

# COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE



**Date: Friday, 22 June 2018**

**Democratic and Members' Services**

Fiona McMillan

Deputy Monitoring Officer

**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 for absence and declarations of interest**

*Guidance on declaring interests is available at*

<http://tinyurl.com/cc-conduct-code>

2. **Minutes and Action Log of the Commercial and Investment Committee held 25th May 2018** **3 - 16**

### OTHER DECISIONS

3. **This Land Board Representation** **17 - 30**
4. **Programme Highlight Report - Progress of Sales to This Land** **31 - 34**
5. **Committee Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies** **35 - 38**

The Commercial and Investment Committee comprises the following members:

Councillor Josh Schumann (Chairman) Councillor Anne Hay (Vice-Chairwoman)

Councillor Ian Bates Councillor Lorna Dupre Councillor Linda Jones Councillor Lucy Nethsingha Councillor Paul Raynes Councillor Terence Rogers Councillor Mike Shellens and Councillor Tim Wotherspoon

*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 <https://tinyurl.com/ProcedureRules>.

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-carpark> or public transport.

## **COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Friday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Venue: Room 128, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Time: 10.00am – 11.50am

Present: Councillors I Bates, A Hay (Vice Chairman), D Jenkins, L Jones, L Nethsingha, P Raynes, T Rogers, J Schumann (Chairman), M Shellens and T Wotherspoon

Also present: Councillors A Bailey and K Cuffley

Apologies: None

### **113. NOTIFICATION OF CHAIRMAN/WOMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN/WOMAN**

The Committee noted the appointment of Councillors Schumann and Hay as the Chairman and Vice Chairwoman respectively of the Commercial & Investment Committee for the municipal year 2018/19.

### **114. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **115. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG OF THE COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE HELD 27<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2018**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

Members noted the following updates to the Action Log:

Item 58 (4) – a quarterly report from ESPO trading services would be available shortly. It was agreed that this would be built in to the future work programme. **Action required.**

Item 96 – Tri-LEP Local Energy Investment and Delivery workshop – Sheryl French had spoken to officers at Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire Councils about how to go about setting this up, and it was anticipated that the workshop would be arranged for September.

Item 109 – It was agreed that a session on Performance Indicators and Finance would take place on the first provisional training slot identified in the Training Plan (20<sup>th</sup> July). **Action required.**

It was resolved to note the Action Log.

## **PUBLIC QUESTION**

A public question was presented by Antony Carpen (transcript of question and response attached at Appendix 1).

### **116. OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE FOR SMART ENERGY GRIDS FOR TRUMPINGTON AND BABRAHAM PARK AND RIDE SITES**

A report was presented giving the outline business cases for two Smart Energy Grids at the Trumpington and Babraham Park and Ride (P&R) sites. The merits, funding options and risks for each site were outlined.

Since the report had been drafted, the Combined Authority had announced it would be undertaking a Strategic Transport Review.

In discussion:

- one Member indicated that she was pleased to see this proposal coming forward, as it was potentially a huge opportunity to expand solar energy in the county. She noted the ongoing issues with possibly relocating the Trumpington P&R site on County Council land west of the M11, or using both sites at Trumpington for P&R, as suggested by the Greater Cambridge Partnership. Officers confirmed that several different options were being considered. The planning application would be based on the current P&R site, as given the proximity to the Biomedical Campus, both Trumpington and Babraham P&R sites would be needed to support demand. If the Trumpington P&R site moved to the new site west of the M11, the project could go ahead on that site, albeit with some redesign and additional costs, so further risk profiling would be required;
- A Member asked if it would be more advisable to phase one project before the other, noting that much had been learned from the first project at St Ives, and more lessons could be learned from the second site. Whilst he understood there was scope for bulk purchases, etc, if the Trumpington and Babraham sites were progressed in tandem, he could see potentially more benefits from developing the sites

separately. Officers confirmed that the Babraham site could be progressed first, as the more viable site, and it was suggested that it may progress more quickly anyway;

- with regard to progress on the St Ives site, the Chairman requested that an update could be circulated to the Committee. **Action required;**
- with regard to the joint funding, it was noted that there had already been discussions with Connecting Cambridgeshire. Innovate UK had also recently put out a call for innovative energy systems although that option had not yet been explored. In addition, the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) had just announced its Smart Systems and Flexibility Plan, with £250M being allocated to smart energy systems. Once there was clarity with regard to the Combined Authority's Transport Plans, this could also be a potential source of funding;
- it was noted that there was broad agreement within the industry on the chemical makeup of the batteries, and costs were reducing. The size of batteries would be dictated largely by the network connection, and there would be engagement with UKPN on this point;
- a Member urged officers to tap in to the work the University of Cambridge was doing on batteries;
- officers confirmed that they had been in contact with South Trumpington Parish Council, and would be meeting the Council in July.

The Chairman thanked officers for their informative presentation. It was confirmed that a report back would be presented in the autumn.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) to agree the outline business cases; and
- b) to support the development budget of £150,000 for each site to fund the development costs to the first stage of an Investment Grade proposal.

#### **117. FORMER MILL ROAD LIBRARY – UPDATE ON ISSUES WITH LEASE TO INDIAN COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL ASSOCIATION**

A report was presented on issues with the former library at Mill Road, Cambridge, a Grade 2 listed building, which was let to the Indian Community and Cultural Association (ICCA). The ICCA paid a peppercorn rent and were responsible for maintenance. A recent survey indicated that maintenance work in the region of £200,000 was required.

Legal advice had been sought on how to enforce the ICCA's maintenance obligations, and officers had met with the Chair of the ICCA in April. Options discussed included a Negotiated Surrender, however, the ICCA does not have an alternative building to move in to. Cambridge City Council had expressed an interest in the property. The property was currently limited to D1 planning Use Class, which was fairly restrictive, but there was still the potential for significant rents to be obtained.

Speaking as the Local Member, Councillor Jones advised that she had spoken with City Councillors, and from a City Council perspective, the high cost of repairs was a real deterrent. It was noted that the wider membership of ICCA had not been consulted, and there were some sensitivities, not least as there was a shrine on the site.

It was noted that if the tenant was unable to fulfil their responsibilities, the liability rested with the County Council as property owner. It was noted that the Trustees had been consulted and there was an issue of financial liability to the Charity, and closing the Charity and surrendering the Lease was a possibility, without any liability for dilapidations, which would then fall to the County Council. Greater clarity was required on the potential costs and potential returns if all works were carried out. It was agreed that there was some urgency, given further delay would lead to further deterioration in the property and greater costs.

