

**COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

16 October 2014  
2.30 - 6.20 pm

**Present:** Councillors Moghadas (Chair), Ratcliffe (Vice-Chair), Austin, Baigent, Reid, Reiner, Sarris and Sinnott

**Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation:** Councillor Johnson

**Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places:** Councillor O'Reilly

Director of Customer and Community Services: Liz Bisset  
Head of Community Development: Trevor Woollams  
Urban Design and Conservation Manager: Glen Richardson  
Sports and Recreation Manager: Ian Ross  
Head of Arts and Recreation: Debbie Kaye  
Head of Strategic Housing: Alan Carter  
Cultural Facilities Manager: Steve Bagnall  
Head of City Tourism and City Centre Management: Emma Thornton  
Urban Growth Project Manager: Tim Wetherfield  
Head of Streets and Open Spaces: Joel Carré  
Asset Manager: Alistair Wilson  
Head of Specialist Services: Paul Necus  
Operations Manager (Deputy Manager): Barbara Scruby  
Committee Manager: Toni Birkin

**FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL**

**14/47/CS Apologies**

No apologies were given. However, Councillor Ratcliffe left after the consideration of item 14/59/CS.

**14/48/CS Declarations of Interest**

Item Number	Name	Interest
14/52/CS	Reid	Personal: Son is a student at ARU

**14/49/CS Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the 11<sup>th</sup> July 2014 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following correction.

Page nine, item 14/40/CS, the following line is deleted:

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation vi.

**14/50/CS Public Questions (See information below)****14/51/CS Information Item: North West Community Forum - appointment of Chair and Deputy**

The Committee noted the following appointments for 2014/15:

- i. The North West Cambridge Community Forum:  
Chair Councillor Hipkin and Deputy Councillor Tucker
- ii. The Southern Fringe Community Forum:  
Chair Councillor Dryden

**14/52/CS Project Appraisal - ARU/Howes Place Sports Ground****Matter for Decision**

Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) were proposing redevelopment of their Howe's Place sports ground facility off Huntingdon Road.

The nearby site of Darwin Green was a major growth development area, and part of the development was being built upon Sidney Sussex playing fields. This part of the Darwin Green proposal received objections from Sport England which had to be mitigated to allow the whole site to be approved. These mitigations were adopted into the S106 Agreement for Darwin Green for the loss of sporting facilities and playing pitches and a specific ring fenced sum of £250,000 was agreed for offsite contribution to improve local sports facilities and pitches but were restricted to only being able to be spent in the four neighbouring wards or within 1 mile of the City Boundary.

It was proposed that the ring fenced £250,000 of developer contributions are invested into the ARU sports pavilion building.

## Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. approve the release of £250,000 of developer contributions derived from the Darwin Green - 14/0086/REM - Sidney Sussex playing fields development towards the ARU development of sports pitches and ancillary facilities at Howe's Place – (subject to South Cambridgeshire District Council planning approval being granted for the application) and add to Capital Plan for 2015/16; and
- ii. authorise Officers to enter into a Community Use agreement to secure public access to the Howe's Place facilities based on the provisions in 3.11 of the Officer's report to be agreed by the Executive Councillor, in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.

### Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

### Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

### Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Sports and Recreation Manager and noted the additional wording to be added to recommendation 2.1 of the Officer's report as follows: and add to the Capital Plan for 2014/15.

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

- i. Concerns were expressed that problems experienced with similar schemes elsewhere in the City would be repeated if the Community Use Agreement was not tight enough and backed up with promotional material.
- ii. Some Members were concerned about delegating the final decision regarding the Community Use Agreement to officers without any further opportunity to review it.

Councillor Reid Proposed the following amendment to recommendation 2.2. The following additional working to be added: to be agreed by the Executive Councillor in consultation with the Chair and Spokes.

The amendment was agreed unanimously.

