

Public Document Pack

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee

S&R/1

Monday, 10 October 2016

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

10 October 2016

5.00 - 8.30 pm

Present: Councillors Sarris, Barnett (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Baigent, Bick, Cantrill, 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

Strategic Director: Suzanne McBride

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Finance: Caroline Ryba

Head of Legal Practice: Tom Lewis

Asset Manager (S&OS): Alistair Wilson

Operations Manager (Community Engagement and Enforcement): Wendy Young

Committee Manager: Sarah Steed

Other Officers:

City Deal: Aaron Blowers

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

16/27/SR Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received, however it was noted that Councillor Barnett would Chair the meeting.

16/28/SR Declarations of Interest

Item	Councillor	Interest
16/36/SR	Robertson	Personal: Council Representative Cam Conservators. Had no interest to declare in relation to rowing

		or property development.
16/36/SR	Barnett	Personal: Alumna of Kings College Boat Club
16/36/SR	Sarris	Personal: Had college affiliations but no interest to declare in rowing

16/29/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meetings held on the 4 July 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

16/30/SR Public Questions

Public questions regarding Agenda item 10 taken when the agenda item was discussed.

Amy Spencer addressed the Committee and made the following point:

- i. Asked if anyone on the Riverside was going to be made homeless.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The consultation was looking at a range of options.
- ii. If it was decided that registered boats with people living aboard needed to be moved off Riverside then alternative moorings would be found for them, if necessary, moorings would be increased temporarily.
- iii. Some moorers may be entitled to housing benefit.

Amy Spencer addressed the Committee and made the following further point:

- i. In the 2014 consultation people were told that they would not be evicted, she asked what had changed since then.
- ii. Made reference to a decision to discontinue banning mooring.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. There was a requirement for individuals who moored to register with the Council.

- ii. Assurances had not been given that people would not be displaced.

Kate Hurst addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She was from Cambridge and had attended 6th form in Cambridge.
- ii. She was involved with a Boat Club; rowing teams felt positivity towards moorers.
- iii. There were financial pressures for people who had boats. She had been told that charges would be in line with Council Tax Band A and would not be liable to pay inflation linked prices.
- iv. Moorers were locked into mortgages with little or no alternative place to go.
- v. Believed this was an affordable housing issue.
- vi. A change in fees would force her to sell up.
- vii. Asked if doubling mooring fees was appropriate.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. Mooring fees had been benchmarked against other authorities for example Oxford City Council; Cambridge City Council charged less.
- ii. As part of the consultation process feedback was requested on the appropriate level of mooring fee.

Kate Hurst addressed the Committee and made the further following point:

- i. A comparison of mooring fees with other authorities was valid however doubling mooring fees was not fair.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The impacts of any changes to the Mooring Policy would need to be considered.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments:

- i. He wanted to make sure that people had full knowledge of the financial support that was available to them.
- ii. The consultation was an open consultation and he wanted to hear people's concerns and what issues there were.

Sarah Airey addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She had lived in Cambridge for 15 years and had lived in a boat for 2 years, this decision had been made following information provided by the Council.

- ii. Doubling the mooring fee would change the Council Tax Band to the second highest Council Tax Band, she asked what the justification was for this.
- iii. She also asked when there was a problem with affordable housing provision why the Council would get rid of an affordable housing option.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The justification for the increased fee was to enable the Council to invest more funding into mooring services and so that the fees were comparable with other providers. No assurances had been given regarding the level of mooring fee.

Sarah Airey addressed the Committee and made the further following points:

- i. It was not easy living off the grid, she liked the lifestyle and mooring community. Many of the residents felt that the moorings would become a community for holiday homes.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. There was a requirement for people living at the moorings that it was their main residence.

Eleanor Lad addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She was a teacher and had been denied the right to moor. She was also attending as an NBTA representative.
- ii. Asked members what interests they had in property development companies and rowing.
- iii. Asked that this issue was referred back to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee rather than the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee, as the Resources Committee would only be interested in the financial aspects of the issue.
- iv. Health and safety issues had been raised however there had been no incidents on the railings.
- v. There was congestion on the river but this was due to the rowers, there were too many rowers on the river and they rowed late into the night.
- vi. Proposed that a 20 week consultation was undertaken rather than an 8 week consultation.
- vii. Wanted mooring to move to the Housing Department and be based on genuine need and asked that the NBTA were involved in the process.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The Council had a duty of care to towards people who moored at the Riverside under the Occupiers Liability Act.
- ii. An 8 week consultation was considered appropriate and was in accordance with the Gunning Principles.