One Member commented on the wider issue this raised about carrying out regular inspections of County Council properties, given this was a Listed building, and it had been originally leased to the ICCA in 1999. Officers advised that the issues at this particular site had come to their attention in 2016. Whilst they would like to be able to inspect more frequently, the team was not resourced to do this.

Another Member sought reassurances that there were not other County Council owned sites with similar issues. Officers were unaware of any other Listed buildings that were leased out, but the point that the deterioration of the estate when leased to tenants would be fed through the Outcome Focus Review process. **Action required.**

A Member queried the suggestion in the report that change of use from D1 was unlikely. Officers confirmed that this was the case, unless similar community facilities were provided elsewhere or on another part of the site. It was further confirmed that pre-application discussions were a possibility.

With regard to the Charity Trustees being unable to meet the costs and surrendering the site, greater clarity was required. It was noted that although the meeting had been with the Chair of Trustees, she had indicated she had discussed a Negotiated Surrender with other Trustees, but not the wider membership. One Members suggested more time should be given to see if the ICCA could secure some of the funds required from its wider membership.

It was resolved unanimously to:

1. agree that officers agree a negotiated surrender of the lease of the old Mill Road Library from the Indian Cultural and Community Association, and to explore options for sale or letting;
2. agree the final terms of the surrender be delegated to the Deputy Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee.

## **118. DISPOSALS POLICY**

A report was presented on proposed refinements to the existing asset disposals policy, to better reflect the Committee's preferred direction in terms of future disposals.

The background to this subject, including the debate and resolutions on the Disposal Process for property assets, considered at the Committee in June 2017, were noted, as were some of the issues that arisen subsequently. One particular issue was what way meant by "surplus to requirements", and also the need for a more robust approach internally, before the decision reaches the Committee stage. The report also sought to clarify that all assets were owned by the body corporate, regardless of who was using them, and the role of Local Members, which was set out in the Constitution.

A Member indicated that whilst it was a Constitutional issue, they would be happier for Local Member involvement to also be included as part of the Disposal Policy flowchart. The Member indicated that whilst acknowledging that it would ultimately be a Committee decision, it was important that Local Members had full information and were able to comment and share their views with the Committee. **Action required.**

A Member observed that it appeared there was no Member or Committee involvement in the process to confirm an asset as surplus, which suggested that an asset could be declared surplus with no Member involvement at all. Whilst this was understandable for some assets, where the decision to confirm as surplus was very straightforward, there needed to be an opportunity for Member involvement. The Chairman pointed out that if an asset was declared surplus, nothing actually happened to it, and the ultimate decision to dispose of an asset would still rest with the Committee.

It was confirmed that there would be deadlines in the new process. In response to a Member question, it was noted that the Operational Assets Board was made up of middle managers across the organisation, especially those with a property focus. The Strategic Property Asset Board was chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive and included more senior representatives from across the organisation. The governance of both Asset Boards was currently being reviewed, and it was likely that the latter would become the governance arrangement for Cambridgeshire 2020 going forward.

Another Member expressed dissatisfaction about the involvement of Local Members in the process, especially given that some assets had a significant value to their communities, and the process as proposed appeared to suggest This Land was being prioritised above Local Members.

There was a discussion around the term “*surplus to requirements*”. It was agreed that this should be changed to “*surplus to operational requirements*”.

**Action required.**

A Member pointed out that Highways had 6,000 parcels of land, historically purchased for highway use which were not used in the current highway boundary extent, and that some of these parcels of land were quite significant and could present additional sale or development opportunities. He asked where decisions on these parcels of land would be made. Officers advised that whilst these parcels of land were recorded in a separate database, they were still assets owned by the body corporate, and would therefore go through the same process.

It was resolved, by a majority, to:

adopt the refined asset disposal policy as set out in Appendix 2 to the report.

## **119. PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT – PROGRESS OF SALES TO THIS LAND**



The Committee considered the progress of sales to This Land. Members' attention was drawn to a table showing a detailed breakdown for each site.

Members noted:

- the list of 14 sales completed on 13/04/18;
- Soham Northern and Milton Road had completed by 22/05/18;
- there had been delays with the Willingham, Landbeach, Litlington and Wicken sites, originally anticipated for completion by 22/05/18;
- current progress being made with the Whittlesford, Shepreth, Burwell, Malta Road and Soham Eastern sites;
- Planning consent for 154 house had been granted at Rampton Road, Cottenham following an appeal, but there was still the possibility of judicial review. A Member pointed out that every effort should be made to work cooperatively with District and City Planning Committees – overturning decisions was not desirable;
- an application for ten houses at Clear Farm had been submitted on 17/05/18.

A Member pointed out that the report referred to the Shire Hall 'sale' which should read 'disposal'. **Action required.**

A Member asked for more information in the table in future reports e.g. how many units, and who was making the application (i.e. County Council or This Land). **Action required.**

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the content of the Programme Highlight Report;

## **120. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE REPORT – OUTTURN REPORT 2017/18**

The Committee considered a report on the financial and performance information relating to the areas within the Commercial and Investment Committee's remit, for the year 2017-2018.

At the end of the 2017/18 financial year, the Committee recorded an overspend of £534K on Revenue budgets. There were six material variances, which were detailed in the report.

Predicted in-year variances of £1.5M in the Committee's Capital budgets were netted off against the Capital Programme Variations budget. An increased in-

year underspend on the Housing schemes of £83.3M resulted in a total programme underspend of £84.1M in 2017-18. The scale of capital underspend was rather large and reflects the attempts to transfer to This Land in 2017-2018, i.e. a number of transfers had not taken place until the 2018-19 financial year. Work on re-profiling had already started.

In response to a Member question, it was noted that the report presented significant changes since previous reports, as the Committee had made a conscious decision not to repeat issues at every meeting, but to focus on the latest variations. However, all budget virements throughout the year will have been reported to Committee. It was agreed that this would be discussed further at the July training session.

A Member asked for more detail on the reasons for the year-end overspend of £154K on the Property Services budget (Building Maintenance). It was agreed that this would be clarified and reported back. **Action required.**

It was noted that the under recovery on Cambridgeshire Catering & Cleaning Services (CCS) was a failure to deliver on profits, not an actual loss.