In response to Members' questions the Sports and Recreation Manager clarified the following:

- i. The pricing structure would be agreed by the management group and would be set at a level which would ensure local residents were not priced out.
- ii. It was anticipated that local schools would be encouraged to use the facilities in the day time.
- iii. An outreach programme was planned to promote the use of the facilities to local communities.
- iv. Officers
- v. In response to concerns expressed about the 12 year repayment plan if ARU decided to exit from the agreement, officers confirmed that this was in line with other S106 agreements.

Councillor Austin was concerned that football was the dominant sport being offered and wondered why there was not more provision for other sport in the proposal. The Head of Arts and Recreation undertook to provide members with an update of other sports provision agreed for the Darwin Green site, which would address such concerns.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **14/53/CS Review of Neighbourhood Community Projects (NCP's)**

#### **Matter for Decision**

The report set out the findings from a review of the three Neighbourhood Community Projects (NCPs) that operate in Abbey, Arbury and Kings Hedges wards. Those wards had the highest overall multiple deprivation scores in Cambridge.

The report considered how the 3 NCPs might evolve in the future to ensure they could remain sustainable and carry on their valuable work, given the difficult financial challenges faced by Cambridge City Council.

#### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to thank the 3 NCPs for their valuable work and achievements;
- ii. that the existing budgets for the 3 NCPs as shown in the table at 3.10 are protected for 2015/16 but cash limited;
- iii. that funding proposals for the 3 NCPs for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are agreed in consultation with ward councillors from Abbey, Arbury and Kings Hedges as part of the 2016/17 budget process (i.e. consultation with ward councillors in September / October 2015);
- iv. that the 3 NCPs are supported and encouraged to maximise opportunities for external funding in order to lessen their financial reliance on the Council in future years; and
- v. that officers feed-back the comments set out in Section 6 to the 3 NCPs and include them, where appropriate, within their funding agreements for 2015/16.

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Community Development who outlined plans for the next year and confirmed that recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 of the report would be included in the budget setting process.

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

- i. Welcomed the report and were pleased that local groups were being encouraged and supported to thrive in a difficult financial climate.
- ii. Suggested that Area Committees could have a role in supporting and scrutinising the work of community groups in receipt of grants.
- iii. Increased use of Ward Councillor in scrutinising local projects was suggested.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Community Development stated the following:

- iv. 'Abbey People' were being supported to move towards a new form of charitable status.
- v. Arbury NCP were also being guided towards greater independence and income generation.

The Head of Community Development undertook to supply members with further information about the governance arrangements for Abbey People outside the meeting.

Councillor Reid proposed the following amendment to the recommendations (additional wording in italic and underlined):

- 2.3 that funding proposals for the 3 NCPs for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are agreed in consultation with ward councillors from Abbey, Arbury and Kings Hedges as part of the 2016/17 budget process (i.e. consultation with ward councillors in September / October 2015);
- 2.4 that the 3 NCPs are supported and encouraged to maximise opportunities for external funding in order to lessen their financial reliance on the Council in future years

The amendments were agreed unanimously.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

## **14/54/CS Review of Outdoor and Other Entertainment Events**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report examined the profile and costs of the Council's outdoor events programme and considered opportunities for refreshing this and making efficiencies within the context of the Cultural Trust. The Executive Councillor for Communities, Arts & Recreation has clarified that the Cambridge Folk Festival is outside the scope of this review.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to continue the general profile of the programme of events as now;
- ii. that the programme should consider ways to offer more support via expertise to neighbourhood events;

- iii. to carry these recommendations forward into the new cultural trust model if approved by the Leader of the Council and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation, Councillor Lewis Herbert, at the meeting of Strategy and Resources Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2014;
- iv. and if approved:
  - A. to establish the process outlined in point 3.14 to enable Council input and influence to the event programme.
  - B. acknowledge that:
    - Along with other external organisations, the Trust may bring forward new ideas for events for the Council to consider;
    - The Council may request support from the Trust for additional events such as major sports events.
    - The Council can consider additional activity and investment into the events programme in discussion with the Trust;
  - C. to agree a saving of 21% will be made against current net costs by year 5 through potential for greater operating efficiency and increased fund-raising in the Trust model; and
  - D. to note that the arrangements for monitoring the trust and the outdoor events in point 3.15 of the Officer's report.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Arts and Recreation.

