

COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE



Friday, 11 September 2020

Democratic and Members' Services

Fiona McMillan
Monitoring Officer

10:00

Shire Hall
Castle Hill
Cambridge
CB3 0AP

**Virtual meeting
[Venue Address]**

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/ccc-conduct-code>
2. **Minutes of the Committee meeting held 10th July 2020** **5 - 16**
3. **Petitions and Public Questions**

OTHER DECISIONS

4. **Insourcing the delivery of overnight short breaks and residential Children's Homes for Children and Young People with disabilities** **17 - 24**
5. **Acquisition of Playing Field land from the Littleport Leisure Trust** **25 - 36**

6. Commercial and Investment Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointment to Outside Bodies

37 - 40

The Commercial and Investment Committee comprises the following members:

Councillor Mark Goldsack (Chairman) Councillor Chris Boden (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Ian Bates Councillor John Gowing Councillor David Jenkins Councillor Linda Jones Councillor Peter McDonald 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/ccc-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/CommitteeProcedure>

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/ccc-carpark> or public transport.

COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: 10 July 2020

Time: 10:00am – 11.55am

Venue: *Meeting held remotely in accordance with The Local Authorities (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Meetings) (England) Regulations 2020*

Present: Councillors M Goldsack (Chairman), C Boden (Vice-Chairman), I Bates, J Gowing, D Jenkins, L Jones, P McDonald, T Rogers, M Shellens and T Wotherspoon

Apologies: None

359. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No apologies for absence were received.

Councillor T Wotherspoon declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding minute 362, Cambridge South-West Travel Hub Greater Cambridge Partnership and Land Proposals

Councillor M Shellens declared a non-pecuniary interest in minute 366, Update on Options for Hinchbrook Parke as he lived adjacent to the park.

360. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 JUNE 2020 AND ACTION LOG

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

The Action Log was noted

361. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

A Question had been received from Mr Michael Sadler. As Mr Sadler had not joined the meeting, the question was read out by an officer:

The County Council had discussed Climate Change and Environment Strategy on 19th May. At a previous meeting it was mentioned that within - 'Energy efficient, low carbon buildings' priority, the Council would show leadership by getting our own house in order and replacing oil and gas with renewable heating in our own buildings'.

Was being considered for every acquisition and new building, alongside the Council's commitment to promote walking, cycling and public transport for staff to access buildings? Was this a firm commitment or just an aspiration within other contexts?

Responding, the Chairman advised that in the Council's approved Climate Change and Environment Strategy, 'Energy Efficient, Low Carbon Buildings' was one of the Council's Priority Areas.

In the Action Plan (that was also approved by Council in May 2020), had been supported by committing to "Implement a plan of property retrofitting to all buildings owned and occupied by the Council - aiming to be fossil fuel free (using renewable heating sources instead of gas or oil) by 2025".

The Council's Property and Energy teams had already started work on the plan, with the first renewable heating projects expected to be completed within the current financial year.

All buildings that the Council both owned and occupied (including new acquisitions), which were currently heated by oil or gas, would be put forward for the programme of works. Business cases would be developed for each building, and the final decision for each individual building would be made taking into account all the financial and environmental costs and benefits of each option.

The Chairman advised that Mr Sadler would receive a written response within ten working days.

362. CAMBRIDGE SOUTH WEST TRAVEL HUB, GREATER CAMBRIDGE PARTNERSHIP AND LAND PROPOSALS

The Committee received a report that considered proposals by the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) to procure the land needed for the Cambridge South West Travel Hub scheme.

The presenting officer informed Members that Cambridgeshire County Council was the Accountable Body for the GCP, and the GCP as a non-executive body could not purchase or own land in its own right. It was therefore a requirement of the Council to purchase the land on behalf of the GCP using funds provided by the GCP.

During discussion Members:

- Sought assurance in the event that land parcel 4, currently owned by Highways England was not able to be purchased. Officers explained that the process for land exchange was well established and had to be undertaken in order to achieve approval. If it was not possible to secure land parcel 4, then an alternative route to the highway would have to be considered.
- Queried the cost of maintenance and operation of the site. Officers explained that income would be received by the GCP. If the GCP ceased to exist then the Council would take over the asset. Officers undertook to supply anticipated

operating and maintenance costs contained within the outline and full business cases. **Action required.**

- Highlighted the reasons as to why the land purchase was being requested. Park and Ride sites had been very successful and had significantly reduced the numbers of cars travelling to the city centre. It would therefore be unlikely that Highways England would not agree to the acquisition as it would reduce congestion and traffic entering the city. The GCP had been subject to a gateway review which had secured its future for another 5 years, at which a further gateway review could provide a further 5 years. Therefore it could be up to 10 years before any liability for maintenance fell to the Council.
- Commented that the Council and the GCP were trying their upmost to deter traffic from entering Cambridge. The site was long-awaited and essential. The worst-case scenario would be that the Council acquired an asset that it could choose to sell at a later date. The advantages to the environment and active travel were considerable and it was vital the scheme progressed.
- Expressed concern that there was a liability that had been identified that was not contained within the report.

It was resolved **[7 in favour: 0 against: 3 abstentions]** to:

agree that Cambridgeshire County Council should acquire the land parcels needed for the Cambridge South West Travel Hub scheme (a scheme being funded and project managed by Greater Cambridge Partnership)

363. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO COVID 19

A report was presented on the Covid-19 response to date for those services within the remit of the Commercial & Investment Committee.

Given the rapidly changing situation and the need to provide the committee and the public with the most up to date information possible, the Chairman reported that he had accepted this as a late report on the following grounds:

1. Reason for lateness: To allow the report to contain the most up to date information possible.
2. Reason for urgency: To enable the committee to be briefed on the current situation in relation to the Council's response to Covid-19 for those services for which it was responsible.

The Director of Business Improvement & Development introduced the report which provided an overview of the Council's activity in response to the evolving emergency situation, and in line with emerging government guidance.

