

Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee Minutes

Date: Thursday 21st July 2022

Time: 10:00am- 12:55pm

Venue: New Shire Hall, Alconbury Weald

Present: Councillors Tom Sanderson (Chair), Hilary Cox Condrón (Vice-Chair), Henry Batchelor, Adela Costello, Steve Criswell, Claire Daunton, Janet French, Ian Gardener, Bryony Goodliffe, Ros Hathorn, Jonas King, Lucy Nethsingha, Philippa Slatter.

61. Notification of the Chair and Vice Chair

The Committee noted that Councillor Tom Sanderson had been appointed Chair of the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee, and Councillor Hilary Cox Condrón appointed Vice-Chair, by Full Council on 10th May 2022 for the municipal year 2022/23.

62. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillors Ken Billington (substituted by Councillor Ian Gardner), Doug Dew, Keith Prentice (substituted by Councillor Jonas King) and Dan Schumann.

Councillor Gardener declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in agenda item 7 (Communities Capital Fund), as the local member for Alconbury and Kimbolton.

Councillor Claire Daunton declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in agenda item 9 (Cambridgeshire Archives Service), as a former representative of South Cambridgeshire District Council on the County Advisory Group on Archives and Local Studies.

63. Minutes – 14 April 2022 and Action Log

While discussing the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, one Member noted that a project in March had still not received any of its grant funding from the Communities Capital Fund, and expressed concern that other projects might also still be awaiting funds.

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2022 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

64. Petitions and Public Questions

There were no petitions or public questions.

65. Household Support Fund

The Committee received a report which presented the findings of an evaluation of the operation of the Household Support Fund (HSF) between October 2021 and March 2022, and which also provided an update on the delivery of the Household Support Fund and associated activity in the 2022-23 financial year. Data that had been collated as part of the evaluation, set out in section 2.2 and Appendix 1 of the report, demonstrated that the fund had generally reached its target recipients, with a broad correlation between how deprived an area was and how much resources were received in the area through the HSF.

However, the evaluation and accompanying consultations with partner organisations and recipients of the fund also concluded that the HSF's sticking plaster approach of simply providing financial support, while effective in the short-term, failed to address underlying issues of poverty and exclusion. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the report set out how the Council was planning to expand the scope of the HSF over the next year, with the help of additional Council resources, to address these limitations that were also reflected nationwide. A less transactional, more personalised model would look to address income and expenditure of individuals, as well as the take up of a wide range of services, with an implicit recognition of the importance of income maximisation. A further £750k had been allocated by the Strategy and Resources Committee for this local enhancement of the Government-funded HSF across 2022-23, while members were informed that £300k had also been allocated by the Adults and Health Committee to improve access to income maximisation services across the system.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Paid tribute to the work of officers in managing the HSF, and welcomed the additional resources that had been allocated by the Strategy and Resources Committee and the Adults and Health Committee.
- Highlighted the broad criteria for applicants qualifying for the HSF, and the fact that residents could apply on the basis of struggling with any financial commitments. Work was underway to see whether different services could write to their users to publicise the availability of the HSF, although the Interim Service Director for Communities and Partnerships noted that there were data protection regulations that limited such an approach.
- Sought clarification on the impact of any staff redeployments as a result of the HSF and whether they were affecting the delivery of other services. Noting that the only significantly redeployed member of staff was from the Council's business design team, the Interim Service Director informed Members that staff running the hub were on short term contracts, and clarified that although the approach was not currently funded beyond March 2023, a business case for extension would be considered as part of the Council's next round of business planning.