Eleanor Lad addressed the Committee and made the further following points:

- i. Concerns had been expressed about safety and no-one had ever had an accident at the mooring, if the Council was that worried then the moorings should be improved.
- ii. Questioned what was being done about the Council Tax refunds and people who were being taken to court in view of the consultation being undertaken.
- iii. Asked about moving the moorings to the Housing Department.
- iv. Asked what would be done about people using moorings as buy to let.
- v. The Gunning Principles advised a 20 week consultation period and not an 8 week period.
- vi. Confirmed would be happy to act as a mooring representative at any meeting and commented that every person on the river needed to have their specific circumstances taken into account.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources made the following comments:

- i. Confirmed that he would meet with the mooring community to discuss issues that had been raised.
- ii. The consultation had to be reasonable and an 8 week period was suitable.
- iii. Every person on the river would be given a copy of the consultation documentation.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The objective of the consultation was to gain feedback on proposals.
- ii. Confirmed that he had contact details for all those who had a river mooring licence and would ensure that they had copies of the consultation documentation. Other avenues to communicate the consultation included social media, press releases, online and paper consultation documentation.

James Tidy addressed the Committee and made the further following points:

- i. Commented that this was the 5th or 6th meeting that he had attended about the same issue.
- ii. Referred to a report in 2009 and Community Services Scrutiny documentation from 25th March 2010 which had not been referred to in the Officers report.
- iii. Commented that the Council had said it would consult with stakeholders but also said that they could not meet with everyone, he hoped this would be addressed.
- iv. Over the past 8 years Cam Boaters had had a good relationship with Councillors and Councillor O'Reilly.
- v. Asked why Cam Boaters had not been involved in the drafting of the consultation documentation and why meetings with them had not taken place.
- vi. Felt they were being promised things which did not then happen and wanted the decision to be fair and equitable.
- vii. Requested that the consultation was postponed, re-drafted and other options included.
- viii. Asked if consultants had drafted the consultation documentation as the language did not follow previous consultation style.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comment:

- i. The style of the consultation documentation was different due to the important issues involved.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources confirmed that consultants had not been used. The consultation involved a huge number of people with lots of different interests which needed to be captured.

Nicky Quinn addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. He was a member of Cam Boaters.
- ii. The increase in fees proposed would threaten the ability of people to live on the river and explained why people wanted to live on the river rather than in a marina.
- iii. The environmentally friendly life style could be found on every boat.
- iv. Conducted a business providing food boxes and provided free herbal medicines to residents.
- v. He commented that it was 'homelessness day' that day.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) commented that any fee or charges needed to be reasonable and proportionate.

Amy Tillson addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. People were welcomed into the mooring community and this would be lost if they were priced out of the market.
- ii. They did not get refuse or waste removal services.
- iii. The river provided a supportive community and provided affordable housing.
- iv. There was a wide variety of people who lived on the river who had children at local schools.
- v. People could be left homeless with the increases to fees proposed.
- vi. Living on the river was not a luxury lifestyle, which was starting to look unaffordable. The licence fee had doubled for those on low incomes and had a 100% increase compared to the level of fees two years ago.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) commented that the consultation was trying to find a balance and the level of fees would be looked at as part of the consultation process.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources commented that whilst he had been responding to members of the public he became aware that some of those living on the river were unaware that housing benefit was available to help pay mooring fees, subject to means testing.

Melissa McGreechan addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. She had lived on the river since 2014 and had held a licence since 2013.
- ii. Referred to the consultation and asked for an assurance that the changes proposed were not to maximise income but to improve services provided to people who lived on the river.
- iii. Commented that the mooring licence was £1200 and not £1050, the fee had increased by 4%, in comparison to Council Tax which had increased by 2%.
- iv. Asked how the mooring fees were invested or spent and asked that a simple document was provided in writing to residents to explain what services residents got for the fees that they paid.
- v. Asked what the proposed improvements were that had been talked about and how much these would cost.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. When the consultation was drafted it was envisaged income could be generated by an increase in the mooring fee.

