

Public Document Pack

Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee

S&R/1

Monday, 20 March 2017

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

20 March 2017

5.00 - 8.05 pm

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

Executive Councillors: Herbert (Leader of the Council) and Robertson (Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources)

Officers:

Chief Executive: Antoinette Jackson

Strategic Director: David Edwards

Strategic Director: Suzanne McBride

Director of Planning and Economic Development: Stephen Kelly

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Revenues and Benefits: Alison Cole

Head of Legal Services: Tom Lewis

Head of Human Resources: Deborah Simpson

Head of Digital and ICT at 3C Shared Services: Paul Sumpter

Organisational Development Manager: Vince Webb

Asset Manager- Streets and Open Spaces: Alistair Wilson

Asset Manager- Estates and Facilities: Will Barfield

Committee Manager: Emily Watts

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

17/1/SR Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

17/2/SR Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Barnett	17/06/SR	Personal: Kings College Boat Club Alumni.
Councillor Sarris	17/06/SR	Personal: Employee of

		Cambridge University and Trinity College.
Councillor Herbert	17/10/SR	Personal: has undertaken planning consultancy training for councillors as an employee of Anglia Ruskin University.
Councillor Cantrill	17/11/SR	Personal: Standing as the Liberal Democrat candidate in the Mayoral election on 4 May 2017
Councillor Robertson	17/6/SR	Had resigned as a Cam Conservator therefore had no interest to declare but wanted to clarify for the record.

17/3/SR Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meetings held on 23 January 2017 and 13 February 2017 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chair.

17/4/SR Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Mark Evans raised the following points:
 - i. He stated that he was pleased with the public response to the consultation and concerning Riverside. He welcomed a technical solution to improving the safety of Riverside but the suggested approach only accommodated 7 vessels, what about the remaining vessels that were currently docked on this site? Could more gates not put in?
 - ii. Would a housing needs assessment be done prior to implementation for the people who would be negatively impacted?

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) and Strategic Director responded:

- i. Making adaptations at Riverside is technically very complex and only 7 spaces are possible. The council would offer a solution to those displaced from Riverside.

- ii. A housing needs assessment would be undertaken in partnership with surrounding Authorities.

2. Charlotte Synge raised the following points:

- i. Why had Cambridge City Council claimed ownership of the Riverside Dock?
- ii. When so many people want the moorings on the Riverside to remain, what was the Council gaining by moving all the existing vessels and spending large sums of money on building gates for only 7 moorings? Was the burden of the cost and maintenance considered worthwhile?

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) and Strategic Director responded:

- i. The report to Committee (2011) established that Cambridge City Council owned the freehold of the land at Riverside.
- ii. The consultation highlighted the strength of view to retain moorings on Riverside, and the Council had made a commitment to securing 7 moorings. There were a number of complex factors including cost which impacted on the decision to limit the amount of mooring that the council could safely provide.

3. Kate Hurst raised the following points:

- i. As a law abiding citizen who looked after her boat and maintained the surrounding area well, she felt that the proposals targeted her unfairly. The proposals were highly detrimental and an ongoing cause for concern.
- ii. The licence fee increase meant that her contribution would rise by 40% because she would be impacted by both the licence fee increase and council tax contribution. At present over half of her income was already spent on housing; she could not afford for it to rise any higher. What would happen if the increase could not be paid? Would residents be forced to pay or forced to leave?

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) responded:

- i. The fees and charges proposals considered a range of models:
 - the single person discount was a discretionary discount on the River Moorings Licence
 - charging by length
 - charging by width
 - charging by both length and width

- ii. A tariff scheme based on length was the industry norm; therefore a single person discount would duplicate the offer when applied to those on a smaller boat. To allow a reduction across most tariffs and create discounts for smaller boats was seen as more equitable and fair.
- iii. The boat length would determine the fee not the occupancy in a situation where there was considerable pressure on the length of river bank where the City Council can accommodate moorings.
- iv. If there was an issue of affordability, the council would encourage residents to discuss options and support with the Housing Advice Service.

4. Andy Rankin raised the following point:

- i. We understand that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources resigned from his position as a Cam Conservator because it would have posed a conflict of interest. However, the decision by him to launch the consultation was made whilst he was a Conservator. What was the Council's position on this?

The Head of Legal Practice responded:

- i. As the Monitoring Officer he confirmed that the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources did not have a conflict of interest at that time because the decision was to undertake a consultation exercise with no other decision made at that time.

