

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4 July 2016
5.00 - 7.32 pm

Present: Councillors Sarris (Chair), Barnett (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bick, Cantrill and Sinnott

Leader of the Council: Councillor Lewis Herbert

Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources: Councillor Richard Robertson

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Strategic Director: Ray Ward

Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba

Head of Property Services: Dave Prinsep

Head of Communities: Debbie Kaye

Strategy and Partnerships Manager: David Kidston

Safer Communities Section Manager

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/15/SR Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

16/16/SR Declarations of Interest

| Item | Councillor | Interest |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| 16/19/SR and 16/20/SR | Sarris | Fellow of Trinity College who had interests in Garrett Hostel Lane. Did not vote on items 16/19/SR or 16/20/SR. |
| 16/20/SR | Sinnott | Daughter used to work as punt tout 10 years ago. |

16/17/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meetings held on the 21 March and 26 May 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

The Committee agreed a 10 minutes adjournment to read through the written representations that had been sent regarding items 6 and 7 on the agenda.

16/18/SR Public Questions

Public questions regarding Agenda Item 6

Gillian Moore addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She was the Chairman of the Residents Association of Old Newnham which represented streets close to Mill Pond. The Association had more than 80 members, 5 members felt strongly enough to attend the meeting and 14 had said that they hoped members would reject the proposals.
- ii. If not Mill Pond and Queens Green where would a new punt station be? She stated that there should not be another punt station.
- iii. It was a question of amenity and the total number of licensed and unlicensed touts meant that punting was no longer a joy and that it should be for both residents and tourists.
- iv. It was a rural setting and 5 minutes from Kings Parade and requested that members kept it as a rural setting.
- v. Queens Green was a grade II listed common and should not be damaged by touting.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Appreciated the strength of feeling in Ms Moore's area and beyond.
- ii. The Committee felt that the possible sites for a punt station in the public domain along the river needed to be considered.
- iii. The report looked at Garret Hostel Lane, Laundress Green, Jesus Green and the Mill Pond, a balanced view would need to be taken.
- iv. He would contribute his views later and had visited the sites earlier in the week, although he knew them already.
- v. The core issue was whether Mill Pond was a suitable site for a punt station. Granta Punts was already located there. It was a special environment close to the centre of Cambridge.

Gillian Moore addressed the Committee and made the following further points:

- i. Granta Punts was already there but it was some way from where residents walk a second punt station closer to where residents walk would be disturbing.

Emma Wynne addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. Worked at La Mimosa punt station for past 8/9 years.
- ii. Colleagues had worked on the river for 18 years and saw the touting problem at its infancy.
- iii. The business used to get business from the bridge then they moved to Jesus Green and the business started with 4 people and had grown.
- iv. This was an issue which should have been cleared up but the problem had gotten a lot worse.
- v. If this wasn't corrected then there would be an issue in the future.
- vi. There had been a change which said that walking tours would be permitted but she argued that this would open the back door for touting and punts.
- vii. The core issue is the consultation responses, need to review and make a decision. Punt touting is a serious nuisance in the City.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The issue of touting would be addressed under item 7 and there was a full report in front of members.
- ii. The Council recognised a significant nuisance issue with touting; the Council had specific powers and roles in this issue as did other organisations for example the Cam Conservators.
- iii. The focus in item 7 was to the disturbance to the city and people walking around it.
- iv. There was a consultation on which the committee would give their views. Officers had done a significant amount of work on and it would be his job to make a decision after committee had considered the matter.
- v. The significant nuisance issue would be considered under item 7.

Emma Wynne addressed the Committee and made the following supplementary point:

- i. All at La Mimosa really cared about city and would approve of a touting ban in the City centre.

The Leader made the following comment:

- i. There was an argument about operations around the Quayside, if you walked along Bridge Street it wasn't the same as walking through the centre of town, there wasn't the significant nuisance to residents and businesses.

