

ASSETS AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE



Date: Friday, 24 June 2016

Democratic and Members' Services
Quentin Baker
LGSS Director: Law and Governance

10:00hr

Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

Room 128
Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

1. **Apologies and Declarations of Interest**
Guidance for Councillors on declaring interests is available at <http://tinyurl.com/ccc-dec-of-interests>
2. **Minutes of the Assets and Investment Committee held 27th May 2016 and Action Log** **5 - 14**

OTHER DECISIONS

3. **Committee Revenue and Capital Budgets 2016-17** **15 - 18**
4. **Review of Investment Review Group Planning Protocols** **19 - 24**
5. **Committee agenda plan** **25 - 28**

6. Exclusion of Press and Public

To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the agenda contains exempt information under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and that it would not be in the public interest for this information to be disclosed information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

7. Red Tile and New Barn Farms, Warboys – Outstanding Rent Arrears

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information);

8. Farcet Farms

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information);

9. Wisbech Castle update

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information);

10. Review of Vacant Caretaker and Residential properties in relation to Looked after Children

to follow

11. Programme Highlight report

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information);

The Assets and Investment Committee comprises the following members:

Councillor Chris Boden Councillor Paul Bullen Councillor Adrian Dent Councillor Lynda Harford Councillor Roger Hickford Councillor David Jenkins and Councillor Paul Sales

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact

Clerk Name: Dawn Cave

Clerk Telephone: 01223 699178

Clerk Email: dawn.cave@cambridgeshire.gov.uk

The County Council is committed to open government and members of the public are welcome to attend Committee meetings. It supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking and micro-blogging websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens. These arrangements operate in accordance with a protocol agreed by the Chairman of the Council and political Group Leaders which can be accessed via the following link or made available on request: <http://tinyurl.com/ccf-film-record>.

Public speaking on the agenda items above is encouraged. Speakers must register their intention to speak by contacting the Democratic Services Officer no later than 12.00 noon three working days before the meeting. Full details of arrangements for public speaking are set out in Part 4, Part 4.4 of the Council's Constitution <http://tinyurl.com/cambs-constitution>.

The Council does not guarantee the provision of car parking on the Shire Hall site and you will need to use nearby public car parks <http://tinyurl.com/ccf-car-park> or public transport

ASSETS AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Friday 27th May 2016

Time: 9.30am – 11.20am

Present: Councillors Boden, Bullen, Harford, Hickford, Jenkins, Sales and Tew
(substituting for Councillor Dent)

In attendance: Councillor Frost

Apologies: Councillors Dent (Councillor Tew substituting)

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN/WOMAN

Having been duly moved and seconded, it was unanimously resolved to appoint Councillor Hickford as the Chairman of the Assets & Investment Committee.

Having been duly moved and seconded, it was unanimously resolved to appoint Councillor Bullen as the Vice Chairman of the Assets & Investment Committee.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Members noted the report that had been approved by full Council on 10th May 2016, establishing the Assets & Investment Committee, and setting out the Terms of Reference. Full Council had agreed the following changes:

- Membership – any seven Members, subject to political proportionality;
- Delegated Authority – last point to be amended to read *“To consider and make recommendations to Council for property rationalisations proposals that are outside of the agreed Business Plan”*.

Members were reminded that the role of the Assets and Investment Committee was much broader than the Investment Review Group, which had primarily focused on housing development. A further report on the full scope of the Committee’s responsibilities, resources and manpower would be presented at the next meeting.

Members discussed frequency of meetings. It was agreed that for the foreseeable future, due to workload the Committee would schedule monthly meetings, which could be cancelled if not required.

It was resolved to note the report.

4. ACTION NOTES OF INVESTMENT REVIEW GROUP (22ND APRIL 2016)

Members resolved to note the action notes of the Investment Review Group on 22nd April 2016.

The Chairman advised that reports 5-7 had not been available for public inspection five clear days in advance of the meeting. He proposed to exercise his discretion under Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to allow discussion of the reports, on the basis that it was important that the Committee was able to receive these report to progress, and timescales had not allowed for the reports to be available at an earlier date.

5. ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMPANY AS A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE (HDV) FOR PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT

Members received a report setting out the rationale and outline business case for the establishment of a company or companies owned by Cambridgeshire County Council for the purpose of identifying and developing potential sites for residential and commercial use.