- ii. The difference between the mooring fees was a VAT issue.
- iii. In 2010 the mooring fee was linked to the RPI, which at that time was less than Council Tax increases.
- iv. The mooring fees collected were used: to make a payment to the Cam Conservators, to make payments towards water and sewage pump outs, a contribution was made towards litter collection and a sum of money went towards enforcement. A report could be sent detailing exactly what the fees were spent on.

Jim Ross addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- i. He was speaking as Chair of the Cam Boaters and welcomed a meaningful consultation but felt the current consultation was biased.
- ii. The current proposal would reduce the community by a third.
- iii. The Council wanted a simple mooring policy but the current consultation would not achieve this and evicting boats would not achieve this.
- iv. An increase in fees would be challenged, by those made homeless, displaced moorers and disgruntled landowners.
- v. Proposed that moorings were extended to Riverside, which was supported by an external Health and Safety expert.

The Asset Manager (Street and Open Spaces) made the following comments:

- i. The points made were received and welcomed, the consultation was a way to collect people's views.
- ii. Meetings with Cam Boaters were scheduled and the consultation results may propose a hybrid solution.
- iii. Health and Safety issues were significant and significant investment was needed. The Council had a duty of care under the Occupiers Liability Act.

Jim Ross addressed the Committee and made the following further point:

- i. If the Council took over the moorings at riverside, many issues could be sorted out.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources referred to point 9 of the consultation document which asked for any other comments and asked that people detailed any concerns that they had in that section, if they could not be covered elsewhere in the documentation.

Public questions regarding Agenda item 6 taken when the agenda item was discussed.

Bev Nicholson addressed the Committee and made the following point:

- i. With regard to the City Deal she did not understand the balance of campaign groups submitting questions and officers / Councillors being able to answer questions, it was not clear what the report was proposing.

The Head of Corporate Strategy confirmed that an agenda for the City Deal meetings would be published a week before the meeting and anyone who wanted to submit a question had to submit the question three days before the meeting.

Re-ordering the Agenda

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

16/31/SR Public Spaces Protection Orders for Dog Control

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report asked the Executive Councillor to approve, in principle, the proposal to make Public Spaces Protection Orders in respect of dog control (including dog fouling, dog exclusion and dogs on leads requirements) within Cambridge, in the form set out in the revised Appendix A and the locations set out in the revised Appendix B; and to authorise officers to publicise the proposed orders and to consult, as required by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Approved, in principle, the proposal to make Public Spaces Protection Orders for dog control within Cambridge in the form set out in the revised Appendix A and the locations set out in the revised Appendix B;
- ii. Authorised officers to publicise the proposed orders and to carry out consultation as required by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

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 Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement.

A revised Appendix A and B had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting which would replace the versions contained within the published agenda pack.

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

- i. Would be using clearer powers under the Public Spaces Protection Orders to address some inconsistencies which had been spotted in the current Dog Control Orders, this would make future enforcement clearer.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Leader approved the amended recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/32/SR Amendments to City Deal Executive Board and Assembly Standing Orders**Matter for Decision**

The proposal to modify Standing Orders aimed to improve the way public questions worked at the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board and Joint Assembly. The changes increased the amount of notice required to submit a public question before the meeting, whilst aiming to maintain the amount of time between publication of agenda and deadline for questions. The changes also ensured questions related to agenda items (whilst retaining Chair's discretion on this), and limited the number of words in a question.

The proposals reflected learning from the first year and a half of the

Executive Board and Joint Assembly, member feedback and suggestions from several key stakeholders who had exercised their public speaking rights at the Board and Assembly. These included Cambridge Past, Present and Future, Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations, Cambridge Cycling Campaign, Smarter Cambridge Transport, Coton Parish Council and Madingley Parish Council.