Lynette Gilbert addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She was a Cambridge resident and lived by the river.
- ii. Had a child involved in punting.
- iii. Wanted to support the proposals.
- iv. Conservators of the River Cam could licence as many boats as they wished except for at La Mimosa where numbers were restricted. She did not see it as a free for all, punting was very controlled.
- v. One operator had 60% of the boats. The Competition & Markets Authority stated that a 40% market share represented a dominant position. Young locals who wanted to run a few boats were being prevented from doing so and were then hounded for being illegal.
- vi. Independent Operators tried to sell tickets through shops but the Council sent letters asking retailers not to permit this.
- vii. The Council's website advised people to only buy punt tickets from named operators which made it harder for Independent Operators to be able to sell tickets, which was a restraint of trade.
- viii. Independent Operators wanted the chance to be able to compete on a level playing field and urged the Committee to create a fair, competitive, market by approving the new punt station not just because competition law required it but the young entrepreneurs deserved it.
- ix. Independent Operators were insured. Novices in self hire punts were the problem. The operators were safe and courteous.
- x. Short term a new punt station would allow young entrepreneurs the opportunity to operate 20 boats legitimately.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Decisions on the appropriate location for a new punt station would be a matter for Planning. It was not the Council's position to regulate punt stations.
- ii. The report looked at some of the issues with the existing site at Garret Hostel lane where 20 or so boats were judged to be operating.
- iii. Public land was only a proportion of the land which abutted the river and there was a significant amount of private land which abutted the river.
- iv. A significant part of the decision would be a matter for planning.
- v. The Council could not control whether or not a person submitted a planning application for a punt station.
- vi. The decision was not about making money for the Council, it had to be a balanced decision and whether environmentally or by location other sites would be appropriate.
- vii. Rejected the assertion that the Council was part of a monopoly along the river.

Lynette Gilbert addressed the Committee and made the following supplementary points:

- i. Whilst the Council could not regulate what happened on private land it did have a responsibility to allocate public land and existing punt station equitably and carefully.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. People were free to take applications to Planning Committee and the Planning Committee would consider each application seriously.
- ii. He questioned whether any additional stations could be accommodated at Garret Hostel Lane.

Milan Kozacevich addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. He was a Director of Traditional Cambridge Tours Limited.
- ii. They began trading from Garret Hostel Lane in 2008 on the advice of the former river manager when Jesus Green was closed by the Council as a site.
- iii. Traditional Cambridge Tours had built their company around this site ever since.
- iv. In 2012 the new 6 boat station requirements were brought in by the river authority. Prior to the new requirements being imposed they were in constant contact with the river authority and Council expressing concerns regarding licensing and touting becoming problematic.
- v. Traditional Cambridge Tours had an excellent health and safety record with no accidents and provided comprehensive training to its staff and was fully insured.
- vi. He understood that Councillors may have concerns about the number of touts in Cambridge, however arguments on this subject should not be confused with the viability of further locations to load and unload people on to punts.
- vii. Once a location was established to be safe and was in line with industry standards it must be in the public interest for the Council to explore proposals which provided further funds to the public purse from a growing industry.
- viii. The 20 boats operating from Garrett Hostel represented only 6% of boats on the river and it was unreasonable to suggest that this threatened any of the other established operators many of whom had recently been given permission by the Council to expand their market share and had been thriving in the current state of affairs.
- ix. Councillors were asked not to dismiss any areas for boat stations based on concerns over touting as this could easily be regulated and controlled

through specific caps on numbers and strict behavioural codes of practice. Specific proposals had been made regarding the site which it was hoped would be considered in detail.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Referred to pages 36-37 of the agenda pack and commented that Garret Hostel Lane was not judged to be appropriate as a small scale location for 20 boats.
- ii. There was a proposal for 12 boats that the Conservators were to consider at their Licensing Committee.
- iii. He would point the Committee to what is in the committee report, the Committee would make a judgement and he would listen to the comments and views of the Committee and the public comments that had been made, he had taken notes and would refer to them later.

Public questions regarding Agenda Item 7.