5. Ana Felix raised the following points:

- i. The Council had a duty to assess the housing needs of its residents including those living in camper vans and boats. How and when were you planning to undertake this for residents living in houseboats?
- ii. What facility do you have in place to alleviate the immediate impact of the fee increase?

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. The council has made a commitment to deliver a needs assessment and would ensure close engagement with the communities throughout the process. The assessment would focus on caravan and houseboat accommodation jointly, aiming to identify accurately the number of households, and future level of need in the area. There was limited space on the river so it was unlikely that the council would be able to meet all this need. Once the assessment was completed needs could be met in a variety of ways; through the socially rented or

commercially rented sectors, or through private ownership of sites or bricks-and-mortar housing and houseboats.

6. Sarah Airey raised the following points:

- i. In October we were assured that the consultation would listen to the views of boaters. However, we only recently found out about the planned change to end the single occupancy discount, which was not previously included/ mentioned throughout the consultation exercise. The removal of the single occupancy discount would impact two thirds of the boating community, increasing fees by between 30% and 50%. This changed the overall nature of the mooring fee. The current discount reflected the services boaters had. The increase would put a disproportionate levy on single occupants.
- ii. Something this important should have been included in the consultation. The size of boats cannot be altered so the fees were neither realistic nor fair.

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. The impact of ending the single occupancy discount would differ depending upon the length of vessel.
- ii. Housing benefit was available if individuals had difficulty meeting their housing costs. The council is very proactive to ensure people get the benefits that they are entitled to.
- iii. The consultation did not specifically raise the single occupancy discount; but it had been raised as an issue. Charging by length is fairer. A single occupancy discount would duplicate the offer when applied to those on a smaller boat.

7. Eleanor Tattam raised the following points:

- i. She had been on the waiting list for a mooring licence for four years and it was unlikely that she would be granted one in the future. Her boat had been moored in a legal mooring area but is due to be evicted despite the fact that she had nowhere else to go. She had a large mortgage with no option to sell her boat. She worked hard and was willing to pay for the mooring but the stress and uncertainty was impacting on the health of her and her family.
- ii. She had sent countless letters and petitions to the council but she did not feel that she had been listened to. If she was forced out of Cambridge she would lose her job and her children would have to move schools. There were empty spaces next to her current mooring, why could she not have a licence there?

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. Committee was not the appropriate place to deal with an individual's case. The Council's policy on enforcement is clear and will be upheld. There were hundreds of people on the waiting list so if moorings are not regulated it would be unworkable. The council did not regard moorings as a form of social housing and if boaters cannot legally moor they would be regarded as homeless.
- ii. There were some moorings which are being left empty; they had been saved for the licenced vessels which will move from Riverside.

8. James Tidy raised the following points:

- i. He noted that the 7 new spaces to be created on Riverside would be filled by a ballot. However, the vessel eligibility criterion means that those over a certain length could not apply. This suggested that the successful vessels had already been decided.
- ii. The present fees subsidised the cost of water and heating at Jesus Green Lido. Other river front management costs such as bin collections would still have to be undertaken whether boats were present or not.
- iii. Claims that the consultation data was unreliable because it was backed by a campaign also meant that the research and data that the council had been working from was also unreliable. The financial figures that Camboaters collated did not match the Council's; Camboaters would welcome them sharing how they are broken down.

The Asset Manager (Streets & Open Spaces) responded:

- i. Due to the nature of the consultation, most of the respondents would have been from a specific interested sector of the community. As such, although the results were indicative they were not representative of the city population. The exercise had been invaluable in understanding the river.
- ii. There were different ways to account for direct and indirect costs, often the figures were referred to without the indirect costs for example, contributions to council support services. Further work will be undertaken to reflect this and shared.

9. Doug Bristol raised the following points:

- i. The whole consultation process felt like the decision had already been made and the council was not interested in the views of residents. Boats were very expensive and cannot just move. Due to the actions of the council he personally felt targeted, threatened and like a criminal which was a horrible situation to be faced with.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded:

- i. There had been several years of indecision by the council, so action was needed. The views of the house boaters had been considered every step of the way and there had been an extended consultation to ensure as many as possible could participate.

17/5/SR Office Accommodation Strategy Projects at 130 Cowley Road, Cowley Road Compound and Mandela House

Matter for Decision

The Committee received a report from the Asset Manager (Estates and Facilities) which sought approval for three refurbishment projects related to the Council's Office Accommodation Strategy.

