

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 30 September 2024
17:30-20:00

Present: Councillors Robertson (Chair), Gawthrope Wood (Vice-Chair), Baigent, Bick, Griffin, Sheil and Young

Councillor Bennett attended virtually.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

24/19/SR Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Todd-Jones.

24/20/SR Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Reason
Councillor Baigent	All	Personal: Member of Cambridge Cycle Campaign

24/21/SR Minutes of the previous meetings held on 1 July and 18 July 2024

Councillor Sheil advised that he was present at the meeting on 1 July, but his attendance was not recorded and the minutes should be amended accordingly.

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 July and 18 July were then approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

24/22/SR Public Questions

Question 1:

There is so little detail in this report and little detail in the July 2023 report, the staff would like to know is there going to be cut to direct service? In the last Town Haall meeting it was mentioned the committee should scrutinise but there isn't enough information to fully scrutinize. Using the stores as an

example, if there isn't a 'like for like service' what will actually happen? Will this come back to the **November 21st** committee as this will effect tenants.

The Leader of the Council responded with the following:

- i. The decision to make £11million pounds in saving over the next four years was not a choice that the Council had taken lightly.
- ii. The recommendation for these savings were first published in the BSR the previous year and now the Council needed to make decisions on how to make those savings.
- iii. The purpose of the report was to provide high level context for the proposed savings and consultations.
- iv. Following consultation with both staff and the public, a report would be brought back to the relevant committee(s) with further details on where and how the savings would be made.
- v. Any significant changes to services the Council provided would be presented through the scrutiny committee for process and proposals to be debated and discussed.
- vi. Internal changes to staffing structures would become clearer following the process outlined.
- vii. Trade Unions should and would be involved throughout the process.

Supplementary:

- i. Important that the detail was brought to the scrutiny committee.
- ii. Using the stores department as an example, if the agreed savings were not met, this could come back to Committee and be looked at further.

The Leader said the following:

- i. It would be helpful to have evidence of where things haven't worked over the last year.
- ii. When the detail of the savings came forward it would be brought back to the scrutiny committee after there had been a chance to discuss with the Trade Unions and the relevant staff members the proposals.

Question 2:

Cambridge is expanding a lot of thanks to our Council here today, there will be more social and private homes. The scrutiny report has no detail in out how savings are going to be made? It feels like as Cambridge is getting bigger, but we may be cutting services and staff. What services and staff levels are being considered, could this come back to the scrutiny committee? And how will it affect service users as there is no details?

The Leader said the following in response:

- i. Any changes that would be made to services which affected residents and / or staff would go through the correct scrutiny process.
- ii. It was imperative that there was scrutiny from all Members of the Council, discussions would take place over the coming months.
- iii. Given the financial constraints under which the Council was operating it was hoped that Officers and Members could talk with Ministers in Central Government about what was possible.
- iv. Had met with Ministers when visiting Cambridge and stressed the issue that with the proposed increase in population there needed to be services in place. One of the concerns raised regarded 'data lag' as the Government were using data ten years out of date which made it problematic in providing accurate reporting.

Supplementary:

- i. Sought confirmation there would be no action until a further report had been presented to the Scrutiny Committee.

The Leader responded.

- i. Confirmed that no action would be taken.
- ii. This was about high-level context, setting the ability for Senior Officers to consult with both staff and residents.

Question 3:

My understanding of the scrutiny report is that it is aimed at saving money yet there's no details in the report how this will be done, especially with the increase of contractors in the last two years. We use more contractors now where we could save thousands of pounds by having more in house staff, has this been considered and has comparison be done ? But there is no details in the report, could this be addressed and come back to another committee once this has been looked at for scrutiny?

The Leader responded with the following:

- i. Believed the question to be about contractors and subcontractors and how they were used.
- ii. The Council faced challenges and needed to make changes for residents which would be brought back to scrutiny with the detail, when in place.
- iii. There was a variable method concerning contractors, when they worked well it helped the Council to look at time limited and clear design principles to keep people focused.
- iv. Believed that the work completed by contractors on the operational hub was a good example of contractors being used properly.