Lynette Gilbert addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. The legislation stated that activities must be unreasonable and justify the grounds to impose a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). Argued that the criteria was not met.
- ii. The Police consultation response contained a number of generalisations about anti-social behaviour, no examples of cautions were provided and was not supported by evidence.
- iii. The city was awash with CCTV so the police could bring an action at any time but they hadn't.
- iv. Notable the word aggressive was used as a synonym for persistent approaches, the two were not the same.
- v. The only evidence the City collected was a survey conducted in 2011
- vi. The report provided a summary in paragraph 5.8, the problem was nuisance not bad behaviour or a criminal offence. Questioned whether a PSPO which criminalised behaviour was a proportionate response.
- vii. The Council had rejected suggestions made by the independent operators, this seemed unfair when the independent operators had tried to use other ways to conduct their business, which had been stopped by the Council.
- viii. Urged the Committee to put the PSPO idea aside and show that they were genuinely willing to work with local independent operators who were trying to make a living with a few punts rather than trying to criminalise them.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. It was a judgement as to whether the PSPO was appropriate; the test referred to was contained on p43 of the agenda pack.
- ii. The issue was whether it was detrimental and persistent and were the activities unreasonable; it was a matter for the Committee to decide.

Tom Arnold addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. He was a Director of Traditional Cambridge Tours Limited.
- ii. Legal advice had been sought from Luke Gittos of Hughmans Solicitors and David Wolf QC of Matrix Chambers who were of the opinion that the PSPO in its current form was open to challenge due to fundamental flaws in the consultation and the process as a whole.
- iii. This was a view shared by civil liberties groups Liberty and The Manifesto Club whose Director would be reporting the matter to the Home Office.
- iv. The 33 complaints received by the Council and the 54% vote in favour of the PSPO represented dissatisfaction with touting as a whole and not simply in the city centre.
- v. People who voted for the PSPO would be surprised when touting continued at Quayside and on Silver Street.
- vi. If an act was genuinely detrimental to the lives of locals then it could not be argued to be less detrimental because it occurred 100 metres up the road, or by the river or by another company.
- vii. Requested that concerns expressed by other punt companies that touting on Kings Parade was unfair were not given serious consideration for reasons of competition.
- viii. The number of touts was the important factor, which could easily be addressed by voluntary control, a blanket ban was disproportionate.
- ix. If the PSPO was to go through regardless and the objective was to stop nuisance touting then it was asked that the PSPO did not cover the passive sale of punting tickets within the PSPO area through shops or market stalls, nor to disallow operators from clearly showing meeting points for internet bookings.
- x. Councillor Herbert rightly identified that there were numerous ways to advertise for business other than touting for internet bookings for example it would be reasonable to have a member of staff at a meeting place dressed in uniform.
- xi. Their staff relied on the company for childcare costs, rent, student loans and bills. Many of these people would not be a burden to their families and the state and it was hoped that the Council had made efforts to research the human impact and financial cost of passing the order.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. Alternative sale routes were part of the consideration.
- ii. There were coach tours coming in and private areas where tickets could be sold.
- iii. He was not aware that the Council had objected to the sale of tickets in private locations. There were opportunities to sell tickets through other routes.
- iv. The key issue was the judgement to be made by the Council, informed by the Committee as to whether the activities were detrimental and significant and whether they justified the order.

5a Public Spaces Protection Order, Mill Road Cemetery, Petersfield Green and the front garden of Ditchburn Place

The decision was noted.

16/19/SR Punting Provision In Cambridge

Matter for Decision

Members were asked to consider if they wished Officers to seek consent to establish a new punt station for independent operators. Granta Mill Pond was considered to be the most suitable location for a new punt station but some of the unlicensed Garret Hostel Lane operators had suggested a smaller scale operation at Garret Hostel Lane. Any new punt station would require planning, Conservator and Environment Agency approvals.

Decision of the Leader

- i. The Council reviewed the topic of providing an extra punt station via the detail included in the report and had considered factors such as the views of elected members and local residents, as well as congestion and likely environmental and planning issues.
- ii. The Council's conclusion was that there was no currently available identified site available on public land adjacent to the river that is suitable for additional development.

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 Property Services.

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

- i. Commented that the ideas on the report would not work and that it would not assist with the issues of touting.
- ii. The report appeared to indicate that individuals had been offered a pitch at La Mimosa, questioned whether there was capacity at La Mimosa and whether individuals had not taken up the pitches because of the terms and conditions attached to the pitches.
- iii. Commented that as a Ward Councillor for Newnham he strongly objected to a new punt station at Mill Pond and Laundress Green, this was a special area in the City, was very close to a rural setting which provided a uniqueness of character to the city centre.