- Welcomed the provision of posters and fliers promoting the HSF and suggested that they should be made available across the County in places such as libraries and mobile libraries, pharmacies, parish council noticeboards, buses, churches and faith groups to reach those most likely to apply for support. Highlighting that the evaluation of the HSF had identified a deficiency in word-of-mouth publicity for the fund, the Interim Service Director acknowledged the suggestions and emphasised the importance of publicising the fund widely. Noting the valuable role that Councillors could play in this, he undertook to inform all Members of where to obtain posters and fliers for distribution. **Action required**
- Suggested that it would be beneficial to develop a general list of suitable locations to promote support that was available from the Council, in order to inform officers and Councillors, while widening the reach of future publicity campaigns. Noting that distribution lists were usually compiled as part of bespoke communication plans for each individual initiative, the Interim Service Director undertook to establish whether such a core list already existed. **Action required**
- Sought clarification on whether the data compiled in the evaluation report included applicants for the school holiday food voucher scheme. Acknowledging that the voucher scheme was funded by the HSF, the Interim Service Director informed Members that the evaluation data did not include the voucher scheme in its statistics, and instead focused on the wider support that was available.
- Queried when data from the 2021 Census would be published and compared to the findings of the HSF evaluation. Clarifying that there had already been some early releases of Census data, the Interim Service Director confirmed that the HSF would be kept under continuous review and would use data provided from the Census to further inform that analysis.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the findings of the evaluation of the operation of the Government-funded Household Support Fund between October 2021 and March 2022; and
- b) Note the update on the delivery of the Household Support Fund and associated activity in the financial year 2022-2023.

66. Decentralisation – The Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee Perspective

The Committee received a report which detailed how the next steps and design principles for decentralisation agreed by the Strategy and Resources Committee might be best enhanced by the Council's Think Communities approach, and which considered the potential role of the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee in relation to the governance process for the pilot projects that would be undertaken. Further proposals for the pilots would be considered by the Strategy and Resources Committee at its meeting in September 2022. Highlighting the difference between the Think Communities service itself and the broader, Council-wide Think Communities

approach, the Interim Director for Communities and Partnerships emphasised that the underlying approach was what would drive the decentralisation process, with the role of the Think Communities service restricted more to its delivery by the delivery's limited scope and resources.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Sought clarification on the relationship between the Think Communities service's Community Connectors and district council's Community Development Officers, suggesting that the role of officers at partner authorities seemed to be more involved with those seeking support. Arguing that there should not be too much difference in the way that the different teams worked across the various local authorities, the Interim Service Director noted that the different councils worked in different areas, and the purpose of the Community Connectors was to provide a bridge for community groups and members of the public to the relevant directorates and officers in the Council. He acknowledged that it was important to ensure there was not a perception of the service minimising engagement, and reassured Members that there was extensive working between officers of the different local authorities.
- Considered whether Community Connectors were unable to realise their full potential due to a lack of resources, and suggested that a focus on community development could lead to other areas, such as local bus services, receiving less attention and support. Acknowledging that limited resources made prioritisation an unfortunate and unwelcome necessity for the team, the Interim Service Director informed Members that officers continuously reviewed how involved they should become with projects.
- Expressed concern that little progress appeared to have been made on decentralisation and sought clarification on when decisions would be made on established proposals, while requesting further information on the pilot schemes being considered by the Strategy and Resources Committee, such as how many there would be and where they would be located. Some Members argued that the decentralisation process represented a significant shift in organisational culture, and while some parts would involve the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee, much of it was being undertaken beyond the remit of the Committee. It was also suggested that decentralisation had already begun to take place, with delivery of the Household Support Fund raised as an example. Emphasising that the report had been written to provide an update on the role of Think Communities and both committees in advancing the decentralisation agenda, the Interim Service Director undertook to provide Members with further information on the pilots.

Action required

- Queried how the decentralisation process would occur in service delivery across rural areas, noting the importance of working with local Members.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse the policy framework, design principles and next steps for the Council's approach to decentralisation agreed by the Strategy and Resources Committee;

- b) Support the potential role that the Think Communities service can play in delivering the policy framework for decentralisation;
- c) Agree that the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee will oversee learning from the decentralisation pilots on the principles set out in Paragraph 2.3.2 of the report; and
- d) Note the current operational model and funding arrangements for the Think Communities service.