- v. Contractors when used effectively could help the Council's tenants and residents in a positive way.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Would it be possible to produce a comparison of cost between the Council's inhouse service and the sub-contractors which could be brought a future scrutiny meeting, as there is not enough detail in the current report.

The Chief Operating Officer responded:

- i. It was possible to present material information to the scrutiny committee. However, would need to be made aware of the specific details wanted to be brought back and whether it was appropriate to bring through the scrutiny process and when.
- ii. Staffing matters were a delegated responsibility to relevant Officers which had to be discussed with the relevant Executive Councillors.

The Leader advised that when future discussions would take place with the Unions, it may be possible to share the requested comparison when appropriate.

Question 4:

I would like to ask as there isn't any details in the report if the transformation team will be looked at as in the cost, over £5m? The report mentions saving money but a large budget has been found to fund the transformation team yet there seems to be freeze on recruitment for front line staff. Will all details be available to be scrutinised later?

The Leader said the following:

- i. The transformation proposals were considered at a past meeting of the Strategy & Resources Committee.
- ii. It was agreed that to make the savings the Council would require a one of expenditure which would be funded from the Council's reserves at that time.
- iii. As with all finances a budget had been allocated to meet the priorities of the Council.
- iv. A recruitment freeze was in place to minimise the risk of redundancies during the extended period of change.
- v. Stricter guidelines had been put in place regarding the recruitment of vacant positions; whether filled through direct recruitment or agencies, would require direct sign off to identify and plan for posts that could be part of the redeployment pool.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Requested that the cost of implementing the transformation to the saving costs was clearly shown in a future report; it looked as if the Council had currently spent more than it was trying to save.

The Leader said the following:

- i. Had previously been challenged by the Opposition Councillors on the same question so would ask Officers to provide the information requested.

Question 5:

Could there be an update on the Extended working hours which includes the results of the tenant's survey last month to see if there is a requirement for this proposed change? Since July 2023 there has been no meaning full discussions around this. Staff are concerned about this and have family issues that will be affected. Other councils do not offer this as there is not a need from their tenants. A similar council we visited this year do not do this and we have half the staff of them.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources replied with the following:

- i. There were several tenant engagement surveys' currently underway which would be shared when the data had been analysed.
- ii. The pilot project which had been approved in July would probably offer the most valuable opportunity to gage the effectiveness of the extended services.
- iii. Would have to wait to determine what the take up would be for the additional weekend appointment slots.
- iv. South Cambridgeshire District Council provided optional appointments from 8pm, weekdays and 8am to 12pm, Saturday, which may be available by exception and delivered through an outsourced model.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Find it difficult to understand is that a report has been produced for this scrutiny committee for something that was not sensitive, ie, the working conditions and the impact of the workforce.
- ii. The survey closed in August and were still waiting for the results to be shared, how many people responded, what was the percentage of those in favour of extended hours, as far as staff were aware, there was not a lot of interest.

- iii. Staff needed to be made aware so personal arrangements could be made if required for issues such as child care, adult care and other personal commitments.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources said the following:

- i. Agreed that the results needed to be shared as soon as was possible.

Question 6 on behalf of Unison:

Why is the Council choosing to move £7,918,000 into General Fund Reserves (see table on page 28 MTFS) when in 2022 it was said that ‘providing there are no unexpected changes to the tax base or the rate of collection, the accumulated surplus will be distributed and received into the General fund in 2023 and 2024/25? Instead, this figure is coming out of the funding of revenue and creating a budget gap in 2025/26?

On page 43 of the MTFS it says ‘provided the Council can deliver the recurring savings requirements, the GF reserve balance is forecast to remain above the target level over the next 5 years, even without the benefit of additional business rates growth.

Why isn't the business rates growth funding used to “smooth” this year's budget to lessen the severity of the cuts and likely severe impact on staff and valued services and put less back into reserves? This would also give time for the new Labour government decisions around the future funding of local government to begin to translate into reality and impact this and other councils?