An out of cycle decision made by the Executive Councillor on 10th November 2016 gave approval for the allocation of £2,443,000 capital funds for refurbishment works but did not give specific approval for award of contracts to carry out works.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the proposed refurbishment works to create new office accommodation at 130 Cowley Road, Cowley Road Compound and Mandela House subject to the tendered prices for work being acceptable.
- ii. Authorised the Strategic Director to award contracts for the appointment of contractors to carry out refurbishment works at 130 Cowley Road, Cowley Road Compound and Mandela House in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution.

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.

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

Councillor Cantrill commented that given the amount of money (£2.5 million) being spent on the renovation he would have liked to have seen more detail about the plans. The original decision was made out of cycle which meant to date it had not been scrutinised at all. He asked why £500k was being spent on temporary accommodation at Cowley Road, and was an adequate return expected?

Councillor Bick asked why the Council had been less than forthcoming in producing figures and plans.

Councillor Sinnott referred to Mill Road Depot and asked when Cowley Road was estimated to be completed so that development of the Depot site could begin?

The Asset Manager (Estates and Facilities) said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Cowley Road had been selected because it could accommodate the varying requirements of council services. A 15 year lease on the building had been agreed and there were plans to use it for at least five years with future potential to rent it out thereafter, recovering the investment cost.
- ii. The Interim Strategic Director referred to figures and plans of the development, he assured that significant work had gone into both the design and the tendering process. The costs had been looked into thoroughly and there was a clear intention to proceed with the best value for money.
- iii. Vacation of the Mill Road depot depended on the completion of refurbishment at Mandela House.

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

- i. The original brief for the council's office accommodation strategy came to Strategy and Resources in January 2016, however the costs for aspects of the project had not been available in full then. Councillor Cantrill had been consulted at the time of the November 2016 Executive decision.
- ii. Referring to the out of cycle decision, he stated that the timing was just unfortunate. The detailed finances were not available in time for the scrutiny committee in October and waiting until the January meeting would have delayed the overall project significantly.

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.

17/6/SR Revisions to the River Mooring Policy

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out proposals for an updated River Moorings Policy (RMP) to ensure the effective operational management of the moorings within the control of the City Council, for 2017 to 2023.

The updated RMP, outlined the principles with which the Council will follow, to manage its moorings effectively, including allocation of annual mooring licences, fees, charges, and enforcement policy.

The policy also brought forward a detailed scheme to develop new, safe, accessible moorings at Riverside to meet the needs of boaters and to address concerns about the safety of the current moorings.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources:

- a) Approved the proposed River Moorings Policy for use as the guiding document for management of the Council's moorings for the period, 2017-23;
- b) Instructed officers to proceed with actions to ensure the successful implementation of the approved policy, including
 - i. Taking forward the proposed Riverside Moorings Scheme, in order to develop up to seven safe moorings, subject to necessary consents and a detailed implementation plan to relocate boats on the Council's Regulated Waiting List as set out in RMP;

- ii. Adopting a fee policy which sets charges in accordance with realistic costs of managing the moorings, including necessary enforcement;
 - iii. Development of a capital investment programme for the improvement of the Council's mooring facilities;
 - iv. Further investigating options for charging for visitor moorings; and
- c) Noted the principal outcomes of the public consultation as detailed in the appendix B to this report, and
- d) Endorsed continued engagement with boat-dwellers and their representative organisations in working up recommendations on
- i. the River Moorings Licence terms and conditions;
 - ii. a Housing and Planning Act 2016, Welfare and Needs assessment
 - iii. Council Tax exemptions and the City Council's means tested Council Tax Reduction scheme and
 - iv. Further moorings investment and improvement options from future income and savings.

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 (Streets & Open Spaces)

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

Councillor Sarris queried the legality of the Council's decision not to collect Council Tax from single occupant boaters. He asked whether the County Council had ever been consulted on this Council Tax exemption.

Councillor Cantrill expressed his concern on proposals to remove the single occupancy discount which had been sprung on the residents with little clarity. He believed that decisions should be deferred so more provisional information was made available on how the Council's costs were calculated and on the impact of reviewing the discount and other impacts of the proposals. It should be brought back to committee before a final decision was made.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded by affirming that nothing had been done about the moorings for years. Some issues would need continued dialogue with the residents and this was still a high priority.

Councillor Baigent wanted to clarify that no resident who was legally moored would be made homeless or evicted by these proposals.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources confirmed that this was correct.

Councillor Bick welcomed the limitation on annual increase on fees, but stated that the package of proposals did not address the issues in a coordinated way. The residents were not consulted on the changes to the single occupancy discount and Members had not received officer analysis, both sides of the argument needed to be considered for a proper response.