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

- i. The provision of a new punt station could be seen as a pragmatic solution.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The generation of the report was not in response specifically to issues at Garret Hostel Lane, it was an overall review of sites which were public land that might be available.
- ii. The consideration of the four sites included discussions of Garrett Hostel Lane as it was a site that did not have permission and operated 20 boats. The issue was the scale of the site. There were discussions that needed to be had with the Conservators see p36 of the agenda pack.
- iii. There was clear evidence on p36 and p37 of the agenda pack that Garret Hostel Lane was not equipped for the type of operation that was now there.
- iv. Laundress Green was not a commercial site and was an important leisure area within the area.
- v. Jesus Green by the Lock had been part of some discussions but there were still challenges there.
- vi. A balanced judgement was required, there was a significant operation at Granta Mill Pond and looking at the capacity of the site it would not be suitable for a second punt station.
- vii. Referred to amended recommendations.

Councillor Sarris proposed amended recommendations to substitute the recommendations contained within the report as follows (new text underlined, deleted text ~~struck through~~):

- ~~2.1 Members consider if they wish to pursue establishing a new punt station for independent punt operators as set out in this report; and if so~~
- ~~2.2 The preferred location for a new punt station is agreed; and~~
- ~~2.3 Authority is delegated to the Head of Property Services to approve expenditure connected with the new punt station, agree and implement the appropriate application process for licensees and complete the licences.~~

2.1 The Council has reviewed the topic of providing an extra punt station via the detail included in the report and has considered factors such as the views of elected members and local residents, as well as congestion and likely environmental and planning issues.

2.2 The Council's conclusion is that there is no currently identified site available on public land adjacent to the river that is suitable for additional development.

On a show of hands this was agreed by 5 votes to 0.

The amended recommendation was therefore put to the vote:

2.1 The Council has reviewed the topic of providing an extra punt station via the detail included in the report and has considered factors such as the views of elected members and local residents, as well as congestion and likely environmental and planning issues.

2.2 The Council's conclusion is that there is no currently identified site available on public land adjacent to the river that is suitable for additional development.

The Scrutiny Committee considered the amended recommendation and endorsed them by 5 votes to 0.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/20/SR Public Spaces Protection Order – Punt and Tour Touting**Matter for Decision**

The report considered the statutory consultation exercise conducted by the Council in relation to the proposal to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to restrict the advertising or soliciting for custom of a punt tour, walking tour, hire or use of punt boats or similar craft.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Approved the proposed PSPO as worded in Appendix B
- ii. Approved the area of the PSPO as indicated on the map at Appendix A
- iii. Delegated authority to officers to implement signage appropriate to any PSPO that may be agreed.

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 Services.

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

- i. Commented that punting was very popular and that there were huge quantities of money to be made from it. The area needed to be looked at closely. Supported the PSPO.
- ii. Expressed concern as a PSPO was a powerful tool and enabled the Council to outlaw activities which were not against the law of the land. Felt that the Council was mixing its objectives and could be subject to challenge. The focus should be on actual behaviour. The hatched areas of the PSPO were problematic and 'detrimental effect' should be defined.
- iii. Asked if the Council had a contractual relationship with all the operators on the river. Commented that the Committee had previously raised issues about the level of signage and that the level of signage was still very extensive and reading p197 of the agenda pack more would be added. Did not feel that this was the correct way to respond to the issue.
- iv. Asked what the implications were for Granta punts.
- v. Asked what the position was of operators for un-approved punt stations for touting in excepted areas.

Officers said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Council had more control over people with whom the Council had licences with as they could be identified more easily and action could be taken against them if necessary.
- ii. The Council had agreements that restricted touting with 7 operators at La Mimosa, Scudamores at Quayside and Cambridge Chaffeur Punts at Silver Street.
- iii. Confirmed that Granta punts would still be able to tout in excepted areas.
- iv. Stated that the voluntary Code of Practice required operators to be licensed and operate from an approved punt station.