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources responded:

- i. The planned transfer of the £7,918,000 into General Fund Reserves was in line with the Council's long-standing policy not to rely on monies received from business rates retention.
- ii. It was very volatile and subject to reset; the Council were at the peak of business rates retention monies and was expecting this to be the final year.
- iii. Many Local Authorities Chief Finance Officers across the county anticipated that the reset would take place next year. In the event of this happening the surplus monies from business rates retention would reduce to £500,000 approximately.
- iv. The approach reflected the prudence of the Council's approach over the years, if there had been spending then further savings would be required than was currently being proposed. The Council would not have the reserves it had to fund capital projects, many of which were about saving revenue.

- v. The plan saving profile of £6million over the next two years was based on budget forecast of deficit in 2026/27 of £6.84 million.
- vi. Even if all the business rates retention monies were used to fund services this would only have a minimal effect on reducing the budget gap. This wouldn't make a significant difference to the need to make at least £6million in savings in 2026/27.
- vii. Regardless of the level of reserves the Council had , there was a need to address the structural budget deficit.
- viii. The reserves could only be spent once, but the revenue was recurring year in, year out. That was why the investment in Transformation made sense because it was one of the investments to make recurring savings.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Needed to be clear on the severity of the savings proposed because of the way the Council was looking to balance the budget.
- ii. This would harmfully reduce the public facing services which elected members must value and constituents.
- iii. If the Council continued to make the savings as it did last year such as the closing of public toilets, this would be deeply felt and lead to public anger, just as it did ten years ago.
- iv. Would ask if Members were ready for the public backlash and would be comfortable with the consequences of this.

The Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources said the following:

- i. There would be a public consultation on the budget making process as there had been each year.
- ii. Savings were needed which meant there would be difficult decisions to be made.
- iii. The Council would respond to public opinion.
- iv. Believed that what was most important to the public was that they saw the Council financially prudent, had a balanced budget and be funded sustainably. If this didn't happen, the Council would be in worse position politically.

Question 7:

This report asks the Committee to agree the principals for communities' group and economy and place group and delegate authority to the relevant director /CEO to develop and implement internal organisation in line with council policy. How can the scrutiny committee recommend this with no detailed information being submitted at this committee? Can this be brought back to the November committee when all the detail are available?

The Leader made the following comments:

- i. It was important to have proper and public scrutiny, and this report was about getting to the next stage of the process.
- ii. The consultation process would allow the Council to listen to staff and residents. The data would be analysed and brought back for scrutiny and debate whether through the BSR process or the appropriate scrutiny committees.

Supplementary Question:

- i. Understood the process but staff were concerned as shown tonight with their attendance and public questions.
- ii. The reason for their concern was at the previous meeting of the Strategy and Resources Committee, there had been a decision to go forward on the stores which had still not yet been brought with the detail but was being pushed through.
- iii. Other reports which had come through on high level principle had not been brought back to Committee.
- iv. Although staff were being assured that the stores report would come back with detail for scrutiny and debate as stated there were other reports which had not been brought back to Committee.
- v. Officers had said that the process had been though the scrutiny committee and therefore had the backing of Members. It needed to be made clear this was not the case and would be brought back for further scrutiny.

The Leader said the following:

- i. Aware of a trust issue and sounded like the stores process had not been run as staff would have liked.
- ii. Trust could be built by having proper communication. Meetings had taken place with the Trade Unions, the relevant Executive Councillors and Deputy Leader, which could be built upon.
- iii. Members did not come into politics to make savings, but this needed to be done.

Question 8:

At the last town hall meeting it was said that the scrutiny committee's job was to scrutinise the recommendations proposed for the Leader.

In the report on page 57 it says proposals for city services and the corporate hub were agreed at the S&R committee on 3 July 2023 and 29 January 2024 .

In the committee report of 3 July 2023 page 243 it says please note -timelines and savings outside of those owned solely by the city services ops programme team (our Cambridge) are estimates at this stage , and require further analysis before returning to the S&R has this been brought back to the S&R?