Councillor Gillespie spoke with prior permission of the Chair. Referring to the Liberal Democrat amendment, he stated that more time for the consultation would perhaps allow boaters time to come to terms with the changes. He agreed that there had been a failure to tackle the issues for years. He believed that the wording of the consultation was loaded and did not represent the resident's situation accurately. There had been a council risk assessment carried out that the residents had not been allowed to see to make their own views. Furthermore, the officer figures did not appear to represent the true cost. Boaters can't inherit a mooring so they can't be compared with a household. It appeared the Council was attempting to gentrify the river, creating a landlord class.

In response to the Liberal Democrat amendment Councillor Sinnott commented that the purpose of revising the single occupancy discount was to create greater equity. The new approach based on length of vessel rather than occupancy was more equal.

Councillor Cantrill suggested that this approach was discriminatory toward single working people. The system would be a reasonable compromise if the council services available to the residents reflected the real costs but they did not.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded by stating that the council had been making losses in revenue on its services to residents of

the river for years which was unfair on the council tax payer. He stated that this approach as identified in the report was fairer.

In response to further Member questions the officers confirmed:

- i. They were satisfied that the Council Tax policy for boaters was legal but were not aware of the County Council ever having been consulted on the single occupant exemption.
- ii. As part of the review of council tax discounting, the City Council as the billing authority will need to review with the other precepting authorities the implications of changes from 2012.
- iii. The proposed fees would still be one of the lowest in the country.
- iv. Officers would share with Camboaters further financial information and accepted that they needed to look again at the costs (e.g. of enforcement).
- v. Riverside works would be prioritised and there would be other investment thereafter.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded to points made by the scrutiny committee:

- i. There was no attempt to gentrify the river
- ii. Charging by length was fairer
- iii. Moorings were costing the taxpayer £30K per year.
- iv. The consultation was useful and Camboater's own report was taken into account when drafting the officer report.
- v. The proposals would bring improvements to the recipients on the river in the long term.

Councillor Cantrill proposed the following amendment to the recommendations:

The Executive Councilor was recommended to:

Defer any overall decision on moorings until

- a) Proper consultation on single occupancy discount
- b) Detailed exploration of options that retain the current moorings on Riverside
- c) Clarification of the position regarding council tax payments
- d) Clarity on potential contractual regulation of boats in respect of air and water pollution

The amendment was lost by 2 votes to 4.

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Cantrill:

The Executive Councillor was recommended to:

Defer any overall decision on moorings until

a) Proper consultation on single occupancy discount

The amendment was lost by 2 votes to 4.

The Committee resolved by 4 votes to 2 to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources declared (see 17/2/SR) that he had resigned as a Cam Conservator.

(Note: The Chair adjourned the meeting for 5 minutes.)

17/7/SR Preparing for the Apprenticeship Levy & Public Sector Targets for Apprenticeships 2017

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report set out a strategic plan for Cambridge City Council to optimise use of its apprenticeship levy contributions of £100,000 per annum from April 2017, and deliver the government's plans for public sector organisations to have an average 2.3% of the workforce as apprentices over a 4 year period whilst providing a high quality 'Cambridge City Apprenticeship Scheme'.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Agreed the proposed approach as set out in the report for the use of the Apprenticeship Levy
- ii. Approved the proposed Apprenticeship Strategy.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

- i. Members welcomed the proposals affirming that it was the sort of philosophy to embed into the business of the council.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/8/SR Discretionary Housing Payments**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report provided an update on the funding and use of Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) to support those affected by Welfare Reforms.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Approved the carry forward to 2017/2018 of the projected unspent additional contribution (see paragraph 4(a) v).

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The committee made no comments in response to the report from the Head of Revenue and Benefits.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/9/SR Shared Services 2017/18 Business Plans**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report set out the 2017/18 business cases for the shared 3C ICT and 3C Legal services for endorsement, the principles of which were approved on 13th July 2015 and 12th October 2015.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Approved the business plans for each of the shared services.

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 Interim Strategic Director.

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

- i. The report said that the 15% savings which had been anticipated would not be achieved this financial year. It was predicted as 8.5% saving for this financial year.
- ii. Should this recommendation fall within Executive Councillor for Finance and Resource's portfolio rather than with the Leader's?

The Interim Strategic Director said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. There had been a higher than expected spend on consultants to accommodate the changes in services.
- ii. There was a commitment to meet the savings target in year 2017/18.