67. Communities Capital Fund

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the 35 projects that had been awarded funding from the Community Capital Fund, and which outlined a proposed governance process for the Committee to review and make decisions on the resources previously awarded to a group of nine projects that had not been completed. It was suggested that a Member-led steering group could assess the projects individually and recommend to the Committee whether to terminate the grant agreement, extend the grant agreement, amend the grant agreement (with no additional financial cost), or invite a new grant application (if amending the agreement required additional financial resources). It was highlighted that the Council's Grants to External Organisations Policy required requests for additional resources to be treated as new applications. Noting that a review of the incomplete projects, along with the current £274k unallocated funding, could lead to up to £1.99m being available for reallocation, the Interim Service Director for Communities and Partnerships suggested that any subsequent grant funding round be called the Cambridgeshire Priorities Capital Fund, to emphasise the change of focus set out in the Council's Strategic Framework.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Welcomed the completion of 26 of the 35 projects that had been awarded funding, and acknowledged the significant restraints that the Covid-19 pandemic had placed on many of the projects.
- Highlighted the importance of assessing social value when considering future grant applications, and queried how the Council approached the issue more widely. Acknowledging the observation, the Interim Service Director informed Members that the Council was increasing its assessment of social value when considering proposals and services, and he noted that the forthcoming business case cycle would be based on triple bottom line accounting, which considered social and environmental value alongside the more traditional financial value.
- Supported the proposal for a steering group to review the incomplete projects and highlighted the importance of assessing them individually. It was suggested that the steering group should take into consideration how close each project was to completion. Members also requested that the steering group meet as soon as possible to minimise the impact that the delay would have on the affected projects.
- Agreed to nominate Members to the steering group after the Committee meeting.

- Raised concerns related to some of the incomplete projects, although it was acknowledged that such matters would be considered by the steering group as part of its review process.

The following amendment to add an additional recommendation was proposed by Councillor Criswell and seconded by Councillor Costello:

- e) As a clearly reasoned exception, award £10,718.76 to Cambridgeshire Highways from the Communities Capital Fund to cover the estimated funding shortfall of the Kimbolton Pedestrian Crossing project.

While discussing the amendment, Members:

- Acknowledged the importance of the project for the local community, and expressed frustration over the delay. Some Members argued that the Council should hold responsibility for the project's cost increase, due to it resulting from an increase in estimated costs made by Council officers, while other Members suggested that cost increases were occurring in all sectors and were not the fault of the Council.
- Observed that construction on the project was scheduled to take place over the summer and that any delay to a decision by the Committee to allocate additional funding would therefore require unplanned borrowing from the parish council's precept, and could result in further additional costs.
- Clarified that the project design could have been amended to ensure it could be completed within the originally allocated budget. It was noted that Kimbolton Parish Council was unwilling to make such amendments as it perceived it would reduce the project's impact.
- Expressed concern that the request did not align with the requirement in the Council's Grants to External Organisations Policy for a new application to be made if additional funding was sought, and suggested that making such an exception would set a precedent and undermine the proposed process for reviewing incomplete schemes. Members also expressed concern about making a decision to allocate funding without being provided with sufficient information and an appropriate level of scrutiny beforehand, and argued that the steering group would be able to carry out a review in a fairer and more transparent manner.
- Queried whether an officer had the delegated authority to award any additional funding if the steering group resolved to recommend it, to avoid the need to wait until the next Committee meeting for a decision to be made. The Interim Service Director undertook to investigate whether such a delegation existed. **Action required**

On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the progress of the projects awarded funding by the Communities Capital Fund, including eight projects that remain incomplete;
- b) Agree to the formation of a Capital Fund Steering Group, as set out in section 4 of the report;
- c) Agree the draft Terms of Reference for the Capital Fund Steering Group, attached at Appendix 1 of the report;
- d) Nominate seven Members to the Steering Group in alignment with political proportionality of the Council; and
- e) Agree to the proposals set out in Section 6 for the use of currently unallocated funds and further money that is currently allocated to incomplete projects but may be returned to the Fund in the future.