The Leader replied:

- i. It was the role of every scrutiny committee to scrutinise the recommendations put forward.
- ii. Today was about getting to the next stage of the process when the detail could be looked at.

24/23/SR To Note Record of Urgent Decision Taken by the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

5a *RoD - Approval of funding to Cherry Hinton Community Benefit Society Limited for fitting out and starting up the Cherry Hinton Hub**
Before the decision was noted, Councillor Young informed the Chair, she had not been consulted as the opposition spokesperson as outlined in the Out of Cycle procedure.

If she had been consulted would have questioned why this funding had not been allocated in the budget.

The decision was then noted.

24/24/SR Combined Authority Update Report

Matter for Decision

The information report provided an update on the activities of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) Board. Therefore, there was no decision to be made by the relevant Executive Councillor.

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 Councillor A Smith.

In response to Members' questions Councillor A Smith said the following:

- i. Would be happy to talk to Officers to arrange a briefing on the bus franchising consultation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- ii. Would investigate if the bus franchising consultation in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough could be brought to the next Planning and Transport Scrutiny Committee for Members comments.
- iii. In response to the question if the CPCA had held further meetings with Government; there had several conversations amongst the constituent authorities and meetings which Cambridge City Council were involved with.
- iv. Cambridge City Councillors who sat on the CPCA, such as Councillor A Smith and Cllr Davey consistently worked hard to make the case for Cambridge City on all projects and scrutiny.
- v. Councillor Davey, as Leader of the Council, sat on the Cambridge 2050 Advisory Board.
- vi. UKREiF (Real Estate Investment and Infrastructure) was an investment and infrastructure forum. The CPCA planned to attend the 2024 annual conference. Cambridge as a major contributor the UK economy would feature next year.
- vii. The Infrastructure delivery framework was being worked on which would form part of the local growth plan.
- viii. At the National Infrastructure Round Table discussions had been held on water scarcity, Cambridge City Council had been represented by Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development, Stephen Kelly. Could not provide a date on when the information from that meeting would be published.
- ix. Last year the Council had agreed to move funding for Dial-a-Ride to the CPCA, in addition to direct funding from the CPCA.
- x. The City Council were aware that Dial-a-Ride required more support and would contribute an additional year's funding to allow the organisation to put together a long-term viability plan.
- xi. Papers from the last CPCA Transport and Infrastructure meeting could be accessed online outlining where improvements had been made to the school transport bus services. This also listed a variety of routes that the CPCA were looking to improve and when.

- xii. Work was also being done at combining certain school routes which should lead to a decrease in the cost of school taxis.
- xiii. The CPCA were currently exploring issues around the capital cost of franchising and location of depots; to make it fair there should be several bus companies who run the depots rather than a single bus company.
- xiv. Currently consulting on the concept of franchising; do we agree franchise.
- xv. A Business Growth and Social Impact Investment Fund of £9.5million spread over a few years had become available to support small and medium enterprises across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough region, some of which was aimed at supporting the third sector.
- xvi. The orbital bus route around Cambridge should be starting in November.

The Chair thanked Cllr A Smith for their update report.

24/25/SR General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy 2024/25-2033/34

Matter for Decision

The purpose of the MTFS was to project the General Fund's financial position over the medium term, and set out the high level strategic approach to ensuring financial sustainability over this period.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. To approve the Council's General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2025/26-2034/35, as attached at Appendix A.
- ii. To approve the 2024/25 capital bid of an additional £487,000 for essential repairs of the riverbank at Jesus Green, as set out at page 19 of the attached MTFS.
- iii. To note the other changes to the capital plan approved under delegated powers since approval of the Budget Setting Report, as set out in section 5 of the attached MTFS.
- iv. To set the General Fund reserve Prudent Minimum Balance at £6.541 million, and the target level at £7.849 million, as recommended by the Chief Finance Officer.

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 Financial Officer outlining the MTFS.

In response to Members' questions the Chief Financial Officer and the Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources commented:

- i. The target of £6 million of savings over two years was an ambitious one. As the Council had been financially prudent over the previous years it was now easier to make some of the savings that were required to balance the budget gap, rather than having to find £11.5 million of savings in the next two years.
- ii. In terms of being able to deliver some of the proposed savings the Group redesign would go into more detail the ways the Council was going to deliver services whilst recognising savings that needed to be made.
- iii. Looking further into the future officers were having to make assumptions with regards to some of the key financial indicators and this was harder to predict the further out the strategy looked.
- iv. Officers were already looking at ways of bridging the budget gap from £6 million to £11.5 million.
- v. It was essential to make services more efficient and effective wherever possible. There were circumstances that dictated that sometimes less was less when it came to delivering some services and those were decisions that Council had to think through. The key for the Council was to make sure the Council was financially sustainable for the future.
- vi. The Council still aimed to deliver excellent services to its residents, including carrying out its programme on housing development. It was essential to make the right level of savings that delivered the least harm to front line services.

- vii. The MTFS assumptions were based on the report produced by the Bank of England in August. The scenario's in the report were based on this and fell within the Bank of England's confidence range. Scenario one was the worst case scenario and reflected CPI going back up to 5.3%.
- viii. All businesses had an independent re-valuation of their business rates which was carried out by the government. The last re-valuation was effective from April 2023. There was a deadline for businesses to appeal against the previous re-valuation done in April 2017 and that was 31 March 2024. The Council was required to make a provision for any successful appeals that were made, although most of the appeals were speculative.
- ix. The Council were in talks with government over the impact of future growth on the city and the services that are provided. The Leader confirmed that they had raised the issue of poor data that had an impact on funding levels for the Council. It was about more than housing and growth but around finances for the Council as a whole. Part of the discussions with government was to show that the Council was prudent with its finances and well run.
- x. Officers were to check the A14 project earmarked reserves fund and provide any future updates. This earmarked fund could be reallocated to environmental improvements or transport mitigations.

The Scrutiny Committee approved the recommendations, a vote on each recommendation set out below.

- i. Approve the Council's General Fund Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2025/26-2034/35, as attached at Appendix A. **(5 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions)**
- ii. Approve the 2024/25 capital bid of an additional £487,000 for essential repairs of the riverbank at Jesus Green, as set out at page 19 of the attached MTFS. **(Unanimous)**
- iii. Note the other changes to the capital plan approved under delegated powers since approval of the Budget Setting Report, as set out in section 5 of the attached MTFS. **(Unanimous)**
- iv. Set the General Fund reserve Prudent Minimum Balance at £6.541 million, and the target level at £7.849 million, as recommended by the Chief Finance Officer **(Unanimous)**

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.

24/26/SR Our Cambridge – Group Design Programme and Alignment with BSR

Matter for Decision

The report referred to draft proposals developed through the Our Cambridge programme, which would enable the Council to achieve £6million net savings and requested the necessary permissions and delegations to progress.

Decision of Executive Councillor for the Leader of the Council

- i. Agreed design principles for Communities Group and the Economy and Place Group, and delegated authority to the relevant Director/CEO to develop and implement internal organisation in line with Council policy.
- ii. Recommended to the Executive the inclusion of proposals in the public consultation that would impact service delivery on the strategic outline budget. Following consultation final decisions would go through the budget setting process.
- iii. Noted the overall approach to achieving £6m savings over the 25/26 and 26/27 budget cycle as recommended in the MTFS.

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 Operating Officer.