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

- i. Expressed concerns that this matter crosses over to other portfolios as it covers open spaces and increased internal dialogue would be needed.
- ii. Discussed regrets over the cancellation of the planned triathlon due to poor water quality.

- iii. Expressed concerns that the report was silent on new outdoor spaces on fringe sites and suggested that these need to be seen as part of City destinations.
- iv. Discussed the role of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee once a Trust was established and hoped that an annual report would be available for scrutiny.

In response to Members' questions the Asset Manager stated the following:

- v. The role of Street and Open Spaces team would alter slightly as the Trust evolved as they would be dealing with an external organisation and not part of the Council
- vi. Once fringe sites were completed, there would be scope to increase events and the new communities would be encouraged to engage in those events.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Arts and Recreation stated the following:

- vii. Initial agreements with the Trust would include performance indicators and performance against those indicators would be reported back to both Community Services Scrutiny and Strategy and Resources Committees via briefing notes.
- viii. The new delivery vehicle was being called a 'trust' although it does not yet have 'trust' status.

Councillor Reid proposed the following amendment to the recommendations, to insert a new recommendation 2.3 as follows, and with subsequent recommendations re-number accordingly:

- 2.3 *To bring forward a mission statement (to Strategy and Resources Committee) which expresses the value and importance of the events program both on a City Wide and at a local level.*

Councillor Johnson stated that paragraph 3.5 of the Officer's report fully covered this matter and was, in essence, a mission statement. He further confirmed that the Articles of Association, as detailed in the report to Strategy and Resources Committee, fully covered governance and object clauses. Councillor Reid withdrew her amendment.



Councillor Reid proposed, and Councillor Reiner seconded, an alternative amendment to recommendation, as follow, to insert a new recommendation 2.4 (B) as follows, and with subsequent recommendations re-number accordingly:

*2.4(b) To ensure that the purpose and value for the Council's outdoor events programme is suitably expressed in the trust documents and contracts.*

Councillor Sinnott and Sarris stated that was difficult to properly consider changes to recommendations tabled at short notice.

The amendment was lost by 5 votes to 3.

Councillor Reid expressed concerns that the Committee might not receive independent reports regarding the performance of the Trust.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

### **Item of Special Urgency**

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

The reason that this document could not be deferred was that it was impracticable to defer the decision until the next committee.

### **14/55/CS CLAY FARM COMMUNITY CENTRE**

#### **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Chair reminded the Committee that some of the appendices to the report were confidential and that, if they were minded to discuss matter in those documents, it would be necessary to consider excluding the press and public.

The Committee resolved to discuss the report in open session.

**Matter for Decision**

The Clay Farm Community Centre project was considered by the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in January 2012 and the Executive Councillor for Community Development and Health, approved that the project should proceed. The project had now reached the stage where tenders had been received to build the new Community Centre. Due to build cost inflation the budget for the project had increased significantly although the increased contribution required from the Council was more marginal. This was because of the partnership nature of the project and because funding for the project comes from a number of sources, much of which was building cost index linked. Nevertheless, as the project had reached a key point and in view of the budget variation it was felt appropriate for the Committee to scrutinise the project again at this stage.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for Community, Arts and Recreation**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to approve the revised budget for the project of £10,950,000.

**Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

**Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

**Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of the Strategic Housing regarding Clay Farm Community Centre. He clarified why this report had been submitted late and the importance of making this decision in a timely and open fashion. He explained that cost had risen but so had contributions from partners to the project. Members noted that the increase in borrowing requested from the Council under consideration was £3.02m rather than the original figure of £2.8m.

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

- i. Members expressed satisfaction with the report and understood the need for the increase.
- ii. Stated that the project was worthwhile.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

The Committee requested that the minutes noted their appreciation for the contribution that the Head of Community Development had made during his time with the Council and wished him well for the future.