68. Cambridgeshire Skills Six Month Review

The Committee received an update report on key progress made by Cambridgeshire Skills in its delivery plan up to and including the end of the 2021/22 academic year. The service had received a Good rating following its first Ofsted inspection in six years in March 2022, and the Head of Service emphasised highlighted the success of maintaining the previous rating following the impacts of Covid-19 and the fact that the service had undertaken a complete overhaul to meet the requirements and needs set by the Combined Authority and funding regulations in which it operated. While other key developments and successes were set out in section 2 of the report, it was noted that work was required to overcome misconceptions about the cost of adult learning, and he informed Members that a publicity campaign to assist in this was being prepared for the start of the academic year.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Paid tribute to Cambridgeshire Skills for obtaining a Good rating from Ofsted, and noted how important it currently was to provide residents with the necessary support to prepare themselves for work. Members welcomed that the service was reaching its target audience in most places and that it was working well with partners.
- Welcomed collaboration with large employers, but suggested that small and medium-sized businesses should also be provided with opportunities to become involved. Acknowledging the observation, the Head of Service highlighted the importance of working with bodies and employer groups such as the Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses.
- Highlighted the importance of online courses, particularly for residents in more rural or isolated areas, but expressed concern about digital exclusion and queried what support was available for people who did not have their own device, sufficient knowledge or suitable internet connection. Noting that Cambridgeshire Skills had a

scheme for providing devices and internet dongles, the Head of Service informed Members that there was a Learner Support Fund, from which people could apply for support for related costs, including travel and childcare. He also emphasised the importance of working with partners on the issue, and targeting the procurement of organisations that already worked with such people to alleviate digital exclusion. The Assistant Director for Skills, Employment and Libraries noted that the Open Door scheme, which was launched in partnership with the library service during the Covid-19 pandemic to promote opportunities to learn.

- Requested an update on any support that the service would provide to the Region of Learning data research platform, which was due to launch on 27th July 2022. Confirming that Cambridgeshire Skills could be involved, despite Region of Learning targeting young people, the Assistant Director for Skills, Employment and Libraries informed Members that the Combined Authority was considering putting it forward for funding from the Shared Prosperity Fund.
- Suggested that the hub and spoke model also needed to target provision in the western part of the County, particularly in St Neots, due to slower rates of employment and business growth in Huntingdonshire. The Head of Service that there was a reasonable level of provision in Huntingdonshire despite there not being a hub, and he informed Members that he was investigating provision in St Neots.
- Sought clarification on how Cambridgeshire Skills monitored the success of its programmes and learners progress into employment. Confirming that the service tracked the progress of learners as they moved into employment, the Head of Service noted that it was sometimes difficult because the process was reliant on learners responding to enquiries.
- Requested information on the levels of enrolment according to age and districts across the County. The Head of Service informed Members that 24% of learners were in Cambridge, 20% were in South Cambridgeshire, 18% were in Fenland, 12% were in Huntingdonshire, and 8% were in East Cambridgeshire, while 12% of learners were from outside the County. He also noted that 18% of learners were under 30, 28% were in their 30s, 28% were in their 40s, 15% were in their 50s, and around 5% were over 70.
- Queried how Cambridgeshire Skills reached out to prospective learners, and sought clarification on the number of prospective learners to whom the information was not reaching. The Head of Service informed Members that various mediums were used, including social media, the Council's communications channel, case studies in the service's brochure, leaflet drops and advertisements in community locations. Cambridgeshire Skills also worked with partners and employers to publicise its courses. He undertook to provide Members with further information on the number of prospective learners who were currently not receiving publicity of any form.

Action required

- Noted that the Covid-19 pandemic had exposed a reliance on the use of community buildings, some of which had not become available for use again.

- Expressed concern about the impact of a Countywide model on staff, and the increased costs that they face due higher fuel costs for travel and higher costs of living.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the 6-month progress of Cambridgeshire Skills; and
- b) Identify other priority areas of focus to support the Council's overall priorities.