It was noted that virements and transfers to/from Reserves were always reported, on a monthly basis in section 2.4 of the appendix to the report.

It was confirmed that as this was the final report for 2017/18, March figures were included.

It was confirmed that only exceptions were included in the “Significant Issues” section of the Appendix. A Member requested that this should also include a brought forward/previous column. It was agreed that these issues could be discussed further at the workshop on 20<sup>th</sup> July.

It was unanimously resolved to:

1. review, note and comment upon the report in the appendix.

## **121. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Committee considered a schedule of appointments to outside bodies, internal advisory groups and panels, and partnership liaison and advisory groups, noting that only one appointment needed to be made. It was proposed by the Chairman to appoint Councillor Wotherspoon to the

Mobilising Local Energy Investment (MLEI) in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough – Project Advisory Board.

It was resolved to:

- (i) review the Agenda Plan;
- (ii) review the Training Plan;
- (iii) agree the appointment, as set out above.

Thank you Chairman, this question that I've submitted comes on the back of a response Cllr Raynes gave to me a few full Council meetings ago, regarding a proposal that's everything to do with heritage, and I also note that the former Mill Road library is also on the agenda. Local people are really interested in the future of this site, as well as obviously the Mill Road library, and I wanted to – basically my proposal for this site was around expanding the Museum of Cambridge as a possibility, given where the car parks currently stand where we used to have a wonderful Court House. And since the full Council meeting, I have been in touch with some architects, and am in a position to potentially commission them to do an outline study on whether it would be possible for part of the site to be used for a Museum of Cambridge and another part of the site to effectively build a castle keep to have offices in them, and to be a potential source of revenue and one of the things I would like advice on is whether I should go ahead and spend some of own money and commission those architects, because it's good for business, isn't it, and with a Conservative majority, Conservatives like business, I assume.

Secondly, I would like to see a comparison between the potential revenues over, let's say a 50 or 100 year period of a long-term lease for this building turned into hotel, because I'm not particularly fussed what happens to it, so long as the revenue that comes back can be put towards local government and effectively create an independent stream, as well as helping support the Museum, versus selling off site completely, so that you have a proper sound evidence base as to which one would be more in the public interest. Again, I would be grateful if at all possible, at some stage we could see the data, mindful of the commercial considerations.

In terms of the wider benefits, one of the things that those of you who come into Cambridge regularly will know, especially at this time of year, is that it becomes very, very crowded, and one of the advantages of turning this into a proper heritage site, beyond what it currently is, is that it extends the tourist trail all the way up to the top of hill, and with those plans it could potentially create a new heritage hub, where we could also potentially have a new transport stop, so we have not just got one single City Centre hub, bearing in mind the plans that Mayor James Palmer has. Having that would again, as well as, creating jobs and revenue, and could also create a new restaurant quarter.

So finally, the real question really is what detailed consideration was given to my proposals, of turning part of the Shire Hall site into an expanded Museum of Cambridge and a heritage site which Councillor Raynes said he would ensure would be considered in response to the public question, because I didn't really see that much of it in the officers' response?

*Councillor Raynes' response:*

I have a prepared response but some of the issues that Mr Carpen has raised go beyond this will be on this written response and I have also added a few points to that. Mr Carpen's previous question to full Council was very welcome, and it highlighted an issue that we feel is very important as Members of this Council, we said at the time we take very seriously the need not only to preserve but to enhance the importance of the scheduled ancient monument and the other historic features of the Shire Hall site as we consider options for its disposal - I very carefully drafted the word 'disposal', just to respond to what Mr Carpen has been saying there - our starting point is indeed the Council's policy for assets like this is not outright freehold sale but leasehold sale, so that's the starting point for our considerations. This has been reflected since in formal conclusions of this Committee which has we took decisions forward highlighted the heritage issues, and indeed at Full Council. It may be worth stressing that this is not principally driven by the historic importance we attach to the heritage of the County Council, even though we're very proud of that. The County Council was originally located in the centre of the city and has been on this site for about ninety years. Rather, we want to celebrate the longer and broader significance of this site which has been home to Anglo-Saxon burghers, Norman administration, a Civil War fortress, and many other uses which places it at the heart of the history of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire.

Now it is too early in the process to set out exactly what the future enhancement of the historic site will look like: we need first of all to engage with the market, to understand fully what commercial uses of the existing Shire Hall building and its neighbours are going to be most advantageous to the taxpayers of Cambridgeshire. But we've got five key elements which for us are a given as we take that forward.

First, is that we want to consider the site in the round, and to that end this Committee has halted previous plans to separately dispose of no. 42 Castle Street, the old police station, registry office, so that they can be considered as part of an overall masterplan for the site.

Secondly, we don't intend to dispose of the part of the site which is a scheduled ancient monument, but there may be creative options for partnering with or delegating to other organisations the day-to-day management.

Thirdly, we want the future use of this site, including access arrangements and design, and I hope this is in line to where the question is coming from, to enhance the overall historic offer and attractiveness to tourists of the Castle Hill area, which has a number of other important historic features and attractions. Our current assessment is that a completely new museum is unlikely to be financially sustainable, so we will be focussing our efforts on conversations about how to make

the most of the site in partnership with existing organisations, and exploring the contribution that a new occupier of the Shire Hall building might be able to make.

Fourthly, we want to work collaboratively on options for the future of the site with other partners, including partners that have been mentioned by Mr Carpen.

Lastly, this work is being taken forward as part of a distinct workstream within the overall programme, to ensure it receives the level of attention it deserves, and specialist County Hall staff will be engaged in that workstream, people who really know about the heritage, know about the museum economy and ecology of Cambridgeshire and so on.

The future picture for Shire Hall and Castle Hill will develop over the near future as we engage further with partners and develop our plans. So while we can't at this point get in to the level of detail Mr Carpen's question might hope for, we do welcome the continuing interest he and others are showing in this element of the Cambridgeshire 2020 project and we are very happy to undertake to keep the public updated on progress through future agenda items and future discussions in this Committee. And just to again go beyond that prepared answer and respond directly to a point Mr Carpen has raised, it is obviously a choice for him, Chairman, whether he wants to put his own capital at risk, engaging an architect or whatever, but if he has an outline sketch, an idea, a broad plan he wants to send in to the Working Group that are working on this, we will be very happy to read that, take that into account, as we consider what the options for the site may be

# COMMERCIAL & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

## Minutes-Action Log



**Agenda Item no. 2**

Cambridgeshire  
County Council

### Introduction:

This is the updated action log as at **14<sup>th</sup> June 2018** and captures the actions arising from the most recent Commercial & Investment Committee meeting and updates Members on the progress on compliance in delivering the necessary actions.