During discussion Members:

- Drew attention to the appendices containing data relating to Universal Credit claims and furlough figures that were out of date considering the report had been published late due to the need to provide the most up to date information. Officers explained that data relating to Universal Credit and the furlough scheme were reported by central government and there was a lag in reporting. Officers undertook to report the figures to the Committee upon their receipt and publication. **ACTION**
- Noted that in relation to paragraph 2.51 it was expected that recovery would not return to pre COVID-19 levels until 2031 and questioned whether the impact of Brexit had been included in the forecast. Officers confirmed that the impact of Brexit had not been modelled within that data, however, scenarios relating to Brexit had been requested to be included in future.
- Noted references to the Hatch Regeneris report commissioned by Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership that anticipated a 13% variable impact across Cambridgeshire and questioned what other sources of information were being analysed in case the view was too pessimistic. Officers confirmed that a wide range of evidence would be taken into consideration when forming a view. The Council's research team was working on the economic recovery and a number of number of data sets were being brought forward in order to provide a rounded view.

It was resolved to note the report.

364. MULTI-CLASS CREDIT FUND MANAGER SELECTION

The Committee considered a report that sought to appoint an ESG-focussed investment manager who was likely to generate strong long-term income and prospective capital growth through investments in Multi-Class Credit.

The report also sought to agree for the appointed fund manager, using the parameters set, to deploy the £20m investment noting that returns could be temporarily reduced if market conditions suggested a staggered investment strategy was necessary.

In presenting the report officers highlighted the recommended Fund 1, contained in Appendix A of the report. They were experienced fund managers with the highest levels of ESG of those Fund Managers shortlisted, whilst also matching our other investment objectives.

During the course of discussion Members:

- Welcomed the planned phased approach as timing was crucial given the current economic landscape. Noting that Fund 3 was domiciled in Ireland, questioned

whether domiciles would be a future consideration in light of Brexit. Officers explained that fund managers would be using various tools to identify when best to enter the market. It was also important to note that volatility brought opportunity also. It was intended to have invested the full £20m by the end of March 2021. With regard where funds were domiciled, Brexit was a concern, however, it did not impact on the recommendation.

- Commented that paragraph 5.1 referred to avoiding exposure to unforeseeable events which was not possible. Officers explained that the wording of the recommendation had been amended to reflect the intention to reduce and minimise the risk of exposure following feedback, however, the use of avoid in paragraph 5.1 had been missed.
- Drew attention to the short time scale of March 2021 for the planned investment which allowed little time for the implications of Brexit to emerge. Officers explained that the steer on the when to invest would come from the Fund Manager and the March 2021 investment date could be adjusted if the Fund Manager felt it prudent to delay investing all the money by this date. The fund allows for daily liquidity and if circumstances changed, a decision could be made to extract our investment if Brexit uncertainty was causing a concern.
- Expressed concern regarding the information available within the public report that related to the short-listing process and the rationale for the selections made. Officers explained that the level of ESG had been a key consideration throughout the process. Based on the ESG requirements and the exclusion of investment in fossil fuels, Fund 1 was recommended as it was the only fund from the shortlist that fully met our ESG requirements. Selecting Fund 3 would have required a loosening of the ESG requirements.

In response to Member concerns regarding recommendations a) and b) it was proposed, with the agreement of the Committee, to amend the recommendations. The recommendations would be adjusted to make it more explicit in recommendation (a) the reasoning for recommending Fund 1, and for recommendation (b) to address the difficulty of maximising opportunity and at the same time minimising risk.

Set out below are the amended recommendations with additional wording in bold.

It was resolved to:

- a) Committee are asked to agree to the appointment of Fund 1, **as it was the only fund that fully met our ESG requirements**, being short listed and recommended by C&I Investment Group and our Investment Advisors.

- b) Committee are asked to agree to use the expertise of the Fund Manager to inform the profile **and timing** of the investment into the fund to minimise our risk exposure.

365. ALCONBURY WEALD CIVIC HUB - COVID-19 UPDATE

The Committee received a report that sought to provide an understanding of the construction progress since the last report in December 2019 and the potential programme and cost implications caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The presenting officer informed Members that the enforced lockdown following the outbreak of COVID-19 had not required the closure of construction sites. However, there had been a considerable impact on the supply of labour and materials which were variable. Supply chain partners had closed down completely during the first 6 weeks of lockdown and in particular manufacturing of glazing had been severely affected. Members noted that the contractor anticipated there would be a seven week delay in construction resulting from the impact of the pandemic.

Councillor Terry Rogers left the meeting at 11.20am

During discussion Members:

- Confirmed that the proposed additional contingency was separate to the contingency fund established at the start of the project and was for the sole purpose of mitigating the risk posed by the pandemic.
- Noted that the operation of the building was being reviewed as a result of the pandemic and it was unlikely that a 2:1 desk ratio would be sustainable as a result.

It was resolved **[9 in favour: 0 against: 1 abstention]** to:

- a) Note construction progress and development to date which remains within the approved budget;
- b) Note the current additional cost (£125k) and delay [7 weeks] resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic and potential for further impacts, which were not allowed for when setting the current risk contingency budget; and
- c) Support the recommended provision of a separate specific £400k Covid-19 risk contingency budget to General Purposes Committee, funded by Prudential Borrowing.

366. UPDATE ON OPTIONS FOR HINCHINGBROOKE COUNTRY PARK

Members considered a report which proposed the granting a new lease for Hinchingsbrooke Country Park to Huntingdonshire District Council for a term of 99 years at a peppercorn rent.