69. Cambridgeshire Archives Service

The Committee received an update report on the Archives Service since it moved from Shire Hall in Cambridge to a dedicated, state-of-the-art facility in Ely in 2019. Although the Covid-19 pandemic had led to a significant decrease in the number of visitors accessing the archive, a concurrent increase in the number of remote enquiries had led to an increase in income, and was indicative of a general shift in user landscape that had also been reflected in other archives around the Country. The Archives Manager informed Members that since the report had been published, The National Archives (TNA) had awarded the service with Accredited Archive status. This would provide the service with more grant funding opportunities in the future, while also encouraging improvement due to the requirement to reapply every three years with updated requirements from TNA.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Welcomed the accreditation of the service as an Accredited Archive and paid tribute to the work of officers in obtaining the achievement, highlighting the important role of the service in bringing communities together and place-building through knowledge of local heritage and history.
- Queried whether the recent heatwave had caused problems for the service. Noting that it had been the first real test of the facility's infrastructure in Ely, the Head of Libraries, Archives and Culture confirmed that the new archive had worked perfectly and had not been impacted by the warm conditions. However, he informed Members that an ageing air conditioning system in the Huntingdonshire Archives in Huntingdon had caused some problems, although the Council was looking to resolve the issue and avoid such problems reoccurring in the future.
- Queried whether the service was encountering any issues related to staffing or resources. The Archives Manager informed Members that the service was thinly staffed following a series of restructures over the previous decade and that the team was probably of a size more suitable for operating just one site, although he noted that staggering days for opening between the two facilities in Ely and Huntingdon ensured that staff could alternate and keep both venues open. He emphasised the desire to keep both facilities open due to Huntingdonshire previously being a separate county. The service was also attracting grant funding for a project archivist to work on specific projects.

- Highlighted the benefit of visiting archive facilities, paying tribute to the increased levels of accessibility that the service had developed, and sought clarification on whether in-person involvement was proactively encouraged within communities. Noting that the service had developed a scheme to improve previously low levels of interest by schools, the Archives Manager emphasised that the archives were maintained for various uses by the whole community, including children. It was suggested that a project to promote information on the area's LGBTQ history would support the Council's work on equalities and engaging people.

The following amendment to recommendation (b) was proposed by the Chair, seconded by the Vice-Chair and agreed unanimously:

- b) ~~Endorse the current application for~~ **Welcome the achievement of** Accredited Archive status.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Endorse the scope and reach of the Archives Service since its move from Shire Hall to the new archive centre in Ely over 2019-20; and
- b) Welcome the achievement of Accredited Archive status.

70. Domestic Abuse Act 2021 – Update One Year On

The Committee received an update report on the statutory duties that were placed on the Council by the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. Information on how the Council had complied with the requirements was set out in Section 1 of the report, with details on how the funding that had been provided by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) to support the work had been used set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.8 of the report. Additional funding had also been awarded following successful bids to the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice, which had enabled the extension of various Independent Domestic Violence Advisor (IDVA) posts until March 2025, including a senior IDVA, 2.4 full time equivalent IDVAs for young people under 21, a specific male victim IDVA and a specialist IDVA for those from Black, Asian and minority ethnic communities. A centralised process for carrying out Domestic Homicide Reviews had been set up, while a significant amount of work had been focused on early intervention and prevention, as set out in paragraphs 2.15 to 2.18 of the report.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Sought clarification on the funding for Domestic Homicide Reviews, highlighting that, although it was a statutory requirement, the Home Office did not provide any funding, despite the large amount of time and funding that were required. Noting that the Council continued to campaign for funding from the Home Office and that recent reviews had recommended to the Home Office that they provide funding, the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (DASV) Partnership Manager informed Members that there was an agreement in place with Community Safety Partners to

combine resources into a pooled budget, with any unspent funds being carried in to the next year.

- Expressed concern that no suitable providers had been identified in the procurement of dispersed accommodation provision, and sought clarification on what would happen if Social Housing Providers were also identified as unsuitable. Noting that the Council was now able to approach providers directly following the unsuccessful completion of an open tender, the DASV Partnership Manager reassured Members that social landlords and housing associations were being consulted as to whether they were able to provide the necessary properties, and it was expected that a solution would be found.
- Suggested that hotels and aparthotels could be approached for the provision of accommodation. Acknowledging that hotel accommodation was a useful resource in the short-term that the Council already used, the DASV Partnership highlighted that they were not ideal in the long-term, particularly if victims were accompanied by family, due to their limited amount of space and lack of facilities.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Note the Council's progress towards fulfilling its statutory duty in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021.