## **14/56/CS Outcomes of the Consultation on a New Management Plan for Coldham's Common**

### **Matter for Decision**

A consultation on creating a management plan for Coldham's Common was completed between August & September 2014. The consultation built on a previous independent consultation undertaken in Spring 2014. The initial consultation was used to gauge the views of all stakeholders and users of the Common and to shape the current issues and options consultation.

The Executive Councillor was asked to instruct officers to draft a Management Plan for Coldham's Common in discussion with key stakeholder groups.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. To note the outcomes of the recent consultation reports; and
- ii. Instruct officers to draft a Management Plan for Coldham's Common, which will return to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, along with analysis of the responses to the consultation, in discussion with key stakeholder groups.

### **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 Asset Manager regarding the outcomes of the consultation on the Management Plan for Coldham's Common.

In response to Members' questions the Asset Manager stated that the initial consultation had received a higher response rate than the second. However,

this was because the initial consultation was quantitative. This had generated the options presented in the second consultation. Future recommendations would draw on both sets of comments.

Councillor Reid proposed the following amendment to recommendation B, additional wording underlined and in italic:

b) Instruct officers to draft a Management Plan for Coldham's Common, *which will return to Community Services Scrutiny Committee, along with analysis of the responses to the consultation,* in discussion with key stakeholder groups.

The Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places stated that the intention had always been to bring this back to Committee and that she was happy for this to be included in the recommendation. She agreed that the Common had a diverse range of stakeholders whose views would be taken into account in the Council led Management Plan.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

## **14/57/CS A future model for Tourism for Cambridge and the surrounding area**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report set out a proposal to establish an alternative delivery mechanism for the future delivery of tourism in Cambridge and the surrounding area which is based on guidance from Government and best practise nationally. This move would deliver a long term sustainable model for tourism whilst increasing investment, safeguarding the visitor economy as a key economic driver for the city and the surrounding area, and reducing the cost to the City Council

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to support, in principle, the establishment of a Destination Management Organisation (DMO) as an alternative model for the delivery of tourism and to authorise work to progress this, subject to further decisions required as part of recommendation (ii) below.

- ii. to agree that the following further work, which has wider implications for the Council, is progressed in discussion with the relevant Directors prior to discussion at Customer and Community Services Scrutiny Committee and final authorisation by the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places in March 2015:
  - § Finalisation of the detailed business case for the DMO and implications for the Council.
  - § Management of transfer of staff
  - § Expectations and relationships between the Council and the DMO
- iii. to delegate authority for all other decisions necessary to implement and establish the DMO to the Director of Environment in discussion with the Executive Councillor, Chair and Opposition Spokes.
- iv. to acknowledge the indicative timetable for implementation as set out in Section 6 of this report.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of City Tourism and City Centre Management regarding a future model for tourism for the Cambridge and surrounding area. Members noted that recommendation 2.2 had been amended as the launch date would be March 2015 rather than January. Section 6.2 of the report would also be amended to reflect the changed launch date.

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

- i. Suggested that lessons could be learnt from the Cambridge Bid process.
- ii. Questioned how the overall vision would be maintained.
- iii. Concerns were expressed that the, value over volume, approach might discourage less affluent visitors, such as young people, from visiting Cambridge.
- iv. Suggested that later reports on this matter included information on inward investment.

In response to Members' questions the Head of City Tourism and City Centre Management stated the following:

- v. Neighbouring authorities were developing similar plans and cross authority communication was well established
- vi. Input from the County Council would be vital for the success of the project, not least because of the transport implications.
- vii. It was not expected that there would be any more than a minimal financial contribution from the County Council.
- viii. The proposals recognised the role of the tourism service as a shop window for the quality of life enjoyed in Cambridge and the function this served to attract business into the City.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

## **14/58/CS S106 Priority-setting and devolved decision making**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report considered how the S106 priority-setting process (with devolved decision-making to area committees over the use of some types of developer contributions) had operated over the last two years.