Greater notice given for public questions and making public questions more focused should improve transparency in decision-making and public information, as well as the efficient discharge of City Deal business.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. To recommend to Council to endorse the proposed modified Standing Orders for the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board which were tabled at the 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 Head of Corporate Strategy.

A tracked changed version of the changes to the standing orders was tabled at the meeting following inconsistencies being highlighted in the version contained in the agenda pack.

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

- i. The changes proposed made sense as some of the public questions asked could require technical answers which Officers would need time to consider. However expressed concern about narrowing the scope regarding what questions could be asked and that there was no provision for supplementary questions.

The Leader said the following:

- i. He believed that the Committee should stick with the recommendations as proposed as there was flexibility within the standing orders.

- ii. He would raise the issue regarding supplementary questions with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Assembly.

An additional recommendation was proposed by Councillor Bick to ask the Executive Councillor to seek further agreement for provision for supplementary questions. This amendment was lost by 2 votes in favour to 4 against.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions to endorse the amended recommendations.

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.

16/33/SR Devolution Proposals for Cambridgeshire & Peterborough consultation results

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report gave the committee and Leader an opportunity to discuss the devolution consultation ahead of a decision at Full Council.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Noted the consultation responses.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Chief Executive.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. There were different views on the devolution deal; but the affordable housing money for Cambridge City council housing and wider affordable housing funding were both invaluable to Cambridge and addressed one of the biggest challenges facing the City.

- ii. The powers of the Mayor would be limited to those contained within the devolution documentation, and there needed to be someone in charge who was accountable.
- iii. There would be a full debate on this matter at the special Council meeting.

The Committee noted the report.

The Leader noted the report and consultation responses.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/34/SR Use Of Body Worn Cameras By Public Realm Enforcement Officers

Matter for Decision

Body Worn Cameras (BWCs) have been in use in the UK since 2006, and the officer's report provided information to members on the introduction of BWC for Enforcement Officers (EOs), as a means of improving 'incident specific' evidence, personal safety and improving the delivery of environmental crime enforcement within Cambridge.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Noted the contents of the report and agreed to the implementation of the use of Body Worn Cameras by Enforcement Officers as outlined in the report from 10 October 2016.
- ii. Authorised the purchase of Body Worn Cameras from the Fixed Penalty Notice fund.
- iii. Approved the Code of Practice and Operational Procedure, as set out in Appendix A and B respectively, of the Officer's report subject to the insertion in the Purpose Statement of the Code of Practice (s.3, p.181) of an additional bullet point with the words: to promote officer compliance with council policies and procedures and to the addition to the end of Recording section of the Operational Procedure (s3.4, p.188) of a sentence with the words: Recording may also be instigated by Council Officers at the request of a member of the public who is being engaged by an Enforcement Officer.
- iv. Requested officers brought as part of the annual CCTV report to the scrutiny committee on operation of Body Worn Cameras, showing:

- Frequency of making recordings
- Conformance with storage duration guidelines
- Actual use of recordings for the purposes defined
- Supply of recordings to other agencies
- Availability of recordings of incidents where a public complaint is later made

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 Operations Manager – Community Engagement and Enforcement.

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

- i. Body worn cameras would offer a source of protection to the public as well as to officers.
- ii. Questioned how it could be ensured that cameras were switched on when they needed to be.

Officers said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The public can ask that Officers turn on their cameras if the member of the public wants the incident to be recorded. A light showed when the camera was recording.

Councillor Bick proposed the following amendments (additional text underlined):

Add to end of Recommendation (3):

Approve the Code of Practice and Operational Procedure, as set out in Appendix A and B respectively of this report:

- subject to the insertion in the Purpose Statement of the Code of Practice (s.3, p.181) of an additional bullet point with the words: *to promote officer compliance with council policies and procedures*

- subject to the addition to the end of Recording section of the Operational Procedure (s3.4, p.188) of a sentence with the words: *Recording may also be instigated by Council Officers at the request of a member of the public who is being engaged by an Enforcement Officer.*

Add further recommendation 4:

Request officers to bring as part of the annual CCTV report to the scrutiny committee on operation of Body Worn Cameras, showing:

- Frequency of making recordings
- Conformance with storage duration guidelines
- Actual use of recordings for the purposes defined
- Supply of recordings to other agencies
- Availability of recordings of incidents where a public complaint is later made

On a show of hands this was agreed unanimously.