Councillor Tom Sanderson, addressed the Committee as local Member. Councillor Sanderson informed the Committee that he was also a member of Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC). Commenting further Councillor Sanderson, highlighted the necessary improvements to the park that were urgently required, especially with regard to car parking which was often full and spilled into nearby residential areas. Councillor Sanderson emphasised the importance of the area as a green space for the community and expressed hope that the Committee would grant Hope we can grant HDC a long term lease to maximise the potential of the park.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Huntingdonshire District Councillor Beuttell, Portfolio Holder, was invited to speak. Councillor Beuttell drew attention to how the COVID-19 pandemic had illustrated the importance of parks and open spaces for communities. Hinchingsbrooke Park had won many awards over the years and HDC was committed to investing in its parks as part of the recovery from the pandemic. The park was vital to the people of Huntingdon as it represented 80% of the available green space in the town. Councillor Beuttell drew attention to the health benefits of parks and confirmed HDC's commitment to invest £1.5m over three years in the park and highlighted the role of Cambridgeshire County Council as a member of the liaison committee.

Councillor Peter Downes was invited by the Chairman to address the Committee as local Member. Councillor Downes commented that he had helped set up the park when it was first established. The park was an essential asset to the area. However, improvements were needed. Councillor Downes was reassured that the park could not be sold off without the expressed permission of Cambridgeshire County Council which was a concern for him. Councillor Downes also requested that consideration be given to the future and potential future governance structures in order that the park remain in public ownership.

In response to a Member question, Councillor Beuttell confirmed that at present HDC had no plans for the car park at Hinchingsbrooke Park.

In welcoming the report and the recommendations, members moved to the vote.

It was resolved unanimously to:

approve Option B: granting the lease to Huntingdonshire District Council, but requiring that all surpluses generated from the Park be retained for investment in country parks within the District.

367. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT - MAY 2020

The Committee considered a report on the financial information relating to the areas within the Commercial and Investment Committee's remit, for the period ending 31st May 2020.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Questioned whether support received from central government relating to the impact of COVID-19 was being devolved to individual services. Officers explained that funding received had not been apportioned to specific areas unless the funding had been ring-fenced. A report was being prepared for General Purposes Committee that would report pressures in specific areas identifying where the additional funding could be deployed.
- Noted that rent revenue remained stable, however, they were being kept under review.
- Requested that with regard to the graph contained at paragraph 1.1 it would be helpful in future to have the previous 12 month figure provided.
- Highlighted buildings maintenance, the request for additional funding and questioned why no provisional budget had been implemented. Officers explained that it related to the timing of the condition survey. Schedules were being assessed in order to avoid a similar situation in the future.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) review, note and comment upon the report;
- b) recommend to General Purposes Committee to approve the roll forward and rephasing of capital budgets as set out in Appendix A, section 2.2;
- c) recommend to General Purposes Committee to approve additional Prudential Borrowing of £352k for the Building Maintenance scheme; and
- d) recommend to General Purposes Committee to approve additional Prudential Borrowing of £330k for the Mill Rd – Former Library scheme.

368. COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN, TRAINING PLAN AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

The Committee considered the Agenda Plan and Training Plan, including changes made since publication.

It was resolved to:

- a) review its agenda plan attached at Appendix 1 to the report.
- b) review its training plan attached at Appendix 2 to the report.

COMMERCIAL & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes-Action Log



Agenda Item no. 2
Cambridgeshire
County Council

Introduction:

This is the updated action log as at **3rd September 2020** 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.

Minutes of 22nd November 2019

293.(1)	Update on Property Services	Tony Cooper	Head of Property to bring a Service Improvement Plan to a future meeting.	Report circulated electronically to Members.	Sept 2020
----------------	------------------------------------	-------------	---	---	------------------

Minutes of 16th December 2019

307.	Milestone 4 and 5 Report for the Alconbury Weald Civic Hub – Cambs 2020 Programme	Andy Preston/ Kim Davies	It was agreed that the totality of the Business Case, including some information that was commercially confidential, should be brought back to a future meeting, so that Members could establish the overall financial position.	The full Cambs 2020 Business Case will be considered by C&I Committee later in the year.	Nov 2020
-------------	--	-----------------------------	--	--	-----------------

Minutes of 21st February 2020

322.	Construction of Northstowe Heritage Facility	Quinton Carroll	Request that Longstanton be included in the name of the Heritage Facility.	This request has been communicated to all parties and has been well received in Longstanton. It will be actioned in due course.	In progress.
-------------	---	-----------------	--	---	--------------

Minutes of 19th June 2020

358.	Shire Hall Disposal Update	Chris Malyon	Carry out further sensitivity testing around office rental with respect to COVID-19.		
------	----------------------------	--------------	--	--	--

Minutes of 10th July 2020

362.	Cambridge South West Travel Hub, Greater Cambridge Partnership and land proposals	Tim Watkins	Supply anticipated operating and maintenance costs contained within the outline and full business cases	<p>The OBC is available here: https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/cambridgesouthwesttravelhub</p> <p>Costs as follows: £220k a year running costs Partly Offset by £45k income from departure charge Total impact on the budget will be £175k per year</p>	Complete
363.	Cambridgeshire County Council's Response To COVID-19	Amanda Askham	report the Universal Credit and Furlough figures to the Committee upon their receipt and publication	A system has been established to provide Members with the latest data when it is released.	Complete

INSOURCING THE DELIVERY OF OVERNIGHT SHORT BREAKS AND RESIDENTIAL CHILDREN'S HOMES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH

To: Commercial and Investment Committee

Meeting Date: 11 September 2020

From: Executive Director for People and Communities

Electoral division(s): All

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

Purpose: To retrospectively provide the Committee with information on the insourcing of Residential and Overnight Short Breaks for Disabled Children back into Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), in particular the implications on the future on-going costs to CCC Property.

