACE TWEEDALE - WALKER COURT WALPOLE ROAD WELSTEAD ROAD WENVOE CLOSE WESTGATE WHITEFRIARS WILSON CLOSE WOBURN CLOSE WYCLIFFE ROAD	
Community Centres	82 Akeman Street The Meadows	Buchan Street Neighbourhood Centre Ross Street Community Centre 37 Lawrence Way Community House Brown's Field Youth and Community Centre Nuns Way Pavilion
Cambridge City		Cambridge City Crematorium &

CATEGORY	INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE	NOT INCLUDED WITHIN SCOPE
Crematorium & Huntingdon Road Cemetery New Market Road Cemetery		Huntingdon Road Cemetery New Market Road Cemetery
Administrative Buildings	Guild Hall Mandela House Hobson House Mill Road Depot Llandaff Chambers Parsons Court	Lion House Corn Exchange
Commercial Buildings	Orwell House Offices Barnwell House Offices Gwydir Enterprise Centre Dales Brewery.	