A Member observed that the report confused two issues, specifically (i) whether the Council should develop land for housing, for which there was already general support, and (ii) the best way to undertake that development. Officers acknowledged this point, and pointed out that some Assets & Investment Committee Members had sat on the Investment Review Group for many months, so were familiar with the debates on the merits of developing land for housing. However, as there were also completely new Members who did not have that background, it was necessary to provide the context in which the Committee planned to move forward. The principle of developing housing on County Council land was already in the Business Plan, the issue was now what the most appropriate vehicle was to deliver that development. There were a number of options, including the Council retaining ownership, but as the Council is a public sector body, any tenants would have the Right To Buy. Whilst that had its merits, from a commercial perspective, it was not the most commercially advantageous. If the Council undertook the housing

developments, it would also have all the upfront infrastructure costs, which would mean a heavy cashflow before any financial returns were realised. By developing a Housing Development Vehicle (HDV), there were two immediate benefits for the Council: (i) the HDV would be a wholly owned company, but sit outside the Local Authority confines, so would not have to offer RTB. The HDV would not own any land, and would not have any cash. The Council would sell the land to the company, for which it would get a capital receipt. The Council would have to lend the HDV money to facilitate this sale, and to also finance the other costs (construction and infrastructure). The HDV would lend at the market rate (7.5%), which the Council would borrow from government at 3.5%. In summary, the profit/income to the Council arose from the profit on the margin, with the security on the loan provided by the land and houses. It was confirmed that based on previous discussions, the HDV would be a wholly owned company, and the HDV would need to be based on a very detailed business case being agreed. A Member observed that whilst the interest rate gap looked attractive, a longer term view needed to be taken, especially given the costs which would eat in to that margin, including tax liabilities.

A Member commented that whilst understanding the rationale, as housing was being developed on Council owned land it should be eligible for RTB. Whilst acknowledging that other authorities had already done this, and it was legally permissible, there was a risk that the current or any future government would take a different political view: the legal landscape could change, and there was no way of quantifying the risk of that occurring. Officers agreed that it was possible that legislation could change to capture these types of project, and that it was difficult to predict the likelihood of that occurring.

It was clarified that the RTB issue arose because of the Council's status i.e. as a local authority and therefore as a housing authority, even though the County Council does not currently operate any housing functions. The majority of land would be developed as private housing with the appropriate proportion of affordable housing.

With regard to risk, it was noted that in their early discussions, the Investment Review Group looked at sharing risk but had opted for a wholly owned i.e. the HDV not being wholly owned, but shared with a developer. It was also noted that the HDV remit would be wider residential housing for rental, to embrace both residential and commercial property.

A Member spoke in favour of the direction proposed, given his experience as a member of another property board for a LA with considerable assets. However, he felt that the risk already highlighted of government changing legislation, and ultimately the returns to the LA reducing, was a very real one,

which needed to be evaluated. He also pointed out that the simple business model presented gave the impression of “making money out of nothing”, which may appear to be the case for the Council’s revenue account, but it did have significant cashflow implications. He asked if enough was known about the Council’s future cashflow predictions, and sought reassurance that the Council would not go illiquid. Officers commented that this was a valid point, and the level indebtedness would significant increase, albeit to an acceptable level, as construction costs would require upfront funding, and this would be reflected on the Balance Sheet.

A Member asked, on the basis of forecasts already undertaken on borrowing, repayments and income streams, how long it would be until there was net income. Officers advised that they did not expect the HDV to make a profit for some time, maybe even for decades, although the income for the Council would be realised straight away. Much depended on the shape and length of the development pipeline.

A Member asked if the HDV would be open to legal challenges by other developers i.e. as a result of the Council selling land to its own company. Officers advised that experience around the country to date showed that land had successfully been transferred in this way, and there had been no legal challenges to date. Members noted the potential issues where there could be challenge, around selling at less than best consideration. However, the model proposed would protect the Council from such challenges, as it was proposing to transfer land at market value to the HDV.

A Member commented that future discussions and reports need to be clear whether they were referring to the County Council or the HDV. He also queried if making a return on money borrowed from the government in the way proposed was completely legal. Officers advised that it was, although it was noted that the government may introduce a cap on prudential borrowing in the future, at which stage the Council would need to look at other potential mechanisms.