<b>Minutes of 23<sup>rd</sup> February</b>					
<b>83.</b>	<b>Sale of Portfolio of properties to Cambridgeshire Housing &amp; Investment Company</b>	Tom Kelly/ John Macmillan	Review how valuations were assessed for future sites (i.e. second valuation proposal)		In progress
<b>Minutes of 23<sup>rd</sup> March</b>					
<b>91.</b>	<b>Minutes and Action Log</b>	Sass Pledger	Committee to receive a report back on CCS, reviewing the process so far, and actions going forward e.g. how schools were being supported in procurement.	Scheduled for C&I Committee on 20/07/18.	In progress
<b>96.</b>	<b>Tri-LEP Local Energy Investment and Delivery Strategy, and other strategic initiatives</b>	Sheryl French	Set up a workshop with County Council, South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City councillors to share the concept for a network of smart energy grids.	Date being arranged for September.	In progress
<b>Minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> April</b>					
<b>109.</b>	<b>Finance and Performance Report</b>	Tom Kelly/ Ellie Tod	Agreed that the Committee needed to have a session to agree Performance Indicators.	Agreed at Committee on 25/05/18 to include this in a training session on 20/07/18.	Completed.

112.	<b>Resolutions for This Land AGM</b>	Chris Malyon/ Fiona Macmillan	Receive a report on the issues around appointing a Councillor to the This Land Board) at the June C&I meeting.	Scheduled for June meeting.	In progress
<b>Minutes of 25th May</b>					
116.	<b>Outline Business Case for Smart Energy Grids for Trumpington and Babraham Park &amp; Ride sites</b>	Sheryl French/ Cherie Gregoire	An update on progress at the St Ives P&R site (Smart Energy Grid) to be circulated to the Committee.	In progress	
118(1).	<b>Disposals Policy</b>	Chris Malyon	Include Local Member involvement as part of the Disposal Policy flowchart.	The flowchart has been updated and circulated to Officers as the final agreed process.	Completed.
118(2).	<b>Disposals Policy</b>	Chris Malyon	Change term “ <i>surplus to requirements</i> ” in policy to “ <i>surplus to operational requirements</i> ”.		
119(1).	<b>Programme Highlight report – progress of sales to This Land</b>	John Macmillan	Reference to the Shire Hall ‘sale’ should read ‘disposal’.		
119(2).	<b>Programme Highlight report – progress of sales to This Land</b>	John Macmillan	More information in the table in future reports e.g. how many units, and who was making the application (i.e. County Council or This Land).		
120.	<b>Finance and Performance Report – Outturn Report 2017/18</b>	Ellie Tod	Cllr Nethsingha asked for more detail on the reasons for the year-end overspend of £154K on the Property Services budget (Building Maintenance). It was agreed that this would be clarified and reported back		



**THIS LAND BOARD REPRESENTATION**

**To:** Commercial and Investments Committee

**Meeting Date:** 22nd June 2018

**From:** Deputy Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer

**Electoral division(s):** All

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

**Purpose:** The Committee is asked to consider the shareholder's representatives on the Board of This Land in light of the contents of this report.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the Committee:

- a) Consider the contents of this report;
- b) Note the removal of Mr Quentin Baker as a Director of This Land;
- c) In light of the issues highlighted in this report consider which of the following options should be adopted:
  - a. Request that the Deputy Chief Executive identify a short list of Council officers that might be appropriate for filling the current vacant role of shareholder's representative on the Board of This Land.
  - b. The Committee nominate a political representative to fill this role.
  - c. A short list of potential independent representatives be identified for the Committee to consider for the filling of this role.

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member Contact:</i></b>	
Name:	Chris Malyon	Name:	Councillor Josh Schumann
Post:	Deputy Chief Executive & CFO	Post:	Committee Chairman
Email:	<a href="mailto:Chris.malyon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Chris.malyon@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:Joshua.Schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Joshua.Schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	01223 699796	Tel:	01223 706398

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 The County Council established This Land as a wholly owned development and investment company in 2016. The Commercial and Investments Committee is responsible for discharging the functions on behalf of the shareholder, the County Council. The County Council is a single shareholder as a body corporate rather than 61 individual shareholders as individual Members of the Council.

## **2. Current Shareholder Representation**

- 2.1 At the recent Annual General Meeting of This Land the Non-Executive Directors of the Company for the forthcoming year were confirmed as Chris Malyon and Quentin Baker. The meeting was informed by the Managing Director that an independent Chairperson was being sought and once a shortlist had been compiled the Shareholder would be invited to interview and make the decision, as they would with all future appointments.
- 2.2 At the Commercial and Investments Committee immediately preceding the recent AGM of the Company a discussion took place on the motions that the Shareholder wished to put to the AGM. As part of that discussion Councillor Nethsingha raised a point regarding the appointment of Non-Executive Directors where their appointment to the Board was as a direct consequence of their employment with the Council, be that as an officer or as a Member. It was agreed that where the employment of any individual with the Council was brought to a close then their role, as a Director of the Company, should automatically be terminated as of their last day of employment with the Council.
- 2.3 At that point the Committee were unaware that Quentin Baker, one of the Non-Executive Directors of the Company, was about to resign from his role with LGSS Law and as Monitoring Officer of Cambridgeshire County Council. As a consequence of his resignation Quentin has been removed as a Director of the Company and his name has been removed from the register at Companies House. This resignation leaves the Company Board currently with one Executive and one Non-Executive Director. This is not a long term sustainable position.

## **3. Future Board Representation**

- 3.1 The Articles of Association of This Land were agreed by the Shareholder before they were registered at Companies House. Under the Articles the Shareholder can appoint an official observer to attend Board meetings and report back to the Committee either monthly or quarterly albeit this role carries with it no voting responsibilities on the Board of the Committee.
- 3.2 At the recent Annual General Meeting of This Land a request was made that the dates of the Board meeting should be made available to the Shareholder in order to facilitate the attendance of an observer attending on behalf of the Shareholder. All Members of the Committee, at that point, were provided with the dates and Councillor Ian Bates has requested to attend two of the dates set out in that schedule. Without wishing to stifle any Member attending in this capacity the process will need to be managed. If other Members of the Committee also express a desire

to attend there will be practical accommodation issues as the meeting room at This Land offices cannot support significant additional attendees.