The Leader said the following:

- i. Referred back to p43 of the agenda pack.
- ii. Commented that detrimental effect was a judgement for the Committee.
- iii. He spoke to Cambridge Bid who commented that punt touting was one of the most significant issues for them.
- iv. Noted the points made by Mr Arnold and referred to p81 of the agenda pack with regards to the discussion about kiosks.
- v. Referred to p89 of the agenda pack and the areas of the river where people would get punts.
- vi. There was logic that people near the river were probably interested in punting.
- vii. There was a Destination Management Organisation (DMO) which could make arrangements to sell tickets; this company was independent of the Council. The DMO was free to make its own choices.
- viii. This was a reasonable measure given the interruptions to people going about their day to day life.
- ix. He wanted to get this right.
- x. Signage had been mentioned and commented that there were only a few new sign locations.
- xi. This would be for a 12 month trial period.
- xii. Did not think that this would be the end of the debate but believed it was an appropriate measure given the scale of the impact.

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

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/21/SR Investment Partner**Matter for Decision**

The report recommended the establishment of an Investment Partnership as the best way for the Council to secure its objectives from the redevelopment of many of its sites.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Delegated authority to a Strategic Director to set up an Investment Partnership subject to legal due diligence and following consultation with all members of the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

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 Managing Director, Housing Development Agency.

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

- i. Questioned what would happen to the vehicle if the partner became financially distressed and asked if the Council would have the right to acquire shareholdings.
- ii. Questioned what the scenario was for the vehicle to be wound up either voluntarily or non-voluntarily.
- iii. Commented that it would be difficult to draft the shareholders agreement to cover all eventualities but expressed concern about the counterparty using their position to extract a leverage on a commercial basis.
- iv. Asked what was meant by 'invest' and how the land would be valued.

The Managing Director, Housing Development Agency and Strategic Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Council could write what it wanted into the Member Agreement. The vehicle used would be determined on a site by site basis. These arrangements would be no worse than if the Council used a development agreement.

- ii. The Council would learn from partner agreements that were in place at the moment and ensure that they covered the Council as far as legally possible.
- iii. Would ensure that there were provisions within the member agreement to deal with the scenarios outlined by members.
- iv. Clarified that the term 'invest' meant that the Council would value its land at the point it was put into an investment partnership, technically no money changed hands at this point. The Partner would put money into the scheme. The Council would retain freehold ownership of the land and would either take a capital receipt or take a value of the capital receipt in revenue terms as part of the partnership deal.

Councillor Cantrill requested that all members of the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee were consulted prior to the set-up of an Investment Partnership and that the recommendation was amended accordingly.

The amended recommendation (additional text underlined, deleted text ~~struck through~~):

To delegate authority to a Strategic Director to set up an Investment Partnership subject to legal due diligence and following consultation with ~~the Leader and Opposition Spokesperson~~ all members of the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the amended recommendation.

The Leader approved the amended recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/22/SR Single Equality Scheme 2015-2018

Matter for Decision

This report provided an update on the progress in delivering key actions set out in the Single Equality Scheme for 2015/16. It also proposed some new actions for delivery during 2016/17.

Decision of the Leader

- i. Noted the progress in delivering equalities actions during 2015/16.

- ii. Approved the actions proposed in Appendix A for delivery during 2016/17.

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 Strategy and Partnerships Manager.

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

- i. Thanked the Officer for the work that had been put into the Strategy.
- ii. Referred to objective 5 and commented that they were concerned how representative the City Council's workforce was particularly with regard to BAME employees where representation in the Council's workforce was below the current target and lower than in the Cambridge population as a whole.

The Strategy and Partnerships Manager and the Chief Executive said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Head of Human Resources leads on recruitment and reviews the targets for BAME employees on an annual basis and whether there were any steps that could be taken to increase the BAME representation within the Council. The Council recently carried out a recruitment survey, but the analysis of the responses to the survey did not identify any specific barriers to recruitment of BAME employees.
- ii. The Head of Human Resources produces an annual 'Equality in Employment' report, which provides detailed data and analysis of trends relating to the Council's workforce. The report had been seriously discussed at the Equalities Panel on the 14 June. It revealed a number of issues, including that there were a limited number of BAME applicants for many of the technical roles required by the Council. A number of existing BAME employees were also in posts which had been transferred under TUPE to shared services and other new arrangements, which had an impact on BAME representation in the workforce.