The Committee noted the example set out in the report, with the caveat that it was predicated on a large number of assumptions, e.g. all units being rented. This would very much depend on the location and nature of the sites, and demand in those areas, and the location of the first ones to come forward were noted. Each project would have a detailed business case, which would come back to the Committee. The key issue was that whilst the land would be sold to the HDV and the necessary borrowing arranged, the detailed operational arrangements would be managed by the HDV. The Council would be the shareholder, but have no operational involvement. There would be clear and absolute separation between the Council, as shareholder, and the

individuals running the HDV, who would be responsible for operational management. This would maintain the requisite checks and balances, and offer transparency and overview of the process, with the shareholder board keeping an overview and effectively having a veto. Mixing up the two roles i.e. Company (HDV) Board and Shareholder (Council) Board, especially by having Councillors on the Company Board, had led to problems for other Councils – the company needed to be free and agile enough to run its own business. A Member was pleased to note that it would be the Committee, not individual officers and Members, exercising their vote on behalf of the Council.

Members noted that one of the non-financial benefits included the ability to boost housing supply, support economic growth and provide affordable homes: however there was a balance to be struck – if too many conditions or caveats were put on developments, it would affect the profitability and therefore the return realised from the HDV.

The proposed form of the HDV was a company limited by shares (CLS), which was the form of corporate entity being used by other local authorities pursuing similar scheme. It was noted that the other companies that had been established had been running for up to five years in relation to housing, although local authorities had been running other types of trading companies for decades. A Member agreed that a HDV company limited by shares was the best option, but for completeness, asked what alternatives had been considered. It was noted that these options had been explored at IRG and was available in the documents referred to in the Source Documents section of the report. Officers agreed to email these to Councillors Boden, Dent, Harford, Jenkins and Sales. **Action required.**

A Member commented that the corporate governance surrounding this proposal was absolutely crucial, and needed to be right from the start, clearly separating out the interests and legal obligations of the County Council and HDV, and their respective Directors. Officers commented that in terms of decisions and the governance process, this Committee would be acting as the shareholder, and would not be involved in the HDV's operational decisions. The relevant statutory corporation would be the Council, and the Committee would exercise control on behalf of CCC as a shareholder. It was pointed out that the potential conflict of interest for Council officers needed to be recognised, specifically the Director of Finance and the Director of Law & Governance, who would also be directors of HDV initially. Officers reassured Members that whilst they would have a role once the HDV was being set up, it was envisaged that professional directors with no connections to the County Council would be in post as soon as possible. It was also noted that officers were in a slightly different position to County Councillors, not being bound by the Members' Code of Conduct. Any potential conflicts on the Board by

officers could be declared, so that the decision could be taken by fellow directors on the HDV Board whether or not they could participate in decisions on specific issues. There was a discussion on the importance of independence, quality and experience of the directors of the HDV.

In terms of HDV documentation that the Committee would need to monitor, it was noted that this would need to be specified, i.e. specific financial reports for quarterly and annual monitoring, including the Profit & Loss account, Balance Sheet, etc. The focus would be very much on keeping an oversight on what was happening.

A Member commented that it would be helpful for the HDV Directors to know as much as possible about the County Council and the land it owned. It was confirmed that the intention would be for the Directors to be proactive with suggestions on development options, and there would be some division of functions between the HDV and the existing County Council assets team, i.e. reviewing land and strategies would be a function that would remain in house, but there would come a point where the HDV could act on the Council's behalf once they have the necessary skills and capacity.

The Committee discussed tax implications, noting that the HDV would be SDLT (Stamp Duty Land Tax) exempt, because the Council was, and the HDV would be the wholly owned body of that body corporate, but other taxes such as CGT (Capital Gains Tax) would be an issue longer term. There was also the issue of VAT registration being done as early as possible, because there would be huge outgoings up front.

It was noted that start up costs would be mitigated as far as possible, and to date all work had been done in-house. There was no intention to put forward a transformation bid.

Members noted that around thirty proposals for name of HDV had been received so far from Members and officers. The Director of Finance would be checking them to see if they were registered with Companies House, and then emailing them to Committee Members. **Action Required.**

Officers were asked to arrange a meeting with the Chairman and Vice Chairman as soon as possible, to expedite the actions listed in section (iii) of the recommendations.

It was resolved unanimously:

- i) Approve the principle of and business case for a wholly owned company or companies to be established and operated by

Cambridgeshire County Council for the purpose of identifying, developing and managing residential and commercial property developments within the UK with a view to generating capital and revenue income for Cambridgeshire County Council.

- ii) Request the Director of Law & Governance to incorporate a company or companies, limited by shares, to be wholly owned by Cambridgeshire County Council for the above purposes.
- iii) Authorise the Director Law & Governance, in consultation with the Chairman/woman and Vice Chairman/woman to
 - a. Agree the final form of the company Articles.
 - b. Agree the arrangements for the exercise of the shareholder functions.
 - c. Agree and appoint the initial directors of the company.