The amended recommendation was therefore put to the vote:

- v. Note the contents of the report and agreed to the implementation of the use of Body Worn Cameras by Enforcement Officers as outlined in the report from 10 October 2016.
- vi. Authorise the purchase of Body Worn Cameras from the Fixed Penalty Notice fund.
- vii. Approve the Code of Practice and Operational Procedure, as set out in Appendix A and B respectively, of the Officer's report subject to the insertion in the Purpose Statement of the Code of Practice (s.3, p.181) of an additional bullet point with the words: *to promote officer compliance with council policies and procedures* and to the addition to the end of Recording section of the Operational Procedure (s3.4, p.188) of a sentence with the words: *Recording may also be instigated by Council Officers at the request of a member of the public who is being engaged by an Enforcement Officer.*
- viii. Request officers to bring as part of the annual CCTV report to the scrutiny committee on operation of Body Worn Cameras, showing:
 - Frequency of making recordings
 - Conformance with storage duration guidelines

- Actual use of recordings for the purposes defined
- Supply of recordings to other agencies
- Availability of recordings of incidents where a public complaint is later made

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the amended recommendations.

The Leader approved the amended recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

16/35/SR Shared Internal Audit Services

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided the business case to establish a Shared Audit Service (SAS) between the Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District and detailed the activity to create it.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Approved the Business Case and delegate authority to the Strategic Director to make decisions and to take steps which are necessary, conducive or incidental to the establishment of the SAS in accordance with the business case.

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 Strategic Director.

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

- i. Welcomed proposals which improved efficiencies in accordance with current shared service arrangements.

- ii. Asked for an assurance that members would get the same access to audit functions as they currently do and that there would be no reduction in the number of audit days. Going forward there would be the same flexibility as currently to re-direct audit work if the need arose.
- iii. Asked whether there would be a reduction to the audit service after the first year.

Offices said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Confirmed that members would continue to have the same access to audit functions as they currently did and that audit resources could be re-prioritised if the need arose.
- ii. There were currently no plans to reduce the audit service, the performance could be reviewed after the first year of operation of the shared service.

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. The hours put in by the Civic Affairs Committee and Audit Team was effective in tackling issues which needed to be looked into.
- ii. There was currently no proposal to change the level of audit services.
- iii. The role of the Civic Affairs Committee would continue.
- iv. A shared service would increase the resilience and robustness of the audit service.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

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.

16/36/SR Review of River Moorings Policy

Matter for Decision

The report considered and proposed a consultation on a range of issues and options relating to a revised River Moorings Policy (RMP).

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Instructed Officers to consult on the range of issues and options relating to the River Moorings Policy (including the revised consultation document) as amended at the Strategy and Resources

Scrutiny Committee meeting and to report back to a future Committee with findings and further recommendations.

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 (Street and Open Spaces).

Reference was made to a revised consultation document which had been published on the Council's website prior to the Committee meeting and amended the consultation document to:

- i. Remove references in item 1 to market testing and auctioning of licences.
- ii. Remove paragraphs 1.3-1.6
- iii. Include a new paragraph 1.3 which asked people about alternative methods for determining fees and charges.
- iv. Remove reference within paragraph 4.1 to auctioning of licences.
- v. Include new paragraphs 4.2 and 4.4 which asked for other solution ideas.
- vi. Add new paragraph 6.3 which sought feedback on increasing the number of licences.
- vii. Make amendments were made to the regulation scheme at paragraph 8.2.

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

- i. One Councillor was concerned by the options being put forward. Appeared that the Council had a desire to see moorings as an income generator. Thought that time should be taken to look at the consultation and then it should be started again.
- ii. Another said the river was an important community within the City and should be valued by residents of the City. Was deeply concerned by this proposal. Commented that £75,000 had been allocated earlier to improve the moorings but this funding had since been removed. Would encourage the consultation to be parked and re-started at a future point.
- iii. The Government grant to the Council would not exist from 2018 funding options for all services needed to be reviewed and that meant

the river therefore also needed to be looked at. There were many competing interests on the river and suggested comments on this issue could be submitted through the consultation.