Recommendation: Committee is asked to consider, approve retrospectively and comment as appropriate.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contact:</i>	
Name:	Sasha Long	Name:	Councillor Mark Goldsack
Post:	Head of Service, Disability Social Care	Post:	Chairman, Commercial & Investment Committee
Email:	Sasha.long@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Mark.goldsack@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01480 377630	Tel:	07831 168899

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) and Peterborough City County (PCC) provide a range of Short Breaks for Disabled Children and Young People¹. Short Breaks are provided for parents/ carers of disabled children in order to support their ability to continue their caring responsibilities as effectively as possible, as well as ensuring the young people have the opportunity to: develop independence, promote and support physical and emotional health, build relationships and enjoy new experiences.²

Residential Care and Community Short Breaks delivered by CCC and PCC include:

- community short breaks (such as activities, holiday clubs and domiciliary care services),
- accommodation based short breaks (in a registered children's home or LINK fostering setting),
- shared care arrangements (in a registered children's home]; and
- the opportunity for families to receive their day time short break via Direct Payments.

- 1.2 The current contract for Residential Overnight Short Breaks and Shared Care across Cambridgeshire is delivered by Action for Children (AfC), and was awarded in October 2015. The Contract term is 4 years, with the option of a 4 year extension and the annual contract value is £2,473,525.00.

The contract encompasses the delivery of short breaks, shared care and long term residential provision to disabled children and young people across three CCC provisions, Haviland Way (short breaks, Shared Care and Long Term), Woodland Lodge (short breaks) and London Road (Shared Care and Long Term).

All three properties are Ofsted registered children's homes and are CCC owned buildings. "Peppercorn rents" for each of the buildings are paid by the provider and recouped by the Provider through the invoicing of the block contract.

The leases for the property are held by Cambridgeshire County Council's Property Services.

All budgets in relation to community support breaks for disabled children is ring fenced to the block contract, as well as £350,000 of funding from the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) for children and young people with complex care needs.

- 1.3 In February 2019 the Children and Young People's [CYP] Committee took the decision to delegate authority exercised to execute a contract extension relating to residential breaks for disabled children in order to allow for a full consultation with children, young people, families, the workforce and stakeholders and ensure the strategic requirements

¹ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/schedule/2>

² <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2011/707/introduction/made>

of the Council were met.

- 1.4 Throughout 2019, a review of provision was conducted by the Residential and Overnight Short Breaks Project Group, a cross functional group made up of operational leads, Commissioners, Finance and Human Resource Partners, Procurement, Property Services and external stakeholders, and as a result a business case was presented to the Executive Director People & Communities, Wendi Ogle Welbourn, and in turn to the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Joint Commissioning Board.

This business case set out a rationale for change to the existing delivery model, following a comprehensive 12 week consultation with families, and a needs / gap analysis that has been undertaken concurrently with the consideration of a range of local and national policies and agendas.

Following the consultation, review and business case, a decision was taken by the CYP Committee that in order to achieve a range of long term development and transformation to the service, the services would be best delivered by the Council.

The CYP committee decided the following:

- a) Agree the TUPE of 73 employees from Action for Children into Cambridgeshire County Council
- b) Agree to insource our Residential and Overnight Short Breaks service
- c) Note the outcome of the Overnight Short Breaks Consultation

- 1.5 A Children with Disabilities [CWD] Programme Board was formed in order to deliver transformation work and continues to consist of representatives from Disability Social Care, Commissioning, Finance, Human Resources, Property and Strategic Assets, Operational Service Leads, Procurement and legal advice, when required

- 1.6 The mobilisation of the business case was split into two phases:

- **Phase 1** to insource the children's homes back to the Council as an enabler to achieving the strategic priorities for disabled children, and a longer term transformation of the service model; and
- **Phase 2** to ultimately mobilise a longer term model of these services that aligns across CCC/PCC, promotes increased independence and less reliance on accommodation based provision, creates provision that is more responsive to complex needs and that enables greater choice and flexibility.

- 1.7 The CWD Programme Board was advised to submit an application to the Strategic Assets / Operational Assets Board, in order to inform them of the programme of work and request advice on alternative properties that may better service the provision requirements, namely replacing London Road

- 1.8 The outcome of this request was that there were no other properties that would fulfil the requirements of a long term children's homes, above and beyond the requirements that London Road was already providing.

2. MAIN ISSUES

2.1 Officers from across the organisation have continued working together under the CWD Programme Board to ensure the effective mobilisation of the insourcing.

2.2 The CWD Programme Board believed that all required approvals for the project had been obtained once the London Road issue was resolved. However, in June 2020, the board was advised that the property aspects of the insourcing, including the cost and use of the buildings for the ongoing purpose of providing the service needed to be presented to the Commercial and Investment [C&I] Committee.

2.3 A paper was subsequently presented to the Joint Management Team [JMT] in July 2020 seeking direction and proposing a recommendation to retrospectively bring a paper to the C&I Committee in September 2020, as no Committees were held in the month of August. This paper has therefore had to retrospectively come to C&I Committee in September, by which time the transfer of the services back in-house to the Council will have taken place (3rd September 2020)

2.4 Financial Position

In January 2020's paper to CYP committee, there was a deficit identified in respect of the budgets available to the service and the cost to delivery [circa £200k-£230k]. This was identified following a full cost appraisal of the budgets available to the service [including those wider than the ring fenced circa £2.35m budget] and a full cross function budget build informed by a budget planning meeting attended and advised by Property Services, Finance and the incumbent provider responsible for the buildings.

A final budget build has been worked up between Operations [Disability Social Care 0-25 Service] and Finance and the current position is projecting running costs of C£2.7m against a £2.4m budget, realising a c£300k annual pressure. This represents a c£150k in year pressure.

A further £81k is estimated to be needed to cover associated set up costs of insourcing the service. This largely consists of IT equipment and Ofsted registration and whilst this had not been accounted for in the existing budget, it is anticipated that a range of means will be applied to try and absorb this financial pressure.

Therefore, in year for 2020/21 there are *estimated* pressures of:

- c£150k legacy staff and running costs
- £81k IT and set up costs

creating an estimated combined in year pressure of c£231k. This is concurrent with the £200,000 to £230,000 cost pressure that was reported in January 2020 committee paper.