Councillor Bick requested that action 5.1 in the Single Equality Scheme Action Plan be amended to include a specific reference to taking forward work to address BAME representation in the workforce, which was agreed.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/23/SR 2015/16 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Strategy and Transformation Portfolio

Matter for Decision

The report presented a summary for the Strategy and Transformation Portfolio of the actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2015/16 (outturn position). The revenue and capital budget variances with explanations and specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2016/17.

Decision of the Leader

Requested that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources approved:

- i. Carry forward requests totaling £122.65k revenue funding from 2015/16 to 2016/17 as detailed in Appendix C.
- ii. Carry forward requests of £325k capital resources from 2015/16 to 2016/17 to fund rephased net capital spending as detailed in Appendix D.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance.

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

- i. Questioned if there was a different way to present variance information.

- ii. Questioned if the over and underspends on p335 of the agenda packs were one off savings or whether permanent savings could be made.

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

- i. Next year individual overhead variances would be shown against originating cost centres for clarity.
- ii. The underspends were only one-off savings not permanent.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/24/SR Annual Treasury Management (Outturn) Report 2015/16

Matter for Decision

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

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Recommended the report to Council, which included the Council's actual Prudential and Treasury Indicators 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 Finance and the Council's s151 Officer.

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

- i. Asked whether the Council had taken any advice following the EU referendum result regarding counterparty risk and asked if the Council had a strategy for managing volatility or if the Council was evolving a strategy.

The Head of Finance and s151 Officer said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Council followed the advice of Capita which was updated on a daily basis. The Council did not invest in the equity of business and all money was on deposit. Advice indicated that the banks were in a better position now than they were pre-2008. There was still a lot that was unknown following the EU referendum; a set of recommendations had been presented. The Council would work to the savings targets that it had to make.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/25/SR 2015/16 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances - Finance and Resources Portfolio

Matter for Decision

The report presented a summary for the Finance and Resources Portfolio of the actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2015/16 (outturn position). The revenue and capital budget variances with explanations and specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2016/17.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the carry forward requests totalling £233.1k revenue funding from 2015/16 to 2016/17 as detailed in Appendix C.
- ii. Approved the carry forward requests of £3,243k capital resources from 2015/16 to 2016/17 to fund rephrased net capital spending as detailed in Appendix D.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/26/SR 2015/16 Revenue and Capital Outturn, Carry Forwards and Significant Variances – all General Fund Portfolios**Matter for Decision**

The report presented a summary for all the Portfolios of the actual income and expenditure compared to the final budget for 2015/16 (outturn position). The revenue and capital budget variances with explanations as reported to individual Executive Councillors and Scrutiny Committees and specific requests to carry forward funding available from budget underspends into 2016/17.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

To seek Council approval for the:

- i. Carry forward requests totalling £485.3k revenue funding from 2015/16 to 2016/17 as detailed in Appendix C.
- ii. Carry forward requests of £18,616k (including 2,171k relating to the Housing Capital Investment Plan) capital resources from 2015/16 to 2016/17 to fund rephrased net capital spending as detailed in Appendix D – Overview.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Finance.

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

- i. Asked for the Executive Councillor's comments on a revenue underspend of 15.4% and capital HRA and General Fund 40% underspend.
- ii. Questioned the Environmental Improvement variance on p388 of the agenda pack. Asked that the Executive Councillor worked with his colleagues to deliver the projects and expressed concern regarding the internal audit report which was reported to the Civic Affairs Committee on 29 June 2016.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. The areas of underspend would be looked at to see whether a permanent saving could be made or if it was a one-time specific instance. With regards to the HRA the Council wanted to invest and had an ambitious capital programme.
- ii. The Environmental Improvement programme involved a lot of small schemes which took time to complete. He would work with colleagues to try to ensure that schemes were completed but commented that these schemes did take a lot of officer time.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 7.32 pm

CHAIR