6. SITES SCHEDULE/HIGHLIGHT REPORT

A report was presented identifying progress and issues with sites. Members noted a number of updates, particularly on the Soham Eastern Gateway site.

All Members agreed that due to the commercially sensitive nature of much of the information in these reports, that they should be considered in confidential session at future meetings.

It was resolved to note the report.

7. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

Members agreed to utilise the monthly Investment Review Group dates up until November 2016, with a 10am start, and identify dates for the rest of the Municipal Year. The Meeting Card would be updated accordingly.

Members noted the agenda plan.

ASSETS & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes-Action Log



Introduction:

This is the updated action log as at **16th June 2016** and captures the actions arising from the most recent Assets & Investment Committee meeting and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

Minutes of 27 th May 2016					
Item No.	Item	Action to be taken by	Action	Comments	Completed
5.	Establishment of a company as a Housing Development Vehicle for property development	Roger Moore/ John Macmillan?	Email Cllrs Boden, Dent, Harford, Jenkins and Sales documents on the alternative legal models (to HDV) previously considered.	Emailed by Roger Moore.	15/06/16
	Establishment of a company as a Housing Development Vehicle for property development	Chris Malyon	Email Committee suggested company names for HDV.		31/05/16
	Establishment of a company as a Housing Development Vehicle for property development	Quentin Baker	Meet with Chairman and Vice Chairman to agree Articles, arrangements for exercise of shareholder functions, and appoint initial directors of HDV.	Meeting arranged for 23/06/16.	10/06/16
7.	Committee Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Send electronic meeting invitations and identify dates for rest of the year.	Electronic invites for dates up to May 2016 issued.	13/06/16

COMMITTEE REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2016-17

To: **Assets and Investment Committee**

Meeting Date: **24th June 2016**

From: **Chris Malyon, Chief Finance Officer**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **N/a** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To set out the revenue and capital budgets that will now fall under the responsibility of this Committee and to inform the Committee of the monitoring arrangements of those budgets.**

Recommendation: **It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of the report.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Chris Malyon
Post:	Chief Finance Officer
Email:	Chris.malyon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699796

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council agreed to establish the Assets and Investments Committee at the meeting on 10th May 2016. The Committee's terms of reference and Constitutional responsibilities were agreed as part of that decision.
- 1.2 The Committee is responsible for all 'landlord' related activities that were previously the responsibility of General Purposes Committee and a number of other property and land related matters.

2. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

- 2.1 The budgets that are currently in the process of being disaggregated from other committees, primarily General Purposes Committee, are set out in the **appendix** to this report.
- 2.2 An officer from the Property Services Team will be at the meeting to provide an overview of the activities and costs that are funded from within the property budgets. A further briefing will be included on the agenda of the next meeting that explains that activities that are covered within the Managing Local Energy Investment (MLEI) portfolio.
- 2.3 The Committee will receive regular Finance and Performance monitoring reports from July 2016 that set out the financial forecasts against these budgets.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications for this priority.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications for this priority.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Source Documents	Location
<i>2016-21 Cambridgeshire County Council Business Plan</i>	Finance Directorate Floor 1 Octagon Shire Hall, Cambridge.

Budgets for consideration by Assets and Investments Committee

All budgets currently reported in CS & LGSS Finance and Performance Report under LGSS Managed.

<u>Capital</u>	2016/17 Budget (£000)	Actuals to 31/05/16 (£000)	Total Scheme Budget (£000)
Shire Hall	750	8	6,146
Local Plans - Representations	519	31	4,284
County Farms investment (Viability)	500	38	2,604
Community Hubs - Sawston	1,105	1	1,309
Renewable Energy - Soham	10,225	250	10,336
Burwell Newmarket Road 350 Homes - Invest to Save	203	12	105,797
MAC Market Towns Project (March)	481	0	1,481
EPAM - Building Maintenance	885	177	6,063
Redevelopment of Milton Road Library, Cambridge	0	6	2,000
Equality Act Works in Corporate Offices	20	0	200
Energy Efficiency Fund	250	0	1,000
Office Portfolio Rationalisation	345	0	345
MAC Joint Highways Depot	0	0	5,198
Community Hubs - East Barnwell	0	0	1,950
Worts Causeway 230 Homes - Invest to Save	0	0	57,202
Shepreth 7 Homes - Invest to Save	0	0	1,200
Cottenham 200 Homes - Invest to Save	0	0	30,000
EPAM - Fenland	20	0	6,596
EPAM - COWA	0	168	0
Other Committed Projects (EPAM)	87	5	2,043
Community Hubs	0	22	0
CCC Contribution to Carbon Reduction & Improved Efficiency	214	0	1,673
Housing - Soham Eastern Gateway	0	7	0
Employment Land - BioMed Park Extension	0	1	0
Total	15,604	727	247,427