2.5 It was also noted in the paper that there were a range of means in order to mitigate the

anticipated pressure including the ability to use wider service budgets flexibly as the Direct Payment model increases, as well as the flexibility not to recruit to vacant positions that is not afforded in the restrictions of an outsourced budget.

- 2.6 It is anticipated that the financial pressure on the existing service budget will be largely managed by the mitigations in 2.5 above in order to bring the budget back in line in year. The service will also endeavour to manage the £81K one-off IT set up costs, but this may not be possible and may result in an in-year pressure. Consideration will therefore need to be given around how all of these costs can be managed across a range of Council budgets, including Children with Disabilities and Property Services.

2.8 **Property Position**

The three sites were let to the service provider on conventional leases. The insourcing of the service requires that the leases be terminated and the properties brought back into CCC's direct management. The leases have provision for termination in the event of changes to the service provision. At the end of the lease the tenant is required to comply with the various lease provisions. The combined dilapidations liability across the three properties has been initially assessed to be £255K. Dilapidations will be negotiated with AfC as part of the lease termination. In addition there may be other potential outstanding sums and clarification is awaited from AfC to ensure that CCC does not become responsible for any historic debts. There are also ongoing discussions regarding the removal or retention of specialist equipment within the properties and the associated maintenance contracts as part of dilapidations.

The lease termination will be completed on normal commercial terms in line with Council policy. The combined estimated revenue operating costs of these three sites is £95K per annum. As revenue running costs were a tenant responsibility there is no current property budget allocation for these sites and confirmation of funding for these costs is awaited.

2.9 **Quality Assurance**

Upon transfer the service will now be managed as an internally commissioned service. Cambridgeshire County Council's Children's Commissioning team will continue to monitor service delivery and quality assurance and a new service specification has been developed to ensure achievable outcomes and robust quality assurance procedures. Any quality and performance issues will be made known to the CYP Committee and full assurance on the existing position was provided in an update briefing to CYP Committee in July 2020.

3 **ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

Report authors should evaluate the proposal(s) in light of their alignment with the following three Corporate Priorities.

3.1 **A good quality of life for everyone**

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

- Continuation of short breaks for young people and families with caring roles.

- Ensure the effective utilisation of Council budgets to ensure we maximise the offer available to families now and in the future.
- Local services enable and provide consistency and continuity in care and support across education, health and social care.
- Young people are more likely to be supported to remain in and/or return to the family home if they are placed in local provision, ensuring close family contact, training and resilience for family settings and keeping local services that know children well at the centre of their care and support.
- Successfully keeping children and young people in their local communities as children, they are more likely to be able to lead fulfilling, connected lives in their local communities as adults, thus avoiding the need for costly and/or out-of-county adult care arrangements

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

- Provide an infrastructure that enables us to embed services in the heart of communities and draw on local services to provide resilient communities for disabled children and young people.
- Continued delivery of local provision will sustain employment opportunities for care and support staff; and support workforce recruitment/retention which contributes to the local economy.

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's Children

All packages and allowances of care have remained the same after the service has transferred in-house. The care provided will remain the same and the quality of care will be monitored as an in-house Commissioned service.

4 SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

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

- The service will cost more to provide in house in the short term. However, opportunities for immediate mitigating actions have been identified to address this including holds on recruitment for vacant posts and invest to save proposals.
- There is a pension pressure as a result of TUPE.
- Continued capital asset cost in the form of three Council buildings and increase management costs. However, these are in the main funded by the existing block contract used for the current Action for Children contract.

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

All affected staff have transferred in via TUPE.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

- Robust engagement has taken place to support staff retention and any anxiety amongst the workforce during the TUPE process as well as engagement with the children/young people and their families on these changes.
- Consultation will need to continue throughout mobilisation and any re-design of services to ensure children, young people and their families' voices are heard and that the Council deliver on their identified outcomes.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications for this section

4.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications for this section

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Martin Wade
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Gus De Silva
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Oliver Hayward
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Tony Darnell
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Oliver Hayward

Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Raj Lakshman

Source Documents	Location
Links to source documents included within the body of the report.	

Agenda Item No: 5

ACQUISITION OF PLAYING FIELD LAND FROM THE LITTLEPORT LEISURE TRUST

To: Commercial & Investment Committee

Meeting Date: 11 September 2020

From: Chris Malyon, Deputy Chief Executive

Electoral division(s): Littleport

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

Outcome: The Committee is asked to approve the acquisition of additional playing field land to support the expansion of the Littleport Education Campus.

Recommendation: That the Council acquire playing field land from the Littleport Leisure Trust to provide additional capacity and future-proof the Littleport Education Campus in the expectation of pupil growth in the local area.

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contact:</i>	
Name:	Tony Cooper	Name:	Councillor Mark Goldsack
Post:	Assistant Director, Property	Post:	Commercial & Investment Committee Chairman
Email:	Tony.cooper@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Mark.goldsack@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 699148	Tel:	01223 706398

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Littleport Education Campus opened in September 2016. On opening it comprised a 4 form entry secondary school (600 places) and an area special school providing 110 places. The Secondary and Special Schools both have the same sponsor; The Active Learning Trust (ALT). The site and school buildings are leased to ALT under a standard 125 year academy lease.
- 1.2 The main exceptions to this general leasing arrangement are in respect of the community sports centre which also occupies the site and is physically linked to the secondary school. This sports centre is run by a private trust (the Littleport Leisure Trust (LLT)) who have a sub-lease from the Parish Council. There are rights reserved within these lease arrangements for the secondary school to use the main sports hall during school hours so that they can deliver the national curriculum for PE and sport.
- 1.3 The playing field land within the area leased to ALT is 2 hectares below that required for the future level of school provision planned for the campus. The total area required by the 6 form entry secondary school, 110 place special school and 2 form entry primary school is 5.5825 ha. The current playing field holding is 3.4748ha. However, LLT has in its ownership playing field land which is adjacent to the Leisure Centre and the site of the Education campus. The area of this land, and the subject of this acquisition request, is 1.9841ha. The secondary school uses this playing field space under an agreement of LLT. This agreement was always integral the County Council's future planning of educational provision in Littleport. This was to ensure that there was access available to a sufficient area of playing field space once the campus was fully developed. The acquisition of this land would bring the area of the Council's playing field holding up to 5.4589ha and very close to the overall DfE recommended area set out in DfE Building Bulletin (BB)103.
- 1.4 The Council has been approached by LLT to see if it has an interest in purchasing the playing field within its ownership.