The report proposed the continuation of S106 priority-setting, but to fine-tune the principles behind S106 devolved decision-making. In addition, it proposed that the next (third) round on S106 priority-setting this autumn should be confined to projects that can be grant-funded.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor resolved to:

- i. re-focus devolved decision-making to area committees within future S106 priority-setting rounds on developer contributions for community facilities, informal open space, outdoor sports provision (incorporating formal open space) and play provision for children and teenagers [see paragraph 4.1 of the Officer's report];
- ii. continue to include developer contributions for indoor sports provision, public art and public realm in future S106 priority-setting grounds, but

return the decision-making for these contribution types to the relevant Executive Councillor [paragraph 4.2 of the Officer's report];

- iii. adapt the method for devolved S106 funding to areas to reflect the fact that area committees no longer make planning decisions: this will be based on 100% of S106 contributions from 'minor'/'other' categories of planning applications from the area and 50% of S106 contributions from the 'major' category planning applications from the area [see paragraphs 4.3 of the Officer's report];
- iv. adapt the method for assigning S106 funding to strategic funds (for use of projects benefitting more than one area of Cambridge, or the city as a whole): this will be based on the other 50% of S106 contributions from the 'major' category of planning applications;
- v. confirm that the 50:50 split (devolved:strategic) of S106 contributions from major planning applications can continue to be varied on a case-by-case basis, following officer discussions with the relevant Executive Councillor, Chair and Spokes;
- vi. agree that the next (third) S106 priority-setting round, scheduled for November 2014-February 2015, should be focussed on prioritising schemes suitable for S106 grant-funding [see Section 5 of the officer's report];
- vii. agree that a fourth S106 priority-setting round, currently proposed to take place between June 2015-January 2016) should focus on the wider range of S106 contribution types, including proposals for projects which would involve project management and/or delivery by the city council; and

Although not a formal recommendation, the Committee noted the discussion in Appendix E about the issues relating to the S106 funding for the Rouse Ball Pavilion project on Jesus Green.

### **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 Urban Growth Project Manager regarding S106 priority-setting and devolved decision making.

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

- i. Welcomed the proposal to prioritise grant funded projects
- ii. Concerns were expressed regarding the Rouse Ball Pavilion project and the Urban Growth Project Manager undertook to meet Members outside the meeting for a briefing.
- iii. Concerns were expressed regarding how the 50:50 split (devolved/strategic) case by case decision of the Executive Councillor would be scrutinised.
- iv. Some members expressed concerns that Public Art projects might not be delivered in future.

The Urban Growth Project Manager stated that previously, Public Art funding had been spread thinly and unevenly across the City. A centralised pot would deliver better projects. In future Public Art projects proposals would be highlighted to the Executive Councillor for decision. The Executive Councillor responded and stated that she recognised the need for transparency and would seek input from Area Committees.

The Committee resolved that recommendation e) of the Officer's report, be amended as follows (additional working underlined and in italics):

- e) confirm that the 50:50 split (devolved:strategic) of S106 contributions from major planning applications can continue to be varied on a case-by-case basis, following officer discussions with the relevant Executive Councillor, *Chair and Spokes*.

Councillor Reid requested that the vote on the recommendations be spilt, A and B followed by C to G.

The Committee resolved by 5 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations A and B.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations C to G.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.



**14/59/CS Local Centres Improvement Programme - Outcome of Audit****Matter for Decision**

At its meeting on July 11, 2014, Community Services Committee agreed that an audit be prepared which would examine all local centres based on specific criteria and for a report to be brought back with the outcomes of that audit. Funding had been agreed already by resolution of full Council in February, 2014, for targeted improvements to select local centres with a total, phased-in budget of £635,000.00 to 2017/18. The purpose of the report is to set out the results of that audit and the proposed centres to be included in the programme.

**Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor resolved to note the findings of the Local Centres Improvement Programme audit and to approve the following:

- i. the selection of Cherry Hinton High Street and Arbury Court centres for inclusion in the Local Centre Improvement Programme for the reasons set out in the officer's report;
- ii. the retention of a third priority project to be added to the programme, after debate at scrutiny committee, at a later date pending the outcome of progress with planned work related to the Mitcham's Corner District Centre as part of City Deal implementation; and
- iii. that the detailed funding, design and delivery of improvements to Cherry Hinton High Street and Arbury Court be the subject of Project Appraisals to be approved by the Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places at a future committee meeting.

**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 Urban Design and Conservation Manager regarding the Local Centre Improvement Programme.

The Committee welcomed the report and requested that subsequent decision be brought back to Committee for scrutiny. The Executive Councillor confirmed that a commitment had been made to bring future decision back to Community Services Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Reiner proposed additional wording to be added to recommendation b) as follow, additional wording underlined and in italics:

- b) the retention of a third priority project to be added to the programme, *after debate at scrutiny committee*, at a later date pending the outcome of progress with planned work related to the Mitcham's Corner District Centre as part of City Deal implementation.

The Committee agreed the amendment (*nem com*).

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

## **14/60/CS Environmental Improvement Capital Programme Review**

### **Matter for Decision**

The report provided a review of the Environmental Improvement Capital Programme's performance over its four year extension period, 2011/12-2014/15. The review included a breakdown of the various local improvement schemes, including local highway projects, delivered through the programme to date; and the pipeline of schemes remaining to be delivered by March 2016. With the current programme budget ending March 2016, the report outlines the need to consider an extension of the programme for a further agreed period, as part of the corporate budget setting process.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to note the Environmental Improvement Capital Programme schemes delivered over the period 2011-2014;
- ii. to note the Environmental Improvement Capital Programme schemes scheduled to be delivered over the period 2014 -2016;

- iii. to consider making provision, as part of the corporate budget setting process, for an extension of the Environmental Improvement Capital Programme; and
- iv. to consider making provision, as part of the corporate budget setting process, of a new dedicated budget to support the match funding of local highway schemes under Cambridgeshire County Council's Local Highway Improvement Programme.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Street and Open Spaces regarding the environmental improvement capital programme review.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

## **14/61/CS Proposals for a Sustainable Business Model for Cambridge's Bereavement Services**

### **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Chair reminded the Committee that some of the appendices to the report were confidential and that if they were minded to discuss matter in those documents, it would be necessary to consider excluding the press and public.

The Committee resolved to discuss the report in open session.

### **Matter for Decision**

The report presented proposals for a sustainable business model for Cambridge's Bereavement Services. It showed how the service planned to meet current savings targets and deliver an improved return to the Council, whilst ensuring both that essential capital investment is properly funded and

also recognising the need to safeguard families and individuals who are struggling economically, and the most vulnerable.

### **Decision of Executive Councillor for City Centre and Public Places**

The Executive Councillor resolved:

- i. to approve the pricing proposals and investment programme for the service contained within the report;
- ii. to approve in principle the proposal to further restructure the service to accommodate required changes to raise the public profile of the service; and
- iii. to move Cambridge's Bereavement service onto a trading account basis from April 2015, in which surpluses over and above the required return to the General Fund can be ring-fenced for reinvestment in the service infrastructure.

### **Reason for the Decision**

As set out in the Officer's report.

### **Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable.

### **Scrutiny Considerations**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Specialist Services regarding the bereavement services sustainable business model.

In response to Members' questions the Head of Specialist Services stated that ring fencing any profits, to allow them to be used for future improvements, would produce business continuity and ease procurement. He stated that the service was not yet a trading arm and that the service was expanding to offer additional, profitable services

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the aim was to retain a strong position in a profitable market and added that there would be an option to remove the ring fence at a later date if necessary.

Councillor Sinnott sought clarification regarding an apparent increase in staffing costs. Officers explained that services that at present are operated

through a service level agreement with another internal service were assumed in the model to be delivered and managed directly as part of the new service team. The increased cost in employee costs was balanced by a corresponding reduction in the services costs elsewhere in the budget.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 3 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

The meeting ended at 6.20 pm

**CHAIR**