<u>Revenue</u>	2016/17 Budget (£000)	Actuals to 31/05/16 (£000)	2017/18 Budget (£000)
Effective Property Asset Management	0	6	1
County Offices	5,045	2,342	4,406
Building Maintenance	1,121	-9	1,115
Farms	-3,453	-491	-4,405
Total	2,714	1,848	1,117

REVIEW OF INVESTMENT REVIEW GROUP PLANNING PROTOCOLS

To: **Assets and Investment Committee**

Meeting Date: **24th June 2016**

From: **Chief Finance Officer**

Electoral division(s): **All**

Forward Plan ref: **n/a** *Key decision:* **No**

Purpose: **To inform Assets & Investment Committee Members of the previously agreed protocol guiding the Council's approach to negotiating planning consents on sites being brought forward for development**

Recommendation: **That the Committee reviews the existing Protocol and:**

a) confirms its continuing application; or

b) provides guidance for a revised protocol to be brought to a future Committee meeting

<i>Officer contact:</i>	
Name:	Roger Moore
Post:	LGSS Head of Strategic Assets
Email:	Roger.moore@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	07748 930805

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In September 2015, the Investment Review Group agreed a protocol to provide guidance to Officers as to the Council's approach to negotiating planning consents and Section 106 Agreements for sites being brought forward for development
- 1.2 The Assets and Investment Committee has now taken responsibility for all property matters on behalf of the Council
- 1.3 The current Protocol is attached at **Appendix 1**.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 As the Property Portfolio Development Programme progresses under the new Committee, Members should assure themselves that the current protocol is fit for purpose

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The agreed protocol will support the Council's objectives in bringing forward sites from its portfolio for development across the county

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

There are no significant implications under this priority

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

There are no significant implications under this priority

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

Planning applications for the development of property are carried out under a statutory process, but there are many areas which are also open to negotiation and agreement. There are commercial and reputational risks for the council in how planning applications are negotiated

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

Each and every site to be developed by the Council will require planning consent to be granted by the local planning authority, and the planning application process involves full consultation with appropriate stakeholders and the public.

4.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

Local Members are consulted prior to any disposal, and advised when planning applications are made

4.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Source Documents	Location
<i>None</i>	

Appendix 1

ENDORISING THE PROTOCOL FOR THE APPROACH FOR NEGOTIATING PLANNING CONSENTS ON CCC DEVELOPMENT SITES

To: Investment Review Group

Date: 23 September 2015

From: Roger Moore

1. PURPOSE

1.1 Following previous discussions with Members, to confirm the general guiding principles under which officers will negotiate planning consents for CCC land for development sites

1.2 To seek the endorsement of the IRG to the Protocol described below.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 CCC is taking a greater role in the development of its own land to create sustainable and ongoing investments for revenue returns and capital growth. As landowner, CCC will be negotiating planning consents which determine the development potential of such sites direct with local planning authorities.

2.2 This approach has the potential to create some tensions between CCC's role as a public authority, promoting high standard and community-focused uses and infrastructure, and the desire to maximise revenue or capital returns from development opportunities in its own property portfolio.

2.3 Particular areas where these tensions may surface include:-

- Levels of Affordable Housing provision
- Definition of Affordable Housing (eg local residency, Key Worker Housing, Specialist Housing such as Extra Care)
- Construction and maintenance standards (eg Lifetime Homes)
- Provision of Public Open Space
- Contributions to local Sporting, Community, Leisure and Arts facilities
- S.106 contributions to Infrastructure (eg Schools, Highways, Libraries etc)

2.4 This protocol therefore sets out the general approach that CCC will take in negotiating planning consents for its own land, following consultation with Members through the cross-party Investment Review sub-group of the General Purposes Committee.