- iv. Representations would be heard from a broad range of people including taking account of all comments from those living on the river. The consultation would respect and take into account equality and diversity issues. All the points made today would be fed into the consultation.
- v. Requested confirmation that an increase in mooring fees would provide money in addition to the £65,000 which the surplus in his view should be allocated to improving riverside facilities for mooring users.

The Executive Councillor said the following:

- i. He felt it was important to issue a press release in advance of the meeting and increase awareness of the planned consultation
- ii. He wanted to enhance the facilities for people who lived on the river.
- iii. The consultation was an open consultation, the last question acknowledged that the Council wanted to hear about any other ideas.
- iv. Needed to hear the views from those who lived on the river.
- v. There was time within the proposed 8 week consultation to talk to people and following this to develop any necessary revisions to the proposals.
- vi. The total income of the mooring was £63-65,000, of which £35,000 included direct costs to the service.

Councillor Cantrill proposed amended recommendations, the first amendment proposed 'To pause and not approve the proposals but to defer this issue to a future meeting to encourage the Executive Councillor and Officer to consider issues which had been raised at the meeting'.

On a show of hands this amendment was lost by 2 votes in favour to 4 against.

Councillor Cantrill proposed a second amendment that 'The Executive Councillor acknowledged the uniqueness of boat people and that any increase in fees was limited to the CPI as had been the case since 2010'.

On a show of hands this amendment was lost by 2 votes in favour to 4 against.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources put forward an amendment (deleted text ~~struck through~~, additional text underlined) to

section 3.7 (page 3) of the Review of River Moorings Policy report and deleted the wording ~~Annual mooring licences to be allocated by public auction~~ and replaced with Mooring fees to be benchmarked with comparable mooring providers. A revised consultation document was circulated to members.

The Committee considered the amendments made to recommendation including the amendments to the Moorings Policy and consultation documentation and endorsed them by 4 votes to 2.

The Executive Councillor approved the amended recommendation.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/37/SR Treasury Management Half Yearly Update Report 2016/17

Matter for Decision

The Council adopted The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management (revised 2011).

The Code required as a minimum receipt by full Council of an Annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement which includes the Annual Investment Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for the year ahead, a half-year review report and an Annual Report (stewardship report) covering activities in the previous year.

The half-year report had been prepared in accordance with CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management and covers the following:-

- The Council's capital expenditure (prudential indicators);
- A review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2016/17;
- A review of the Council's borrowing strategy for 2016/17;
- A review of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and

Annual Investment Strategy;

- A review of the Council's investment portfolio for 2016/17; and;
- An update on interest rate forecasts following economic news in the first half of the 2016/17 financial year.

In line with the Code of Practice, all treasury management reports have been presented to both Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee and to Full Council.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources to recommend to the Council to:

- i. Approve the Treasury Management Half Yearly Update Report 2016/17, which includes the Council's estimated Prudential and Treasury Indicators 2016/17 to 2019/20.
- ii. Approve the amendments to the Counter Party limits as follows:

Name	Recommended Limit (£)
Enhanced Cash Funds (Standard & Poor's: AAAs/S1, Fitch AAAs/V1)	10m (in each fund)
CCLA Local Authorities' Property Fund	15m

- iii. Approve the increase to the upper limit on principal sums to be deposited for over 1 year to £50m.
- iv. Approve an amendment to the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy for 2016/17.
- v. Agree to remove Deutsche Bank from the Counter Party list.

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 whether the Council had invested in Deutsche Bank and if the Bank could be suspended from the Counter Party list. Also requested

that Counterparties that did not meet the criteria should be removed or suspended from the Counter Party list.

- ii. Requested that future reports contained an analysis on any changes to the way in which money was invested into assets.
- iii. Asked about the liquidity of the Council's assets.

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

- i. Deutsche Bank was put on the investment list 2-3 years ago when it had sufficient credit status. The Council had never used them and would not do so (referred to p277 of the agenda pack). The Council used Capita's creditor criteria before any investment were made and Deutsche Bank did not meet this criteria.
- ii. Confirmed that the Council had various investments which could be liquidated / accessed in a variety of different periods of time.