The Chief Operating Officer, Director of Communities, Chief Finance Officer and the Leader said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. A neighbourhood-based approach would allow services such as housing, environmental health, estates, sport and leisure and community development, as example, to be delivered collectively and collaboratively, which would look at services from a resident's perspective in the different neighbourhoods throughout the city with inclusion from Ward Councillors.
- ii. There were also other key public services that worked on a neighbourhood-based approach, particularly in health. Worked had been undertaken to determine how the Council was better aligned with external health colleagues and integrated neighbourhoods to improve the working relationship.
- iii. The neighbourhood approach would also benefit the Council's external organisations such as the Police and health groups.
- iv. Savings referenced would be made across all groups in the Council.
- v. The report had been set out to establish the principles that could be taken out to consultation with staff and the community. The details would come back for full scrutiny at a future meeting. It was important to highlight that Officers were working behind the scenes to look at that detail.
- vi. The process was not just about savings, the transformation programme was also about making a Council fit for purpose for the future, working more effectively and efficiently and better for residents.
- vii. Was looking at the Council's internal staffing structure to enhance resilience, reduce cost and become more effective. The Council had in place traditional structures for a long time, it was right to question whether they were still the correct structures to meet the needs of how the Council would operate moving forward.
- viii. Part of the Our Cambridge programme was to look at performance, how well were officers carrying out their roles and responsibilities.
- ix. Disputed that the Our Cambridge programme was taking too long; already significant changes had taken place.
- x. The way the Our Cambridge programme had outlined the purpose, was to talk more about the impact and outcome of what was trying to be achieved as a Council and not necessarily focused on the individual services.

- xi. Looking across the work that Officers undertook, the Council was a fundamental partner to public safety; shared the community safety partnership, provided environmental health services across the city, employed antisocial behaviour teams and enforcement teams.
- xii. While the Council were not the primary / lead contributor to public safety had contributed £14 million of health and wellbeing services
- xiii. The Council was also a housing provider in the City which was probably the most fundamental role for providing a safety net for residents.
- xiv. The Council were investing £100million in Abbey Ward which would take some of the health inequalities that currently existed with the current housing properties.
- xv. The 2.5% inflation figure was a baseline assumption that was used to calculate the budget gap. The Council's budget for 2024/25 included £23 million income from fees and charges, although this did not include income from commercial property, of which there was an additional £10 million of income. There was also an additional £3.5 million in income from other commercial sources.
- xvi. The public budget consultation would ask high level questions, however there would still be opportunity to scrutinise those fees and charges that are proposed to change through the budget setting process.

The Committee **resolved** by 5 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions 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.

24/27/SR 3C ICT Shared Service Review

Matter for Decision

The report referred to the recommendations on the future of the shared ICT service that serves Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Finance and Resources

- i. Noted the final report submitted by Triple Value Impact (TVI) (Appendix 1 of the Officer's report – confidential item).
- ii. Agreed to the recommended option 1 (redesigned 3C ICT and Digital, Lead Authority remains Huntingdonshire District Council) and to delegate the responsibility for finalising the scope and detailed nature of the new agreement and associated activities to the Chief Executives and respective Portfolio Holders for each partnership council reporting on progress through the revised member board.

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 Digital Lead Officer.

In response to Members' questions the Chief Operating Officer and Strategic Digital Lead Officer and External Consultant said the following:

- i. The reference to legacy systems were systems that needed to be replaced.
- ii. Originally the partnership agreement was a shared partnership agreement, but it had become more of a client, supplier relationship which would be renewed as part of the agreement.
- iii. The data would be stored in a UK based data centre (which was a requirement of where any data would be moved to) with UK based staff who would be subjected to the living wage.
- iv. With the move to the cloud there would be some risk, such as being impacted by Microsoft wide outages. These were very rare, .01% when these outages occurred and the resilience very good.
- v. Some of the data would be stored in Microsoft data centres; Microsoft had a target to be carbon negative by 2030. Further information could be provided.

- vi. The future of the ICT service was integral to the Our Cambridge programme and the work on the Council's digital technology strategy.

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.

24/28/SR Hartree - Vacant Possession Strategy

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report referred to Hartree - Vacant Possession Strategy

Decision of the Leader of the Council.

- i. Approved Officer's recommendations.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Scrutiny Committee resolved to exclude members of the public from the meeting on the grounds that, if they were present, there would be disclosure to them of information defined as exempt from publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

The Committee **unanimously** resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Leader approved the recommendations.

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

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Leader.

The meeting ended at 20:00

CHAIR