3. PROTOCOL

- 3.2 When negotiating planning consents for the development of CCC land for residential, commercial and investment purposes, CCC will make fair and reasonable efforts to comply with the current requirements of the local planning authority and its statutory consultees
- 3.3 Where a genuine viability/profitability gap can be demonstrated in respect of any particular site, CCC will use its reasonable endeavours to ensure that a viable planning consent is obtained
- 3.4 In considering any viability/profitability, CCC will include a reasonable expectation of a market value return for its interest in the site as landowner (i.e. what it could reasonably expect to receive if it were to sell the land at market value, including development value)
- 3.5 Where requirements for contributions or works relating to statutory functions of CCC exceed those that might reasonably be expected from current market practice, those proposals will be referred to the Investment Review Group for consideration
- 3.6 Each site will be considered on a case by case basis, including consultation with the local CCC Member, and any potential areas of departure from this Protocol will be referred to the Investment Review Group for consideration and guidance

4. RECOMMENDATION/DECISION REQUIRED

- 4.1 Members are asked to endorse the Protocol as guidance to officers in dealing with future negotiations for planning applications for development on CCC land for residential, commercial and investment purposes

ASSETS AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

Published – 1st June 2016
Updated – 16th June 2016



Cambridgeshire
County Council

Notes

Committee dates shown in bold are confirmed.

Committee dates shown in brackets and italics are **provisional/reserve** dates.

The definition of a key decision is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 2, Article 12.

* indicates items expected to be recommended for determination by full Council.

+ indicates items expected to be confidential, which would exclude the press and public. Additional information about confidential items is given at the foot of this document.

Draft reports are due with the Democratic Services Officer by 10.00 a.m. eight clear working days before the meeting.

The agenda dispatch date is six clear working days before the meeting.

Committee Date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
24/06/16 10.00am	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore		13/06/16	15/06/16
	Committee Revenue and Capital budgets 2016-17	Chris Malyon			
	Review of Investment Review Group Planning Protocols	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore			
	Warboys, Red Tile Farm tenancy (<i>confidential</i>)	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore			
	Looked After Children in residential properties – update (<i>confidential</i>)	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore			
	Farcet Farms (<i>confidential</i>)	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore			

Committee Date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	Wisbech Castle Update (<i>confidential</i>)	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore			
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		
22/07/16 10.00am	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable	11/07/16	13/07/16
	Managing Affordable Housing – discussion paper (<i>confidential</i>)	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	Wisbech, Queen Mary Centre - discussion paper	Roger Moore/Stephen Conrad	Not applicable		
	Assets & Investment working processes – discussion paper	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	Acquisitions and Investments Strategy – discussion paper	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	Energy Investment discussion paper	Chris Malyon/Sheryl French	Not applicable		
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		
26/08/16 12:00 noon	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable	15/08/16	17/08/16
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		
16/09/16 10.00am	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable	05/09/16	07/09/16
	Asset Management Strategy update	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	County Farms Estate Strategy update	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	Oasis Centre, Wisbech	Chris Malyon	Not applicable		

Committee Date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
	Implications of digital strategy on property assets (review of Telecoms Strategy; Housing design)	Roger Moore/Noelle Godfrey	Not applicable		
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		
21/10/16 10.00am	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable	11/10/16	13/10/16
	Care Accommodation Business Case	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable		
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		
11/11/16 10.00am	Programme Highlight Report	Chris Malyon/Roger Moore	Not applicable	07/11/16	09/11/16
	Agenda Plan	Dawn Cave	Not applicable		

Notice made under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 in compliance with Regulation 5(7)

1. At least 28 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private.
2. At least 5 clear days before a private meeting of a decision-making body, further public notice must be given which must include a statement of reasons for the meeting to be held in private, details of any representations received by the decision-making body about why the meeting should be open to the public and a statement of the Council's response to such representations.

Forward plan reference	Intended date of decision	Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Decision maker	List of documents to be submitted to the decision maker	Reason for the meeting to be held in private

Decisions to be made in private as a matter of urgency in compliance with Regulation 5(6)

3. Where the date by which a meeting must be held makes compliance with the above requirements impracticable, the meeting may only be held in private where the decision-making body has obtained agreement from the Chairman of the Council.
4. Compliance with the requirements for the giving of public notice has been impracticable in relation to the business detailed below.
5. The Chairman of the Council has agreed that the Committee may hold a private meeting to consider the business referred to in paragraph 4 above because the meeting is urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred for the reasons stated below.

Date of Chairman's agreement	Matter in respect of which the decision is to be made	Reasons why meeting urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred

For further information, please contact Quentin Baker on 01223 727961 or Quentin.Baker@cambridgeshire.gov.uk