71. Communities Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee Performance Report, Quarter 1

The Committee received a report which proposed a new suite of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the services that fell within the Committee's remit, in order to align them with the Council's revised corporate strategy and new performance framework. The Strategy and Resources Committee had also agreed to transfer open actions in the Council's Joint Agreement Action Plan Tracker to oversight by the relevant committees, and attention was drawn to those listed in section 2.4 of the report which had been transferred to the Communications, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee, although the Interim Service Director for Communities and Partnerships suggested that the action relating to informal and young carers should be overseen by a different committee.

While discussing the report, Members:

- Welcomed the opportunity for input that had been provided to Members during a Committee workshop that had informed the new suite of KPIs.
- Clarified that the removal of some previous KPIs related to inclusion was due to it being a cross-cutting issue that ran throughout all the Council's work, and to ensure that the new suite of KPIs focused on services.
- Clarified that the decision to transfer open actions to the relevant committees had been made by the Strategy and Resources Committee at its meeting in March 2022.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the recommended suite of key performance indicators to be reported to the Committee; and
- b) Note the transfer of elements of the Joint Agreement Action Plan from the Strategy and Resources Committee to the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee.

72. Finance Monitoring Report - May 2022

The Committee received the Finance Monitoring Report for People and Communities, as well as Public Health, covering the period to the end of May 2022, which reported that the budgets within the remit of the Committee were currently forecasting a balanced position. Attention was drawn to the challenges faced by the Public Library Services in recovering its level of income to previous levels due to impacts of Covid-19 leading to a lower number of visitors and fewer requests to hire facilities.

While discussing the report, Members paid tribute to the work carried out by the staff of the Library service and supported the precautions and difficult decisions they had been required to make when faced by restrictions that were enforced during the pandemic. It was queried whether the income target for the Public Library Service could be reduced to reflect the challenging circumstances. Noting that the impacts were proving more long-term than had been expected during the 2022/23 business planning process, the Senior Finance Business Partner confirmed that although the target could not currently be revised, it was now being taken into consideration in future planning.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review and comment on the report.

73. Finance Monitoring Report - Outturn 2021-22

The Committee received the Outturn Finance Monitoring Report for People and Communities, as well as Public Health, for the 2021-22 financial year. The budgets within the remit of the Committee ended the year with an overspend of £198k, with the most significant issues highlighted in Section 2.1.2 of the report, most of which had resulted from impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Interim Service Director informed the Committee that the demographic pressures and changes in natures of types of inquest being undertaken by the Coroner service were providing ongoing pressures on the service, and he suggested there could be a business case for enhanced investment.

It was resolved unanimously to:

Review and comment on the report.

74. Community, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups, Panels, and the Appointment of Member Champions

The Committee was asked to review its agenda plan and training plan, appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and the appointment of the Community Safety Champion.

It was resolved to:

- a) Review its agenda plan attached at Appendix 1 of the report;
- b) Review its training plan attached at Appendix 2 of the report;
- c) Review and confirm the appointments to outside bodies as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report, subject to the appointment of:
 - (i) Councillor Bulat to the ESOL Local Planning Partnership South;
 - (ii) Councillor Hoy to the ESOL Local Planning Partnership North;
 - (iii) Councillor Taylor to the St Neots Museum Management Committee, to replace Councillor Prentice;
- d) Review and confirm the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report, subject to the appointment of:
 - (i) Councillors Costello and French to the County Advisory Group, to replace Councillors Sanderson and Taylor;
 - (ii) Councillor Daunton to the Cross Party Working Group for Library Services, to replace Councillor Thompson;
 - (iii) Councillor Hathorn to the Cultivate Cambs Fund Bid Assessment Panel, to replace Councillor Thompson;
 - (iv) Councillor Daunton to the Cultivate Cambs Steering Group, to replace Councillor Hathorn; and
- e) Review and confirm the appointment of Councillor Hilary Cox Condrón as the Community Safety Champion.

Chair
22nd September 2022