2 Main Issues

- 2.1 The opportunity to acquire the freehold of the LLT playing field land (outlined with the black hatched line in the plan at Appendix 1) has arisen from the current challenges faced by LLT. Whilst the Council was not actively seeking to acquire the freehold of this land, it does use it as part of the school facilities by agreement of LLT. Education officers advise that the window of opportunity to acquire this land is limited.
- 2.2 Analysis by the Council's Place Planning Team confirms that whilst the current provision of land for schools in Littleport is sufficient, based upon the expected growth in pupil numbers the campus would need to expand. Additional playing field space will be required to support this expansion in order to meet Department for Education (DfE) recommendations on site area. The acquisition provides future-proofing for this growth of Littleport and pupil numbers.
- 2.3 Should the Committee approve the proposal that the freehold of the land is acquired by the Council, it would then be transferred into a long lease to the Active Learning Trust (ALT) who sponsor the schools that currently comprise the Littleport Education Campus to sit in

parallel to the existing leases from the Council for the campus site. Under this lease arrangement, the ALT would be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the additional playing field in the same way as for the playing field areas that already fall within the campus. The ALT would then negotiate a local agreement with LLT to allow access for community use. The Council does not receive a financial return on the purchase, but does benefit from securing the additional playing field space to support predicted growth and its statutory duty to secure sufficient and suitable school places to meet parental requests for their children to be educated in the state-funded sector.

- 2.4 The Strategic Assets Team have undertaken an internal valuation of the land available for purchase. This is in line with the LLT's own valuation of £150,000. If the acquisition is approved a formal independent valuation will be undertaken prior to terms being agreed to independently verify the value. The acquisition will only proceed if the price agreed is at, or below, the formal valuation figure, and no higher than £150,000 net of costs. Current advice is that there is very limited scope for development on this land beyond playing field/school use.
- 2.5 Any offer made by the Council would be subject to contract and agreement of suitable heads of terms covering issues such as maintenance liabilities and the ongoing requirement for continued community use once the land is transferred to the ALT as the sponsor of the schools currently comprising the Littleport Education Campus. There are a number of small assets on the land that have ongoing maintenance requirements and it would be a condition of the acquisition that the Council would not be liable for any costs whilst the land is occupied by third parties. There would be a £7,000 acquisition cost for legal and other professional fees. The acquisition would be funded from existing school acquisition budgets.
- 2.6 In considering this specific opportunity presented by LLT there are other options, including doing nothing to be considered. There is farmland adjoining the site, and any acquisition would require the landowner to be willing to sell at a realistic price, which is not guaranteed. The acquisition price is likely to be lower, possibly in the region of £50,000. The Council would then need to obtain planning permission for change of use and invest further capital resources to bring the land up to the standards required for playing field use. With neither acquisition nor planning consent guaranteed, combined with the substantive overall costs, this option is not considered a viable solution to meeting the additional playing field requirements.
- 2.7 A further option which could be considered, if additional land cannot be acquired, would be the provision of an artificial non-turf pitch (NPT) on the education campus. The increased usage possible in all weathers compared to a grass pitch means that the area of such a surface is counted as double in meeting the overall need for playing field space. However, this option would require investment in excess of £1m at current prices.
- 2.8 As the existing playing field provision is adequate for current demands, it can be argued that no acquisition is necessary. Work to acquire additional land from adjoining landowners can be undertaken at a point in the future when there is a definite requirement. This avoids any acquisition cost now but provides considerable uncertainty and risk that the Council will be unable to meet its statutory responsibilities with regard to the sufficiency of state-funded school places in the event that it is unable to acquire additional land. The proposed acquisition removes this risk. With growth and demand for housing ongoing in the locality

and wider county at present it is reasonable to assume this will drive the need for additional school places and playing field space.

- 2.9 In terms of the potential to invest the identified funding elsewhere, the Council does not have a planned programme of site acquisitions for future proofing existing school sites. There is a limited budget that is used to respond to opportunities when they arise. For new schools serving new developments, future proofing of school sites does take place where possible through the land use planning process and the negotiation of the supporting section 106 agreements. How this is being achieved is described below:
- (i) forecasts of pupil numbers are not predictions and at the time an outline planning application is approved there is a forecast range for the number of pupils that may be generated. In these circumstances, sites are secured/negotiated on the basis of the upper range of the forecast with a commitment to return any “excess” land to the developer (if required) at an agreed review date during the build out of the development.
 - (ii) Some new schools in new developments serve both the needs of that development and an existing need within the local community. This is the case with the proposed secondary school on Land North of Cherry Hinton. The developer is only obligated to provide sufficient land for a school of the size required to meet the needs or impact of that development. The Council has negotiated the purchase from the developer of the additional land required for the school to ensure that it can meet the forecast future needs of both the development and the existing community which surrounds that development.
- 2.10 As the proposed acquisition supports the predicted expansion of educational provision in the Littleport area and secures the playing field space required for an enlarged facility, the Committee is recommended to approve the acquisition of this land to ‘future-proof’ the Littleport Education Campus site against local growth.
- 2.11 The proposed acquisition has been requested and approved by the service through the officer Capital Programme Board on 18th August 2020. Support for the approach agreed by the Board has been given at the Children and Young People’s (CYP) Leaders’ meeting and that will be reported to the CYP Committee on 15 September as part of the Director of Education’s report.
- 2.12 The Committee are to note that the value of the proposed acquisition falls within Officer delegated powers under the Scheme of Authorisation. However as the proposed acquisition is not driven by a specific requirement at this time (the need for the land has yet to materialise) and may be perceived in part as supporting financial matters in a third party organisation, it was agreed between Education, the Chief Finance Officer and Head of Property that the authorisation would be waived and the matter passed to this Committee for consideration.

3. ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

3.1 A good quality of life for everyone

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

- If pupils have access to local school places and associated services, they are more likely to attend them by either cycling or walking rather than through local authority provided transport or car. They will also be able to more readily access out of school activities such as sport and homework clubs and develop friendship groups within their own community. This will contribute to the development of both healthier and more independent lifestyles.

3.2 Thriving places for people to live

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

- Providing access to local and high quality mainstream education will enhance the skills of the local workforce, and enable them to thrive within the community

3.3 The best start for Cambridgeshire's children

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

- Creating inspirational places to learn will ensure the best outcomes for children from an early age.
- local schools are best placed to ensure that children and their families develop positive attitudes to learning.

3.4 Net zero carbon emissions for Cambridgeshire by 2050

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

- Future expansion of the campus will need to reflect the Council's policies on the climate emergency

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource Implications

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

- The Capital Programme Board on 18th August identified the budget within the Education Capital Programme for site acquisition and development as the source for funding the cost of acquisition
- Although the need for additional playing field land is linked to future housing growth and rising pupil numbers, the alternative options identified would require higher levels of investment than for the acquisition now being proposed

4.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

- Terms will be negotiated with the LLT regarding the purchase of the land on commercially acceptable basis to acquire the freehold. An RICS valuation will be commissioned to confirm that the price agreed is appropriate with respect to the site value. Where terms are agreed in accordance with Committee approval, officers will complete the transaction under delegated powers and update the Committee upon completion.

4.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

- On completion of the acquisition, the land in question will need to be transferred to ALT on terms that mirror the responsibilities contained within its current 125 year lease for the existing site area comprising the Littleport Education campus.
- The provision of playing fields are no longer a statutory requirement. The areas required by schools for both accommodation and external play are set out in DfE Building Bulletin (BB) 103. These are now recommended areas.

Although not statutory, the DfE ensures that the issue of external play and sports pitches are considered through the land use planning process via Sport England. Sport England will ensure through this process that appropriate mitigation is put in place should playing field/external area be lost to buildings on a school site. Similarly, if there is a current deficiency in provision, or one is about to be created because of a school expansion, it will expect to see proposals for rectifying that by either the:

- (i) Provision of additional playing field/site area
- (ii) Provision, on tight or undersized sites of an all-weather pitch because that counts as double the playing field area compared to that provided by a grass pitch. This would be considered appropriate mitigation by Sport England

Both of these options will require future investment

To summarise, it is not statutory but the provision of playing field/outdoor space is highly regulated through the planning process to ensure that proper effect is given to the recommendations made in DfE Building Bulletin 103 when proposals are made to expand the Littleport Education Campus.

- If it is not possible to mitigate playing field/external area loss through the planning process the Council would be required to go through a formal 'disposals' process with the DfE where the construction of school buildings takes place on 'playing field/external land'. This is often a lengthy process and approval for disposal often difficult to achieve.

4.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant issues within this category

4.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There will be a need to re-assure the local community that current levels of access for local sports groups will be maintained as part of the process of acquisition of the land from LLT.

ALT as the sponsor of the schools on the campus, have been briefed on the discussions and the resulting proposal and are supportive.

4.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

The local County Councillor is fully informed and is a member of LLT

4.7 Public Health Implications

- The provision of school-based sport and adequate space for team games contribute towards developing healthy lifestyles at a young age.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Martin Wade
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by the LGSS Head of Procurement?	Yes Name of Officer: Gus Da Silva
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by the Council's Monitoring Officer or LGSS Law?	Awaited. Name of Legal Officer: Fiona McMillan
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes or No Name of Officer:
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes or No Name of Officer:
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Ian Trafford
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	N/A Name of Officer:

Source Documents	Location
Department for Education (DfE) Building Bulletins (BB103 and BB104)	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/area-guidelines-and-net-capacity

Appendix 1

NOTES:

All dimensions must be checked on site and not scaled from this drawing.

All cross references are to the latest revision of the relevant drawing or specification being referenced.



Appendix 2: Calculation of playing field land required for expansion of Littleport Campus

From: Ian Trafford (Interim Education Capital Strategy Manager)

1. Purpose

- 1.1 To set out the calculation of playing field requirements for future expansion of the Littleport Education Campus.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Littleport Education Campus opened in September 2016. On opening it comprised a 4 forms of entry secondary schools (600 places) and an area special school providing 110 places. The Secondary and Special Schools both have the same sponsor; The Active Learning Trust (ALT). The site and school buildings are leased to ALT under a standard 125 year academy lease.

3. Educational Need/Business Case

- 3.1 The recommended playing field areas for primary and secondary schools is set out in published Department for Education (DfE) Building Bulletins (BB103 and BB104).
- 3.2 Currently, the Littleport Education Campus has sufficient land for the schools and size of schools occupying the site. However, to allow for the planned growth of Littleport and forecast increases in pupil numbers, the education campus was always planned on the basis that it could be expanded to accommodate the following schools:
 - a 6 form entry 900 place secondary school (currently 600 places)
 - a 2 form entry primary school providing 420 places (no primary provision at present)
 - a 110 place area special school (as now)
- 3.3 The playing field land within the area leased to ALT is 2(ha) below that required for the level of provision set out in paragraph 3.2. For that reason, the agreement to use of the playing field in the ownership of LLT was always part of the County Council's future planning. The area of this land extends to 1.9ha (4.69 acres) and takes the overall playing field holding very close to the DfE recommended total overall area for the number and size of schools comprising the Education campus.
- 3.4 The Place Planning Team have revisited the development proposals for Littleport and the pupil forecasts. As proposed the purchase is to future proof the site against development risk all planned development is included. If the Council were making a significant investment in new buildings a more

cautious approach to forecasting may have been taken looking at, for example, average build out rates being achieved over recent years.