The Leader said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Figures related to the predicted and actual savings were available on p 245 of the report.
- ii. He affirmed that if they were not committed to achieving the 15% saving it would not have been included in the report. They had set clear priorities which they were able to deliver on.
- iii. He agreed that the transformational aspect of the shared services fell correctly within his portfolio but future decisional reports would move to a different portfolio from now on.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The Chair permitted Councillor Cantrill to ask a question to the Leader in an update to the item considered on the Combined Authority:

Referring to the comments by Mr Barclay, what is the Local Enterprise Partnership's (LEP) current position on the Combined Authority? Should the LEP stand aside from the Combined Authority whilst investigations are ongoing?

The Leader said the following in response to Councillor Cantrill's question:

- i. Requested that Councillor Cantrill email him so a formal response would be provided because he had no notice of the question.
- ii. He had not changed his mind about the LEP's role within the Combined Authority. It is a matter for all LEP's and governance.
- iii. Unfortunately the issue to date had not been raised in the most appropriate manner through the media.
- iv. At the Combined Authority meeting he attended earlier today it had been suggested that the National Audit Office may investigate.
- v. From his perspective, the LEP broadened the Combined Authority as he stated at the last scrutiny committee.

17/10/SR Shared Planning Service

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report outlined the progress in developing a Shared Planning Service between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

The report sought agreement for a number of key principles underpinning the development of the service; a multi-phase programme of delivery, and early use of a "Greater Cambridge" designation. The report also set out an initial high level action plan which sought agreement to the procurement of additional resources to support this, identifying two key issues which would require early decision.

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Noted the progress to date on the implementation of the Shared Planning Service.
- ii. Agreed the development of the multi-phase programme for delivery of the project
- iii. Approved the broad principles of the proposed management structure as the basis for the continued development of the organisational structure.
- iv. Noted the allocation of additional resources to support the programme
- v. Agreed the early introduction of a "Greater Cambridge Planning Service" designation on signatures of emails from planning staff of both Councils
- vi. Noted the need for seamless ICT systems across Greater Cambridge and the commitment to early work (and costs) on the procurement of a common ICT system for planning.

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 Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development.

Councillor Bick made the following comments in response to the report:

- i. He welcomed the report; it was a necessary development for the planning service and Local Plan to work seamlessly.
- ii. The management structure at appendix A would help recruit the best staff. The Shared Planning Service would be the biggest second tier authority for planning in the country.

Councillor Bick welcomed the point and proposed an amendment to the recommendation by adding:

7. To note the high level objectives identified by the project team (p.250) and invite them to consider adding to them the need to retain and support an understanding of Place in the way Shared Service was structured, delivered and managed.

8. Noting the competitive market for planning staff and the high turnover and vacancy rates that tended to result, to call on the offices to explore how grading and pay systems could be applied effectively or adapted to the new organisation to support and strengthen the council's ability to recruit and retain the right staff.

Councillors supported the proposed amendment 7. The Leader wished to amend 8:

8. Noting the competitive market for planning staff, officers are asked to explore measures that would strengthen the recruitment and retention of planning staff.

Councillor Bick requested that it be minuted that he thought there should be an explicit reference to pay and grading.

The Leader said the following in response:

- i. He thought that putting pay into the public domain was not helpful; the change of wording indicated a commitment to paying a competitive rate.
- ii. The current changes would have a big impact. In order to be competitive the package needed to be broader than just pay and grading.

The Committee resolved unanimously to endorse the recommendations as amended.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

17/11/SR Update on Key External Strategic Partnerships and our Involvement

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided an update on the key external partnerships the Council was involved with as part of a commitment given in the Council's "Principles of Partnership Working".

Decision of the Leader and Executive Councillor for Strategy and Transformation

- i. Approved the continued work with key external partnerships (LEP, City Deal, Cambridge Community Safety Partnership, Health and Wellbeing Board, the Children's Trust and the Combined Authority) to ensure those public agencies and others can together address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge and that the concerns of Cambridge citizens were responded to.

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.

It was noted that section 5.26, (P279) needed to be amended as Councillor Bick no longer chaired the City Deal Assembly.

The Leader said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Proposed that Section 9 relating to the Health and Wellbeing Board be referred to Community Services Scrutiny Committee in June.
- ii. Agreed that the City Council's representatives on the various Health Partnership bodies should raise the issue of homelessness as a priority and seek to gain partnership engagement in addressing issues surrounding homelessness and rough sleeping in the City.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm

CHAIR