- 3.3 There has however been significant debate over whether there should be some political representation on the Board of the Company. When establishing the governance of the Company independent legal advice was sought from Bevan Brittan LLP. The full report was considered by the Committee when they considered and approved the Articles of the Company. The following is however an extract of the key elements appertaining to this issue from that advice.

#### *Members*

*14.14 The conflicts issues for members relate both to the code of conduct, and also to the risk of decisions made by members who are also directors being challenged on the basis of bias or predetermination or bias.*

*14.15 Directors who are members must disclose any potential conflicts of interests and observe the requirements of the code of conduct of the Council required under the Localism Act 2011. Such directors must also be careful (when undertaking their Council role) to behave in ways which avoids suggestions of bias or predetermination. This can be difficult and more so for more senior members, for example, the Cabinet members. Despite the potential for the Council to approve dispensations to effectively authorise the conflict from a councillor standards perspective, it could remain difficult in practical terms for the member to deal with a matter in a satisfactory way and it could lay both the member and the Council open to allegations of bias and potential challenge.*

*14.16 For example, take a scenario where the Council has invested say £25m in a housing vehicle for development. A councillor on the board of the company is aware that the development is not going well and the company risks insolvency so a board meeting is held where they agree they will approach the Council to restructure the financing and obtain further funding in order to further the company's activities. In this situation a councillor or officer who made the decision to approach the Council with this proposal in light of the company's best interests would then be in a difficult position if the individual was then responsible for considering the proposal and making a decision either as a senior officer or member within and in the best interests of the Council. In such situations questions of bias, predetermination and general probity around public decision making would be difficult to satisfactorily manage.*

*14.17 As mentioned in section 10.11.4, where the Council is seeking to establish a company that is not caught by the procurement rules, the position would typically be stronger without members on the board. This is because it would help create greater distance between the company and the Council and reduce the perception or risk that the vehicle has a policy purpose rather than being purely an investment/financial purpose.*

*14.18 Directors' remuneration (if any) for members is restricted in law. This means that they cannot receive any additional remuneration from the company for acting as a director which is beyond the special responsibility allowance they would have received had the activities of the company been discharged by the Council. Any remuneration they receive will be*

*deducted from the special responsibility allowance that they receive within the Council and they may only claim mileage and subsistence at the rates that apply to members.*

#### *Non-executive directors*

*14.19 Officers and/or independent directors could be appointed and engaged either on an executive (i.e. employed or engaged by the vehicle as a worker) or a non-executive capacity. A non-executive director is a director who is not employed by the company and would usually be an independent. Whilst it is considered good governance for a company to have one or more non-executives on its board this will not always be practical or necessary. A non-executive director is intended to increase probity and to bring additional experience to the company in order that it is operated to the best advantage of its shareholders and in accordance with relevant legislation/ rules. A company will usually be of reasonable size before appointing a non-executive and they can be reasonably expensive (to reflect their relevant experience).*

*14.20 The board will need to agree the terms of delegation from the board to the individuals engaged to delivery CHIC's business plan. This could be to individuals employed by the vehicle, to staff seconded in (whether or a full or part time) from the Council and/or individuals contracted in on a temporary basis.*

- 3.4 The advice, whilst quite clear, doesn't rule the option out completely. It simply highlights that there are risks of the Company being challenged by others as being a 'contracting organisation' and therefore subject to local government procurement rules. The risks and issues appertaining to whether a local authority trading company is deemed to be a contracting organisation are set out in detail in the Appendix to this report.
- 3.5 Members of the Committee have referenced other local authorities that do have political representation on the Boards of local authority wholly owned companies that they operate. Whether these organisations have the same level of procurement activity, and therefore risk, that This Land will be undertaking is another matter. Members of the Committee may however feel that even with these risks the benefit of political input to the Board of This Land makes the risk worth taking.
- 3.6 If the Committee do decide to appoint a Member to the Board there is probably a benefit in that Member not being a Member of C&I Committee. This would therefore provide a degree of separation from the interests of the Shareholder as discharged by the Committee and the interests of the Company as discharged by the Board of Directors.

#### **4. Recruitment of Independent Non-Executive Directors**

- 4.1 The Managing Director of the This Land provided a verbal update to the Annual General Meeting regarding the desire to appoint an independent chair of the Board. He highlighted that the process to attract potential applicants had been delayed in order that the product that the Company was offering to the market had been better defined, that a business plan had been published, and that company actually owned

some assets to be able to demonstrate that it was a serious business proposition. Now that all those items are in place the recruitment process has begun in earnest.

- 4.2 As was agreed at the Annual General Meeting that all appointments to the Board would be made by C&I Committee. However the Managing Director has agreed to assess who might be a suitable candidate, with relevant experience to add value to the Board and the Company, and who might be willing to join the Company at this point. The Managing Director has approached an individual with suitable credentials but at the point of drafting this report they had neither accepted nor declined the offer to engage on whether the opportunity was of interest to them.

**5. ROLE OF THE NON EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

- 5.1 A non-executive director is a member of the board of directors but they do not form part of the executive management team. They are not employees of the company or affiliated with it in any other way and are differentiated from executive directors who are members of the board who also serve as executive managers of the company. However they do have the same legal duties, responsibilities, and potential liabilities as their executive counterparts.
- 5.2 Non-executive directors provide independent oversight and serve on committees concerned with sensitive issues such as the pay of the executive directors and other senior managers; they are usually paid a fee for their services but are not regarded as employees.
- 5.3 All directors should be capable of seeing company and business issues in a broad perspective. Nonetheless, non-executive directors are usually chosen because of their independence and initiatives, and are of an appropriate caliber and have particular personal qualities.
- 5.4 It is important for the successful operation of the company that the non-executive directors add value to the operations of the company by ensuring that the executive deliver the outcomes set out in the Articles of the Company and in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the shareholder(s).
- 5.5 As This Land evolves the skills and attributes that the Company will benefit from most from its non-executive board members will also change. At this point however the Company can benefit from a broad range of skills/experiences. The following is a set of skills/experiences that the shareholder should therefore be looking for any non-executive appointment to bring to the Board:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quantity Surveyor</li><li>• Legal</li><li>• Finance</li><li>• Workforce Development</li><li>• Customer Services</li><li>• IT/Digital</li><li>• Design</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Marketing</li><li>• Sales</li><li>• Land Assembly</li><li>• Planning</li><li>• Supply Chain Management</li><li>• Governance</li><li>• Tax</li></ul>
---	---

## **6. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

### **6.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all**

There are no significant implications for this priority arising directly from the proposals contained in this report.

### **6.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives**

There are no significant implications for this priority arising directly from the proposals contained in this report.

### **6.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people**

There are no significant implications for this priority arising directly from the proposals contained in this report.

## **7. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Implications</b>	<b>Team</b>	<b>Name of Officer Consulted</b>
Resource	Finance	Tom Kelly
Statutory, Legal and Risk	Legal	Mickaela McMurtry
Equality and Diversity	Author	Chris Malyon
Engagement and Consultation	Communications	Christine Birchall
Localism and Local Member Involvement	Author	Chris Malyon
Public Health	Public Health	Val Thomas

### **7.1 Resource Implications**

The appointment of an independent Chair, and independent Non Executive Directors, will have resource implications for This Land and these will be funded by the Company as part of their operating expenditure.

### **7.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications**

The potential legal risks appertaining to the Shareholder appointing a political representative to the Board of This Land are set out in this report.

### **7.3 Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

### **7.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications**

There are no significant implications within this category.

## 7.5 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

## 7.6 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

## 8. Source Documents

Source Documents	Location
Bevan Brittan report	Section151/CHIC//Legal advice
This Land Articles of Association	Section151/CHIC/Articles

## 10 CHIC AS A CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

- 10.1 An important requirement of the Council is that CHIC is able to operate within the market as a commercial entity and not be subject to regulations that affect public bodies, in particular the procurement Regulations. The effect of this, as an example, is that CHIC could purchase building contractors, back office or property management services from the Council or a third party without tendering the opportunity. It would be possible for CHIC to be structured this way, and we set out below the legal issues to be considered in order to do so.

*Legal test*

- 10.2 To decide if a body is a contracting authority, it is necessary to work through the definition of "bodies governed by public law" in the Regulations. These are:

*"bodies that have all of the following characteristics:*

*(a) they are established for the specific purpose of meeting needs in the general interest, not having an industrial or commercial character;*

*(b) they have legal personality; and*

*(c) they have any of the following characteristics:*

*(i) they are financed, for the most part, by the State, regional or local authorities, or by other bodies governed by public law;*

*(ii) they are subject to management supervision by those authorities or bodies; or*

*(iii) they have an administrative, managerial or supervisory board, more than half of whose members are appointed by the State, regional or local authorities, or by other bodies governed by public law."*

- 10.3 The court has emphasised as a general principle that the definition must be interpreted broadly. This means that the specific facts of a case are important, and in these circumstances they will therefore have to demonstrate clearly that CHIC does not fall within it.

*Will CHIC have a separate legal personality?*

- 10.4 Yes, and so this limb will be met.

*Will CHIC meet one or more of the control tests in section 10.2(c)?*

- 10.5 Yes. Under the proposed structure, the Council will fund CHIC on a commercial basis. As a result, the first part of the control test would not be met. The second part of the test is more difficult to apply, but could well be met if the Council is seen as having the



ability to scrutinise CHIC to an extent that constituted management supervision. The threshold for this test is low. However, as the Council's briefing paper to us indicates that it will be the sole shareholder and so the only body with the right to appoint CHIC's directors, CHIC will definitely meet the third part of the test i.e. more than half of the board is appointed by the State or another body governed by public law.

*Is CHIC established for the specific purpose of needs in the general interest?*

- 10.6 Yes, as the court has construed this limb so broadly it is prudent to assume a body has been established for meeting needs in the general interest.

*Do those needs have an industrial or commercial character?*

- 10.7 This limb provides the most scope for falling outside the definition of a body governed by public law, and the court has decided that both the characteristics of the marketplace and the nature of the body must be considered.

- 10.8 The key principles are set out below:

*"51. If the body operates in normal market conditions, aims to make a profit, and bears the losses associated with the exercise of its activity, it is unlikely that the needs it aims to meet are not of an industrial or commercial nature. In such a case, the application of the Community directives relating to the coordination of procedures for the award of public contracts would not be necessary, moreover, because a body acting for profit and itself bearing the risks associated with its activity will not normally become involved in an award procedure on conditions which are not economically justified."*

*Advice*

- 10.9 CHIC is more likely to reflect these principles, reducing the possibility of CHIC being classified as a contracting authority, if CHIC's structure is such that it:

10.9.1 operates in normal market conditions;

10.9.2 aims to make a profit; and

10.9.3 bears its losses.

- 10.10 It is clear that the Council intends CHIC to operate for a profit as this is its overriding objective. If the other two factors are also present then there would be good grounds for a court to conclude that CHIC is unlikely to purchase goods, works or services for anything other than economic reasons.

- 10.11 In order to embody all three commercial principles, and strengthen the grounds for arguing that CHIC is not a contracting authority, we suggest that the following actions should be taken. It is difficult to establish a structure that removes entirely the risk of CHIC being classified this way, but these suggestions would create a good argument that it is not:

- 10.11.1 making it clear in the Council's decision-making process that it is setting up CHIC to generate profit, rather than to pursue policy objectives, by relying on its investment power,<sup>4</sup> the general power of competence<sup>5</sup> or a combination of the two, and for this reason is using the company limited by shares model, with unrestricted articles of agreement and the ability to distribute profits by way of dividends. This suggestion has to a large extent been met in the Report;
- 10.11.2 providing all financial and other support from the Council on market terms, documented by suitably commercial terms and conditions. It is likely that this suggestion will be met, for example, because funding will be provided on market terms. It will be important to take the same approach for any other services that may be provided by the Council;
- 10.11.3 having a clear audit trail acknowledging that the Council does not intend to step in and provide support on non-commercial terms in the event of insolvency or similar financial difficulty. We have not seen anything to this effect;
- 10.11.4 appointing directors who are not Council officers or members and who have relevant commercial experience. Two senior Council officers have already been appointed (the Chief Finance Officer and the Director of Law), and the Report indicates that the Council intends to add three other directors with relevant experience. We do not know at this stage if these will be officers, members or external appointments, and for the purpose of structuring CHIC to sit outside the Regulations, would recommend that the key criteria for selection should be commercial experience;
- 10.11.5 sourcing the management capability needed from the market, whether employing someone, or contracting-in resources from the market (rather than seconding someone from the Council), with the clear criteria of suitable commercial experience. Both this and the previous suggestion lend more of a "commercial feel" to the structure;
- 10.11.6 not establishing CHIC as a Teckal company (considered in section 17.2). Although the tests for a contracting authority and Teckal status are different, they are closely related, and it would be more difficult to claim non-contracting authority status whilst being subject to the control of the Council and limited to providing 80% of activities to it. This suggestion will be met as the Council does not intend to establish CHIC with Teckal status.

10.12 If these suggestions are adopted, there are good grounds for deciding that CHIC will not be a body governed by public law caught by the Regulations. The case would be even stronger if the Council did not have the right to appoint the majority of the board of directors, because there would be no relationship of close dependency (please

see the control tests in section 10.2(c) above). The Council should therefore consider if this would be an acceptable position.

- 10.13 There will remain a residual risk that CHIC could be classified as a body governed by public law because of the broad way the court has interpreted the term in the past. The risks of challenge cannot be removed entirely, and we would be happy to provide more detailed advice about the implications of challenge if that would be helpful. As the test of whether a body is a contracting authority is an ongoing one, we recommend that CHIC's status is monitored regularly to see if any of the facts, and so its status, have changed. If it becomes clear that a change might have occurred then this can be addressed. Regular monitoring would also provide an audit trail that the issue has been considered properly should a challenge be brought.

## 11 STRUCTURE

- 11.1 The Report considered two models: a company limited by shares and a company limited by guarantee. The Council decided that the former was more suitable for a project designed to generate long term revenue generated by rental income and capital receipts received by CHIC. In our view, this is the most appropriate model to achieve the Council's objective, in particular because of the ability to distribute profits, its ability to form groups for certain tax purposes, and being the most flexible form for future alternative investment and exit options.
- 11.2 The Report provides authority to establish one or more companies. For the reasons set out in the tax analysis above, the Council should consider establishing a group structure comprising a holding company and three subsidiaries as follows:
- 11.2.1 a holding company to provide a corporation tax group for the different companies to allow carrying across of trading losses;
  - 11.2.2 two separate companies for development and rental activity, rather than both activities being through CHIC. This would maximize the possibility of VAT recovery;
  - 11.2.3 a company for trading in selling units. This would provide greater clarity and a stronger position for discussions with HMRC over treatment of trading and investment assets.
- 11.3 In addition to this headline structure, the Council and CHIC should consider establishing multiple versions of vehicles, for example development companies, to ring-fence risk associated with different developments or phases of developments. This should allow the Council to more effectively manage risk as well as facilitating alternative investment or exit routes in respect of different sites or phases. There is no set rule as to when a separate vehicle would be warranted. The Council would need to balance the additional cost and administration of having a separate vehicle against the size of the site or phase and the desire to ring-fence associated liability. In similar circumstances we know that some councils prefer to create a separate company for each individual development, but (to mitigate against administrative cost and complication) not separate companies for each **phase** of development.

- 11.4 The above structure is focused on housing delivery. The position with commercial property is different with there not being the same benefits of a company letting out commercial tenancies as apply to residential, in particular the ability of a company to provide non-secure tenancies of residential property. Given the preferential tax position of the Council it is common for commercial investment property to be held by a local authority. However, there may be wider reasons for it being held by CHIC, or a vehicle within the CHIC group, including isolation of risk and/or the ability to operate and make decisions on a more commercial basis than the Council might be able to do.
- 11.5 A holding company could also undertake a governance function in managing the subsidiaries with just one relationship between the group and the Council rather than multiple relationships. There is flexibility in exactly how this is set up. At one end of the spectrum, it could pass all decisions relating to the subsidiaries straight to the Council so that it took no material decisions itself, and the Council in effect managed their activities. At the other end, it could act as a filter between the strategic control of the Council and delivery of operational matters by the subsidiaries. The latter approach is recommended in light of the desire to structure CHIC as a non-contracting authority.
- 11.6 The holding company and its subsidiaries will be classed as regulated companies subject to the restrictions in Part V, Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Authorities (Companies) Order 1995. Classification as a regulated company has a number of legal and practical implications, which are explained in Schedule 1.

## **12 GOVERNANCE**

- 12.1 CHIC's governance will be based on the two roles of shareholder and director, which are considered below.

## **13 SHAREHOLDERS**

- 13.1 The Council will be the sole shareholder of CHIC, and unless this element of the proposed structure changes will control CHIC through the appointment and removal of directors and certain other statutory rights. We understand from the Report that the Council would like to keep the governance structure simple and avoid the potential for conflicts of interest (considered below in section 14). As a result, it decided that the Assets and Investment Committee should exercise the Council's rights as shareholder which should also include the rights the Council has under the shareholders' agreement.
- 13.2 In a local authority-owned company it is common for a shareholders' agreement to give the Council strategic control over the operation of CHIC through the right to approve a business plan and the requirement that certain listed decisions, referred to as "reserved matters", be referred back to the Council as shareholder rather than being within the discretion of the board of directors. As the intention is for CHIC to not be a Teckal company and sit outside the Regulations, the Council should limit the control exercised in this way. The Council's rights under the shareholder agreement should be focused on control/monitoring of the commercial performance

of CHIC in light of the equity investment made by the Council. We have prepared a draft of the articles of association and shareholders' agreement that reflect this.



**PROGRAMME HIGHLIGHT REPORT - PROGRESS OF SALES TO THIS LAND**

*To:* **Commercial & Investment Committee**

*Meeting Date:* **23 June 2018**

*From:* **Deputy Section 151 officer**

*Electoral division(s):* **All**

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

*Purpose:* **To summarise progress of sales to This Land**

*Recommendation:* **It is recommended that the Committee:**

- 1. Note the content of the Programme Highlight Report**

<b><i>Officer contact:</i></b>		<b><i>Member contact:</i></b>	
Name:	John Macmillan/Tom Kelly	Name:	Councillors Joshua Schumann
Post:	Group Asset Manager/ Deputy s151 Officer	Post:	Committee Chairman
Email:	<a href="mailto:John.macmillan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">John.macmillan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> <a href="mailto:Tom.kelly@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">Tom.kelly@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Email:	<a href="mailto:joshua.schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">joshua.schumann@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>
Tel:	07808 861 360	Tel:	01223 706398

## 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Commercial & Investments committee have previously considered the sale of a portfolio of properties to “This Land” (formerly Cambridgeshire Housing and Investment Company) each month.

1.2 This reports provides a progress update on the sales.

## 2. MAIN ISSUES

2.1 14 sales with a value of £22.84m completed on the 13<sup>th</sup> April. (see table)

2.2 A further 6 with a value of £5.45m completed since the last committee meeting in May.

2.3 A number of others are delayed or deferred.

Site	Planning	No units	Issues
<b>Sold 13 April</b>			
Cambridge, Russel St	Planning consent refused. This Land.	6	
March, Former Highways Depot	Planning consent obtained by 3 <sup>rd</sup> party promoter.	34	
Huntingdon, Hartford PRU	This Land	7	
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Rd	This Land	3	
Fen Ditton, Camfields site	This Land	25	
Horningsea, Northgate Farm	This Land	5	
Brampton, Meadow View Farm.	Planning application submitted. This Land.	32	
March, Norwood Rd	This Land	25	
March, land at Hereward Hall	This Land	60	
March, Station Rd	This Land	10	
Guilden Morden, Trapp Rd	This Land	8	
Guilden Morden, Dubbs Knoll	Appeal for non-determination end June. CCC.	16	
Cambridge, Worts Causeway	This Land	230	
<b>Sold since May C&amp;I</b>			
Cambridge , Milton Rd Library	Planning consent obtained by CCC.	7	
Landbeach, Beach Farm	This Land	5	
Litlington, Sheen Farm	Planning consent	22	



	obtained by CCC		
Wicken, Church Rd	Planning application submitted by CCC.	6	
Soham North	This Land.	20	
Willingham , Belsar Farm	Planning consent obtained by CCC.	25	
<b>Sales still to be completed</b>			
Papworth, Old School	Planning application submitted by This Land	6	3 <sup>rd</sup> party access issue being resolved
Whittlesford, Parsonage Farm.	Planning consent refused. This Land.	2	Resolving chancel repair issue.
Shepreth, Collins Close	Planning consent obtained by CCC	25	Awaiting final s106 approval.
Burwell, Newmarket Rd	Planning consent obtained by CCC.	350	Phasing issue being resolved
Soham, Eastern Gateway	This Land	600	Revised Masterplan being prepared which may impact on value
Cambridge, Malta Rd	This Land	10	Awaiting resolution of access query.
Cottenham, Rampton Rd	Planning consent obtained by CCC	154	Potential legal challenge (21 June) or judicial review (2 July) of successful planning appeal awaited.
Bassingbourn, Clear Farm	Planning application submitted CCC	10	Application submitted 17 May.
<b>Sales deferred or cancelled</b>			
Cambridge, East Barnwell	This Land no longer buying due to viability and procurement issues.		
Cambridge, Old Police Station and Register office	Deferred pending Shire Hall marketing.		



# COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

Published on 1st June 2018  
Updated 13<sup>th</sup> June 2018



Cambridgeshire  
County Council

## Notes

Committee dates shown in bold are confirmed.

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.

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.

The following are standing agenda items which are considered at every Committee meeting:

- Minutes of previous meeting and Action Log;
- Finance and Performance Report;
- Agenda Plan, Appointments to Outside Bodies and Training Plan;
- Programme Status Report.

Committee Date	Agenda item	Lead officer	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
<b>22/06/18</b>	This Land Board representation	Chris Malyon	n/a	12/06/18	14/06/18
<b>20/07/18</b>	Update on arrangements for schools currently using CCS for school meals	Sass Pledger	n/a	11/07/18	12/07/18
	Smart Energy Systems - Innovate UK Funding Bid Support	Sheryl French/ Cherie Gregoire	2018/055		
	Music Reference Panel Report	Matthew Gunn	n/a		
<b>17/08/18</b>				08/08/18	09/08/18

<b>Committee Date</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Reference if key decision</b>	<b>Deadline for draft reports</b>	<b>Agenda despatch date</b>
<b>14/09/18</b>	Closed Landfill Sites (x2) energy project feasibility	Cherie Gregoire	N/a	05/09/18	06/09/18
	Smart Energy Grid, Power Purchase Agreement	Sheryl French	2017/030		
<b>19/10/18</b>	Smart Energy Grids for Trumpington and Babraham Park and Ride Sites	Sheryl French Cherie Gregoire		10/10/18	11/10/18
<b>23/11/18</b>				14/11/18	15/11/18
<b>14/12/18</b>				05/12/18	06/12/18
<b>18/01/19</b>				09/01/19	10/01/19
<b>22/02/19</b>				13/02/19	14/02/19
<b>22/03/19</b>				13/03/19	14/03/19
<b>26/04/19</b>				15/04/19	16/04/19
<b>24/05/19</b>				15/05/19	16/05/19

To be programmed: Oasis Centre, Wisbech (Hazel Belchamber);

# COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Date	Responsibility	Attendance by:
1.	Introductory Session for the Commercial & Investment Committee	The Committee's remit, focus on work areas e.g. CHIC, Strategic Estates, Facilities Management and Horizon Scanning	26th May 2017	Chris Malyon/ John Macmillan	C&I
2.	CHIC Workshop		27 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	Chris Malyon/ David Gelling/ David Bethell/ John Macmillan	C&I
3.	Business Planning Session		15 <sup>th</sup> September 2017	Chris Malyon/ James Wilson	C&I
4.	Asset & Risk Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asset Strategy</li> <li>• CHIC</li> <li>• Risk approach and risk register</li> <li>• Site tenure mix and retention of rental housing</li> <li>• Affordable housing</li> <li>• Community Land Trusts</li> </ul>	20 <sup>th</sup> October 2017	Chris Malyon/Stephen Conrad/ David Gelling	C&I
5.	This Land Performance Workshop		12 <sup>th</sup> March 2018	David Gelling/David Bethell /Chris Malyon/John Macmillan	C&I
6.	Finance/Performance Indicators		20 <sup>th</sup> July 2018 (12:00)	Tom Kelly/Ellie Tod	C&I
7.	<i>To be confirmed – provisional training session</i>		18 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (13.30)		C&I
8.	<i>To be confirmed – provisional training session</i>		17 <sup>th</sup> January 2019 (10:00)		C&I
9.	<i>To be confirmed – provisional training session</i>		26 <sup>th</sup> April 2019 (12:00)		C&I