- 3.5 The catchment forecasts for both primary and secondary pupils in Littleport show the current schools will not be able to accommodate the forecast rise in pupil numbers over the next 10 years.

2019 Catchment Forecast for Littleport Primaries									Places remaining (Capacity: 840)
Year	R	Yr1	Yr2	Yr3	Yr4	Yr5	Yr6	Total	
2020/21	128	105	104	123	113	121	104	798	42
2021/22	122	127	111	107	123	115	120	825	15
2022/23	123	123	134	115	108	126	115	844	-4
2023/24	131	124	130	138	116	111	126	876	-36
2024/25	138	132	131	134	139	119	111	904	-64
2025/26	141	137	137	133	133	140	117	938	-98
2026/27	141	140	142	139	132	134	138	966	-126
2027/28	136	138	144	143	137	132	131	961	-121
2028/29	131	133	142	145	141	137	129	958	-118

2019 Catchment forecast for Littleport Secondary							Places remaining (Capacity: 600)
Year	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11	Total	
2020/21	124	110	95	101	83	513	87
2021/22	105	122	109	93	101	530	70
2022/23	121	103	121	107	93	545	55
2023/24	116	119	102	119	107	563	37
2024/25	127	114	118	100	119	578	22
2025/26	112	125	113	116	100	566	34
2026/27	118	110	124	111	116	579	21
2027/28	139	116	109	122	111	597	3
2028/29	132	137	115	107	122	613	-13

In addition, there are an additional 155 dwellings due to be built in Littleport after the catchment forecast ends. There is also large scale development (3500+ dwellings) planned in the neighbouring town of Ely. Ely College will not be able to accommodate all the secondary children from these developments; Littleport and East Cambridgeshire Secondary is the next closest school to these.

COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT POLICY AND SERVICE COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN	Published on 1st September 2020 Updated on 3 rd September 2020	 <div data-bbox="1832 76 2188 167">Cambridgeshire County Council</div>
---	--	--

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.

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

- Minutes of previous meeting and Action Log
- Finance Report – The Council's Virtual Meeting Protocol states that no monitoring or information reports (includes the Finance report) will be included on committee agendas, they will instead be circulated to Members separately
- Agenda Plan, Training Plan and Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

Committee Date	Report title	Report author	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
11/09/20	Insourcing the delivery of overnight short breaks and residential children's homes for young people with disabilities	Clare Rose		01/09/20	03/09/20
	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod			
	Littleport Land Acquisition	Tony Cooper			
16/10/20	Swaffham Prior Community Heat Project	Sheryl French	2020/032	06/10/20	08/10/20
	+This Land Update	Tom Kelly	2020/038		

Committee Date	Report title	Report author	Reference if key decision	Deadline for draft reports	Agenda despatch date
20/11/20	Cambs 2020 full Business Case	Andy Preston/ Kim Davies		10/11/20	12/11/20
	2020 CUSPE Policy Challenge #4	Dustin McWherter			
18/12/20	Quarterly performance reporting against Commercial Strategy KPIs and Risk Register	Chloe Rickard		08/12/20	10/12/20
	Babraham Smart Energy grid, Investment Case	Cherie Gregoire	2020/052		
	North Angle Solar Farm – Investment Case	C Julian-Smith	2020/053		
22/01/21	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod		12/01/21	14/01/21
	Approval for paying the balance owed to UKPN for the grid connection and an investment key decision for the Stanground Closed Landfill Energy Project	Cherie Gregoire	2021/008		
19/02/21	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod		09/02/21	11/02/21
19/03/21	Quarterly performance reporting against Commercial Strategy KPIs and Risk Register	Chloe Rickard		09/03/21	11/03/21
	Stanground Solar and battery project	Cherie Gregoire	2021/007		
	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod			
16/04/21	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod		06/04/21	08/04/21
11/06/21	Finance Monitoring Report	Eleanor Tod		01/06/21	03/06/21
	Quarterly performance reporting against Commercial Strategy KPIs and Risk Register	Chloe Rickard			

To be programmed: ICT Future Delivery Options (John Chapman); Trumpington Park & Ride Smart Energy Grid (Sheryl French); Oasis Centre (Adrian Chapman)

COMMERCIAL AND INVESTMENT COMMITTEE TRAINING PLAN

Ref	Subject	Desired Learning Outcome/Success Measures	Date	Responsibility	Attendance by:
1.	Redington Investment training session		10 th July at 2pm	Amanda Askham/Dan Sage	C&I
2.	Performance reporting		17 th January 2020	Amanda Askham	C&I
3.	Presentation on Shire Hall site plans		22 nd November 2019	Chris Malyon	C&I
4.	Committee Training: MLEI/Energy projects		18 th October (12-3pm)	Sheryl French	C&I
5.	Nearly Zero Energy Buildings members/officers workshop		24 th May 2019(1-2.30pm)	Sarah Wilkinson/Sheryl French	C&I and GPC
6.	Commercialisation training (all Members)		26 th April 2019 (1-4pm)	Amanda Askham	All Members
7.	Finance/KPIs		3 rd December 2018 (1pm)	Tom Kelly/Ellie Tod/Amanda Askham/Sue Grace	C&I
8.	Commercial Strategy		9 th November 2018 (12.30pm)	Amanda Askham	C&I
9.	Members' duties and obligations in considering Promotion Agreements.		2 nd November 2018 (12.30pm)	Chris Malyon	C&I
10.	Future Smart Energy Systems Demonstrator Project		18 th October 2018 (13.30)	Sheryl French/Emily Bolton	C&I
11.	Finance/Performance Indicators		tbc	Tom Kelly/Ellie Tod	C&I