The Executive Councillor confirmed that the General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy report contained further information on borrowing money and the changes to the way in which the Council was looking to invest its money.

Councillor Cantrill proposed an additional recommendation that Deutsche Bank was removed from the Counter Party list.

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

The Executive Councillor approved the amended recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/38/SR General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy - October 2016

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report presented and recommended the budget strategy for the 2017/18 budget cycle and specific implications, as outlined in the Mid-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) October 2016 document.

The report also recommended the approval of new capital items and funding proposals for the Council's Capital Plan, the results of which are shown in the MTFS.

At this stage in the 2017/18 budget process the range of assumptions on which the Budget-Setting Report (BSR) published in February 2016 was based need to be reviewed, in light of the latest information available, to determine whether any aspects of the strategy need to be revised. This then provides the basis for updating budgets for 2017/18 to 2021/22. All references in the recommendations to Appendices, pages and sections relate to the MTFS Version 1.

The recommended budget strategy is based on the outcome of the review undertaken together with financial modelling and projections of the Council's expenditure and resources, in the light of local policies and priorities, national policy and economic context. Service managers have identified financial and budget issues and pressures and this information has been used to inform the MTFS.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources to recommend to Council to:

General Fund Revenue

- i. Agree the budget strategy and timetable as outlined in Section [pages 1 to 2 refer] of the MTFS document.
- ii. Agree incorporation of the budget savings, pressures, proposals and rephasings identified in Section 4 (pages 13 to 15 refer). This provides an indication of the net savings requirements, by year for the next 5 years, and revised General Fund revenue, funding and reserves projections as shown in Section 5 (page 16 refers) of the MTFS document.

Capital

- i. Allocate £20m in the Capital Plan for investment in a new programme of commercial property acquisition with the emphasis on security of assets and their income stream and
- ii. Delegate authority to the Head of Property Services to identify and invest in suitable commercial property up to £20m (inclusive of

acquisition costs) in consultation with the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources, the Chair and Opposition Spokesperson for Strategy & Resources Scrutiny Committee and the Head of Finance.

- iii. Note the changes to the Capital Plan as set out in Section 6 [pages 17 to 21 refer] of the MTFS document and agree the new proposals:

Ref.	Description	2016/17 £000
Proposals		
SC631	Grand Arcade car park LED lights	194
SC622	Grafton East car park LED lights	137
SC629	Abbey Pools air plant upgrade	46
SC630	Abbey Pools solar thermal upgrade	49
SC625	Lammas Land kiosk improvements	20
SC623	Environment and cycling improvements in Water Street and Fen Road	50

Ref.	Description	2016/17 £000
PR038	Investment in commercial property	20,000
Misc	Section 106 miscellaneous	1,084
Total Proposals		21,579

Reserves

- i. Agree changes to General Fund Reserve levels, with the Prudent Minimum Balance being set at £5.31m and the target level at £6.37m as detailed in Section 7 [pages 22 to 25 refer].

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 on what basis it was concluded that the Council should invest in commercial property and what type of commercial property the Council would invest in.
- ii. Questioned income and staffing underspend and the £200,000 contribution to the Sharing Prosperity Fund.
- iii. Commented that bids for the Sharing Prosperity Fund were being processed at the moment.

The Executive Councillor made the following comments:

- i. The Council needed to make its assets earn money to bridge the £2.2 million budget gap. The Council's portfolio was currently heavily reliant on retail commercial property and would look at warehouse and office investment opportunities to balance the portfolio.
- ii. The Sharing Prosperity Fund was the Anti-Poverty fund, currently the fund was in danger of running out before the end of the current financial year.
- iii. Confirmed that a review of the Sharing Prosperity Fund had been presented to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee in June but a briefing note on the Fund would be made available to Councillors to explain the bidding process for the fund and provide clarification on the allocation.

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

The Executive Councillor approved the amended recommendations.

Subsequent to the meeting the Head of Finance requested a change to recommendation 2.2 to add the wording (underlined) 'budget savings, pressures, proposals and rephasings' to properly cross reference the MTFS document as detailed in recommendation 2.2.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

16/39/SR Decision Sheet

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank