

## STRATEGY AND RESOURCES: MINUTES

Date: 6 July 2021

Time: 10.00a.m. to 2.00p.m.

Venue: University Sports Centre, Philippa Fawcett Drive, Cambridge

Present: Councillors Boden, Criswell, Dupré, Fuller (substituting for Councillor Count), Goldsack, Howell, Howitt, Hoy, Meschini (Vice-Chair), Murphy, Nethsingha (Chair), Sanderson, J Schumann, Slatter (substituting for Councillor McDonald) and Wilson (substituting for Councillor M King)

### 1. Notification of Chair and Vice-Chair

The Committee noted that the Council had appointed Councillor Nethsingha as the Chair and Councillor Meschini as the Vice-Chair for the municipal year 2021-22.

### 2. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillors Count, M King and McDonald.

Councillor Howell declared a non-statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in Minute No.8, as the report referred to a building in Papworth Everard where he was formerly employed, and he also currently resided close to that building.

### 3. Minutes of General Purposes Committee and Commercial and Investment Committee – 23 March 2021 and 19 March 2021

The minutes of the General Purposes Committee and Commercial and Investment Committee held on 23 March and 19 March 2021 respectively were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 4. Petitions and Public Questions

The Chair invited Mr Andrew Milbourn, Chair of the Hurst Park Residents Association, to present a 1,207 signature petition (at time of submission) asking the Council to stop the sale of Milton Road Library immediately and then to keep it as a community resource permanently.

Mr Milbourn explained that four years ago Milton Road Library was under threat of closure and demolition but was eventually rebuilt to include seven flats. A great deal of community effort had gone in to collaborating on the design process, and Cambridge City Council had contributed £100,000 to enable community rooms to be provided and fitted out. It was therefore assumed that the library was reasonably secure, but it had been found out recently from an advertisement in a local newspaper that the building was now being sold. The local community had felt shocked and let down and within a week 1,000 people had signed the petition, and 100 people had attended a demonstration at the library.

He therefore called on the Council to use its influence as the sole shareholder and controlling entity of This Land Ltd to pause the sale of the Milton Road library building with immediate effect. This would allow time for alternative solutions to be explored which would enable the site to be permanently saved as a community asset. If the sale of the freehold went ahead the library would be lost within 25 years when the current lease ran out. A great deal of community effort had gone into creating this new community resource and it would be a tragedy to lose it when it had already existed for around 100 years.

He explained that the County Council was paying an annual rent to This Land of £51,000, which meant that Milton Road Library was more expensive than similar libraries. The long term rental agreement did not provide an adequate guarantee, and the Council could easily buy itself out of this agreement with the 23 years remaining. He suggested that This Land was unlikely to make a profit on the sale despite obtaining a prime Cambridge site. This Land had also encumbered the Council with rental costs of 1.275m over 25 years. The Council could therefore lose approximately £2m from disposing of the land and then having to rent its own library.

The Chair thanked Mr Milbourn for his presentation.

Six public questions had been received which would be taken at the relevant agenda items.

## 5. Joint Agreement – Action Plan

The Director Business Improvement and Development (BID) reported on the action plan describing activity to deliver the new priorities and approaches for achieving improved outcomes for the people of Cambridgeshire as set out in the Joint Agreement. She drew attention to the background to the signing of the Joint Agreement on 14 May 2021. The new Administration was committed to turning its Joint Agreement into tangible actions which would be monitored openly and transparently. It was noted that over the next few months the Policy and Services Committees would develop the outline actions into formal plans, which would be tested, discussed, and agreed through the committee process. Monitoring delivery of the Joint Agreement was important to assess whether the Council was achieving what it had set out to do, which included delivering value for money, and meeting the needs of residents and customers. A Joint Agreement tracker was being developed with the proposal that the Strategy and Resources Committee review the tracker at each meeting of this municipal year.

The Chair invited two members of the public and Cambridge City Councillor Scutt to address the Committee.

In the absence of Ms Anne Hamill, the Democratic Services Manager, read out her question. "Paragraph 2.7 of today's agenda papers states that '[the new administration] will also start a radical overhaul or replacement of the Council's development company 'This Land' with the aim of redirecting it towards building genuinely affordable housing and supported living facilities'. Action reference F.4 also states '[the] position of This Land to be considered within LGA Peer Challenge and an action plan produced with a target date for completion of September 2021.

By the end of 2020 the county council had extended loans totalling £123million to This Land Ltd and the company had made cumulative losses of £15.7million to Dec 2019. Its financial year was extended to March 2021 but, with accounts so far unpublished, its recent financial performance cannot be assessed.

In the light of the company's recent developments of luxury housing in Cambridge, and its recent purchase of farmland in Hertfordshire, will the Council now undertake an immediate forensic audit into the affairs of the company, seek publication of its latest accounts (even on an interim basis) and also make public its Business Plan?"

Ms Nicky Webb asked her question as follows:

"When HPERA heard about the proposed sale we launched a petition on the council website which has already been signed by more than 1200 people in just a fortnight. We believe that it is totally in line with the policy statement at the end of para 2.3 in this committee's agenda papers, namely 'We will keep the county's libraries open, in public ownership, and ensure their services remain free for everyone on Universal Credit'. In view of This Land's reliance on loans from the county council for its operations it would seem reasonable that the executive directors on behalf of the council as shareholder should remind the board of its stated policy to keep libraries, and in particular, Milton Road library, in public ownership. Can officers and/or councillors therefore assure us today that the sale of Milton Rd library has been, or will be, paused to enable alternative options to be explored?"

Cambridge City Councillor Jocelyne Scutt reported that This Land proposed selling the freehold of Milton Road Library (including the Library and flats). She asked what steps the Council would take to ensure that Milton Road Library remained a community library facility, and to ensure the £100,000 contributed by Cambridge City Council to the community space in the library was not lost to the public. In her view, the 25 year lease was simply unacceptable. The proposed sale raised concerns about This Land. It had commenced as a company called Cambridgeshire Housing Investment Company (CHIC) with three directors two of whom were officers of the County Council. Since then numerous directors had come and gone with the number exceeding the original three. She therefore queried whether this raised any concerns with Councillors.

She asked the County Council to immediately publish, for the benefit of Cambridgeshire residents and Council taxpayers, complete and open accounting of all the monies lent by the Council to CHIC and This Land, the lending terms, including interest rates, dates upon which interest payments were to be made and dates upon which the loans were to be repaid to the County, with a complete and open account of all or any payments of interest made on these loans by CHIC/This Land with a precise calendar of dates, and of all or any repayments of these loans and date/s of payments and, if no interest had been paid or delays in payments had occurred, upon what basis and authorised by whom and, if no repayments of loans had been made, what repayment requirements existed and when were the loans expected to be repaid.

The Chair thanked the public questioners for their questions and then invited the Chief Finance Officer (CFO) to respond to all three questions. He reported that the Council was the 100% shareholder of This Land, it was also the company's only Lender, and in relation to Milton Road Library, it was the tenant of the library and community space.

The role of this Committee included oversight of the Council's assets (including leased assets) and taking decisions as shareholder of This Land. Decisions about libraries policy and service sat in the first instance with the Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee. It should be noted that the provision of buildings and accommodation was a product of service and policy needs rather than vice-versa. In other words, it was reasonable to expect that in the years to come the provision and location of libraries would not primarily be determined by the circumstances or terms on which the Council occupied an individual property, more decisive would be the needs of residents and readers expressed through Councillors' decision making and the business plan agreed each year.

Turning to the roles of the Committee, the Council sold the Milton Road site to This Land in May 2018. Following that disposal, the Council did not have a straightforward power as shareholder to instruct This Land to take a particular decision about Milton Road. There was a separation in law between the role of director and shareholder, and the Council had not reserved decisions about This Land's property transactions to the shareholder through the articles. As well as that general point, the current setup of This Land specifically, which was previously agreed, was that the Council dealt with the company on an arms-length basis as an investor, that the company had a commercial character and was therefore not a contracting authority for the purposes of the public procurement rules.

As the lender and mortgage holder for Milton Road, the decisions the Council had previously taken were as follows:

- January 2020, This Land gave notice that they intended to sell the property.
- February 2020, the Commercial and Investment Sub-Group decided it did not wish to pre-empt or repurchase the property (the purchase in prospect at that stage did not ultimately proceed)
- April 2020, the Commercial and Investment Committee (C&IC) received the This Land business plan, which committed to the sale of this property (and thereby vary the mortgage), forming a part of This Land's business success.
- October 2020, the Council agreed to a legally binding protocol for handling property sales by This Land. Through that agreement, the Council limited its pre-emption power to repurchase to only be available if the property had not been marketed or was being sold at less than market value.

In this constrained context, the leadership of the Joint Administration had requested that officers consider what scope the Council had to make any variations to the current proposal, particularly safeguarding the position as tenant. This was being actively worked on and involved negotiation with This Land and a potential purchaser so further details could not be given on this currently in a public answer.

The Council's current lease at Milton Road expired in May 2044. In 2020, the Council and This Land agreed to remove the five year breaks from the lease. The existing lease was already protected by the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954, this meant that the County Council had the statutory right, in most cases, to renew the lease when it expired in 2044 on terms not significantly less favourable than before, and there were only certain restricted grounds on which the Landlord could refuse to renew the lease, which had to be dealt with under a Court process should the Landlord seek to exercise them.

On This Land more generally, page 166 of the agenda papers for this meeting set out the total financing provided to This Land as at 31 March 2021 and the repayment timescales. Since then, in this financial year, This Land had repaid £2.04m several weeks ahead of schedule. This meant the total amount currently on loan to This Land was £113.85m. It was also proposed to publish on the agenda page for this meeting a breakdown of all of the outbound and inbound loan advances and repayments and the years in which they were due to be repaid. **Action Required.**

Whilst principal amounts had been paid on time, there was a delay previously in receiving some interest payments from This Land. This was during a period where the Council was awaiting and then considering an updated business plan from This Land, and whilst the Council withheld advancing further loan funds until there was greater certainty, at the same time This Land needed to defer making interest payments. With the agreement of the revised business plan last year, this was resolved in August 2020, and This Land was now up-to-date, or ahead of schedule with both interest and principal, they had also paid a penalty sum, for the delays to interest payments. To date, the Council had not published the exact interest rates or exact dates for interest and principal payment on the basis that this information related to This Land's business activities and that if it were disclosed to a competitor it would be liable to cause harm to This Land's business.

The change in This Land's accounting date was reported at the February meeting of the C&IC. This Council had received the draft accounts for the 15 months ending 31 March 2021 from This Land and would consolidate these in its draft group financial statements to be published before 1 August 2021. Those are unaudited figures, but they show a profit before interest and taxation and a significant improvement in cash balance. The company continued to make significant interest payments to the Council, and this had been vital to mitigating the level of savings the Council would otherwise have made in recent years, and the This Land accounts continue to record an overall and growing deficit on the balance sheet. This aligned with the business plan adopted last year and this Committee was due to consider the annual update early in the Autumn. That would happen in the context of the review of This Land that the joint administration had committed to. The Local Government Association was expected to give an initial view through the peer challenge, and in order to ensure a thorough going over and specialist input the expectation was that an independent advisor would be engaged thereafter. There was coverage of This Land within the Council's internal audit plan, the company's accounts were subject to external audit and within the last fortnight the company had appointed its own internal auditors, at the Council's request.

Returning to Milton Road, page 105 of the Committee papers also recorded the significant spokes investment of £897k at the Ascham Road site retained by the Council a few metres away from Milton Road library, signalling the Council's ongoing investment in public buildings in that neighbourhood.

One Member asked City Councillor Scutt questions of clarification in relation to her public questions. She was asked as a former County Councillor how many libraries had been closed under the previous Conservative administration in the last four years, and whether she was aware that an arms-length company legally had to remain at arms-length to avoid the Government perceiving it as a delivery vehicle and then requiring the Council to pay back any profits. City Councillor Scutt reported that this did not preclude

every Councillor from being responsible for what This Land had been doing or what it did in the future. Whilst on the Council, Councillor Scutt confirmed that she had asked questions about This Land from the outset.

The Chair reported that the Joint Administration shared concerns raised about the way This Land was set up and managed, which had been made clear in the Joint Agreement. However, whilst it was important to look into the management of This Land, as the newly elected leader of the Council it was also important to consider the financial risk to the Council of any precipitant action in relation to this management. There was a need to make sure that any action did not put at serious risk the Council's wider aims and goals, which would not be the right thing for the residents of Cambridgeshire. The Joint Administration was very keen to preserve libraries, which were an important way for the Council to keep in touch with its residents so it would do all it could to ensure that Milton Library remain secure on its current site.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- requested clarification as to whether This Land would be publishing its accounts and if they would show a profitable position, as well as the risks and financial implications associated with the Joint Administration taking an active role in This Land. The CFO reported that the accounts which were in draft form confirmed that This Land had paid the Council around £8m in interest. It was noted that the net benefit to the Council was approximately £6m a year, which was structured into future financing arrangements. The accounts for This Land were published as part of the Council's group accounts and then at Companies House. He advised the Committee that the company needed to maintain a commercial character and in order to do this there needed to be separation from the Council in terms of its operational decision making particularly in relation to public procurement rules. The immediate risk around arms-length was that it could be infringed but it was important to note that this did not prevent the Joint Administration from conducting a review of This Land.
- requested clarification as to the number of libraries which had been closed under the previous administration. The Director BID reported that no libraries had been closed.
- requested clarification as to which Members had been involved in extending the lease agreement for Milton Road Library to 25 years. The CFO reported that the removal of the lease breaks had been a proposal from This Land. Officers in the Property Team had been involved in the operational negotiations before it was considered by the Commercial and Investment Sub-Group.
- highlighted the fact that there had been a presentation on This Land for all Members of the County Council in November 2020. It was queried whether there had been any changes to the Business Plan since then. The CFO reported that the formal receipt of the updated Business Plan was in April 2020 with further shareholding monitoring since then. The main Member Seminar was held in the spring led by the new Acting Chief Executive of This Land. The Business Plan was due for resubmission which would include a number of updates, but they were not expected to be significant. The Committee would receive the updated Business Plan at a future meeting.

- expressed concern that there was no representation at the meeting from the Chair or Vice-Chair of Children and Young People Committee (C&YPC). Attention was also drawn to the lack of smart targets for the actions set out for Children and Education on page 10 of the agenda. It was suggested that some of the items in the report conflicted with what had been said at C&YPC. For example, the report stated that there would be work with schools to increase breakfast clubs but the C&YPC had confirmed that there would be breakfast clubs in every school. There had also been little mention at C&YPC of the integrated approach to support children and young people's mental health and wellbeing. The Chair explained that the report was the first iteration of the working document to deliver improved outcomes as set out in the Joint Agreement. It was very important that the tracker went back to committees so they could take ownership. Work would take place as to how these actions could be tracked over time, which could include KPIs and project management. She explained that children and young people were a significant priority for the Joint Administration. This area included some of the biggest risks for the Council such as the overspend in Special Educational Needs and Disability and the crisis in children and young people's mental health. It was a key priority of this Council to work with all schools to understand with them the best way to provide services. The Chair agreed to investigate the issue raised at C&YPC regarding the provision of a breakfast club in every school. **Action Required.**
- welcomed and looked forward to pursuing the action to develop and deliver care in neighbourhoods, moving from domiciliary care agencies to carers in local neighbourhoods.
- welcomed the exciting and ambitious agenda set out in the report particularly the climate change and environment area. Attention was drawn to the youth provision reference, as it was so important to provide for young people. The importance of the joined up health and care agenda was highlighted. It was also hoped that a new fit for purpose policy would deal with the issue of heavy goods vehicles.
- welcomed the proposal to carry on the work of the previous administration in relation to communities. It was noted that the previous administration had opened additional libraries. It was also important to note that the Council already had libraries under different ownership. The Council needed to open libraries wherever it could which did not mean it needed to own the building. Attention was drawn to the action to identify budget implications and options for removing the 50p charge on book borrowing for people on Universal Credit. It was confirmed that there was no charge for book borrowing, the 50p charge only related to book transfers.

Councillor Schumann proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Boden, which received the unanimous support of the Committee, that officers create a tracker, with a comprehensive base line position on all of these actions dated from the last AGM. This to happen at the next meeting of this committee, or at the earliest opportunity. He highlighted the importance of establishing the current position and the position the Council would have found itself in on the natural projection of the last council in order for the new Joint Administration to justify its bold statements in the Joint Agreement. The Director BID explained that this report was not the Joint Agreement tracker. The tracker was being developed and would be populated by each of the committees as

they developed the actions. There would be a baseline position and KPIs against each action.

It was resolved unanimously to note and comment on the Joint Agreement draft Action Plan and agree:

- a) to discuss, develop and agree actions with the relevant committees and officer leads.
- b) to monitor progress against the action plan at each meeting of this committee for this municipal year.
- c) that officers create a tracker, with a comprehensive base line position on all of these actions dated from the last AGM. This to happen at the next meeting of this committee, or at the earliest opportunity.

## 6. Integrated Finance Monitoring Reports

### (a) Integrated Finance Monitoring Report for the period ending 31 March 2021

The Committee received a report detailing the performance of the Council for the 2020/21 financial year. The overall revenue budget position was showing an underspend of -£6.3m at year-end. Members were informed that the number of children in care had decreased across the year, this was a key indicator of financial pressure and demand. Attention was drawn to the forecast outturn position 2020/21 on page 23 of the agenda, which pleasingly demonstrated a very narrow range. Members were advised of the key exceptions relating to Place and Economy, and People and Communities. In relation to schools, it was noted that schools' balances had increased by £3.8m across the year, which would be of interest to the Schools Forum as it scrutinised the reasons for this. Members were advised that the General Reserve balance was currently at £26m, that the growth in borrowing had been less than expected, and of variations to the capital programme budgets. In conclusion, the Committee noted the external and contextual issues particularly relating to the Covid pandemic. The full extent of the pressures from the pandemic had not yet materialised. The Council continued to face significant pandemic risks including the economic impact on local taxation and the Council's investments, rising demand and limited funding certainty.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- queried the unusual accounting practice being used to manage the Adults and NHS debt, which included a reserve of £2.824m from an advanced payment made by the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) against a total debt of £6.10m exceeding one year. The CFO acknowledged the unusual treatment of this debt. He explained that the advanced payment had not been applied to individual invoices because there had been no agreement yet as to which invoices the funding related to. The Council was therefore holding this amount in reserve, rather than applying it to the debt position until there was a wider settlement. It was noted that the CFO had fortnightly

calls with the CCG and Peterborough City Council to solve the debt issue and prevent a similar situation. Concern was expressed about the impact of departing from standard accounting practices on the Council's published accounts. The CFO reported that the Audit and Accounts Committee would consider this issue.

- requested more information on the savings shown in black and red on the savings tracker. The CFO reported that those shown as black demonstrated non achievement. He drew attention to page 32 of the agenda which showed that nearly 50% of the original savings had not been delivered due to the pandemic. It was noted that this greater variance than normal had been addressed through business planning.
- queried the nature of the historic savings and noted that they were predominantly recurrent.
- queried the divergence of P&E in the winter months in the forecast outturn position graph on page 23. The CFO reported that the major reason for this was due to the pandemic as the Council had changed its prediction during the year of the compensation it would receive from Government for reduced sales, fees, and charges.
- queried why the balance sheet graph on page 39 did not flow from one year to the next. The CFO reported that this graph looked at real cash. It was noted that the March figures were for the 31 March, and the April figures were for the 30 April, which was why there was a disparity.
- queried the changes to the PWLB rules. The CFO explained that authorities wishing to borrow from PWLB must now, as part of the application process, submit a high-level description of all their capital spending and financing plans for the next three years. The Section 151 officer must confirm that the Authority was not borrowing in advance of need and did not intend to buy investment assets primarily for yield.
- queried whether This Land needed to borrow from the Council for its housing schemes and noted that it had not needed to extend budgeting for 2020/21. Another Member drew attention to the success of This Land which had been raised previously. It was reported that the Council had made money from This Land's borrowing and its commercial activities. It was suggested that prudent financial management by the last administration during the challenge of a pandemic was the reason why there was £6.3m underspend.
- highlighted the fact that a small number of authorities had received a "safety valve" package of additional funding from the Department for Education (DfE) alongside agreeing to mitigating actions locally to deal with pressures on the Special Education Needs and High Needs block. It was queried how this would impact on Cambridgeshire. The CFO reported that these packages had been conditional on local authorities dealing with recurrent pressures. It was noted that Cambridgeshire was due to look at the way it funded top up support in mainstream schools amongst wider plans. He acknowledged that the Council was in a very constrained position on the High Needs Block. The Council had approached the Schools Forum and the Secretary of State regarding transferring funding from the schools' block and was not able to reduce special school budgets according to the regulations. There was

therefore only a relatively small amount of expenditure to restructure this budget and manage demand. Officers were liaising closely with the DfE to escalate these issues, but it was an issue faced by many councils. The Council was now less of an outlier in terms of the magnitude of the overspend compared to other authorities. One Member highlighted the need to avoid agreeing to mitigations which could have a detrimental impact on a vulnerable cohort.

In summing up, the Chair explained that the financial legacy left by the previous administration did not make it easy for the new administration to achieve its ambitions. She highlighted the £7m pressure in Adult Social Care, the £12m overspend in SEND and the £22m unfunded budget gap for the coming year. The Council was therefore in a difficult financial position facing a very challenging budget round in the autumn.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the allocation of the accrued £1.47m Business Rates Retention 2020-21 Pool Dividend to the corporate grants account within Funding Items, as set out in section 6.1.
  - b) Approve accounting for £17,914k Greater Cambridge Partnership funding in place of borrowing, to partially offset the additional borrowing required to repay the recognition in previous years of £19,963k Basic Need funding and £1,401k Combined Authority funding for the Wisbech Access Strategy, and also approve the resulting increase of £3,450k in the prudential borrowing requirement, as set out in section 13.6;
  - c) Note the use of £9,569k Section 106 contributions for applicable schemes where expenditure was incurred in prior years, and the resulting reduction of £9,569k in the prudential borrowing requirement for 2020/21 as set out in section 13.6.
  - d) Approve the transfers to earmarked reserves totalling £7,323k as set out in section 14.1; and
  - e) Note the additional funding for the Emergency Active Travel scheme, previously recommended in the February 2021 report, as set out in Appendix 3.
- (b) Integrated Finance Monitoring Report for the period ending 31 May 2021

The Committee received a report detailing financial and related information to assess progress in delivering the Council's Business Plan. The overall revenue budget position was showing a forecast year-end pressure of +£0.3m. Attention was drawn to the detailed analysis of financial performance on page 79 of the agenda which demonstrated a broadly balanced forecast. However, this needed to be considered against a number of risks set out in Section 2.3.2. Members were advised of the additional investments set out in Section 2.3. The CFO drew attention to the process for reviewing the budget, which reflected a dynamic approach to budgeting that acknowledged the complexity and uncertainty in making forward looking financial estimates. It was noted that favourable changes resulting from contingencies which had not been realised amounted to £2.7m., and there were approximately £1m of additional

pressures which had not been anticipated. It was therefore proposed to hold the £2.7m centrally and reallocate it to meet additional pressures.

The Chair invited Mr Antony Carpen to address the Committee. In his absence, the Democratic Services Manager, read out his question "Please could the County Council provide an update on the works/negotiations for the old Mill Road Library and the Shire Hall site - and indicate whether in principle they have asked Brookgate if any of the Shire Hall Site can be used as an expansion facility for the Museum of Cambridge".

The Assistant Director of Property reported that the former Mill Road Library was having repair works undertaken with contractors on site. It was anticipated that these works would be completed by the end of September. The Council was currently considering future options for this site and had been engaged in discussions with parties regarding community and other uses for the site that would respect and protect its listed status. This Committee was accountable for all property matters and had oversight of any decisions regarding the long-term future of the building.

The future of the Shire Hall site was the subject of a paper being presented to this Committee and further details were set out in the paper. There was a strong heritage component to the design and operation of the new site however the proposals did not include an expansion facility for the Museum of Cambridge. The Council and Brookgate were committed to improving the management and presentation of the heritage of the site and had undertaken discussions to scope the opportunities. Both had always worked closely with local cultural partners including the Castle Hill Open Days, and previous discussions had included those partners. As the heritage proposals were worked through, both parties would continue those conversations.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- requested updates on the progress of Wisbech Access and the Secondary School. **Action Required.**
- expressed concern that the Combined Authority (CA) had voted to award funding from the Government's Levelling Up Fund to a scheme in Peterborough rather than £2,072k for a March Area Transport Study scheme. As this scheme was part of the CA Mayor's re-prioritisation programme, it was asked whether it was safe to treat this funding as an additional contribution. The CFO reported that this item would only be included in the report if the Council had paperwork giving a commitment that this funding would be received. He would therefore investigate all items expected to be funded by the CA. **Action Required.** The Chair explained that the CA could only submit one successful bid for Levelling Up funding, and the Peterborough bid was for a significantly larger amount of funding. She added that she was supportive of the March bid in the event of the Peterborough bid not proceeding.
- highlighted the fact that this administration had been able to remove over £2m from the Adults and Health Committee without affecting frontline service expenditure, which related to the prudential financial planning to cope with the Covid measures.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve allocating £25k in order that all directly employed staff were paid at least the living wage throughout 2021-22 and to commence work to explore achieving the Real Living Wage Foundation accreditation, with the full implications to be considered by this Committee in collaboration with Staffing & Appeals Committee, as set out in section 2.3.4;
- b) Approve allocating up to £537k, from the Transformation Fund reserve, to People & Communities (Education) in order to provide children eligible for free school meals with that provision in Summer 2021, as set out in section 2.3.5.
- c) Approve the net the budget revision and redistribution set out in the table at 2.3.6: deducting £2.7m budget for items that were not currently required and investing £956k for additional pressures.
- d) Approve the carry forward of £33.8m capital funding from 2020/21 to 2021/22 and beyond as set out in section 5.6.
- e) Approve the -£25.4m revised phasing of funding in relation to schemes as set out in section 5.6.
- f) Note the changes in capital grants of £2.8m, and the associated reduction of £3.6m in the prudential borrowing requirement as set out in section 5.6.
- g) Approve £869k virement between property budgets, as set out in section 5.6.
- h) Note the changes in other contributions and Section 106 funding of £6.8m as set out in section 5.6 and
- i) Note the £0.3m reduction in capital receipts funding in 2021/22 as set out in section 5.6.

## 7. Future of the Shire Hall Campus, Cambridge

The Committee considered a report detailing the need for an agreed commercial position that would enable the Council to enter into formal contractual arrangements with Brookgate (the developer), an apart-hotel operator and a funder thereby resulting in the disposal of the original Shire Hall building on a long lease for hotel use, and the redevelopment of the Octagon and Old Police House buildings as modern office accommodation. Attention was drawn to the background to the proposal, the options considered for the future of Shire Hall, the project appraisal, construction, environmental improvements, the hotel rent free period, and heritage.

The Committee's attention was also drawn to the income strip and financial model. It was noted that the income strip process meant that the institutional investor and developer would take on the development risk and all assets would return to the Council in 40 years at the end of the hotel lease. The Committee also noted the use of capital receipts and increasing revenue retained including the different rental scenarios for a total rent of £5.12m set out in Section 9.4: officers were recommending the 50%

rent scenario be adopted. The report set out the key risks relating to the Cambridge hotel market, the Cambridge office rental market, the financial stability of the hotel provider, planning, and contract documents and relationships. It was also noted that the Council would shortly take possession of the accommodation at Alconbury Weald and access to the accommodation space would be reviewed as the country emerged from the pandemic.

The Chair invited Cambridge City Councillor Scutt and one member of the public to address the Committee.

City Councillor Scutt expressed disappointment that there was absolutely no reference to the public footpath or Town Green in the report. She explained that as one of three Town Green Applicants, she had requested a copy of the press release issued on or about 29 June in relation to the future of Shire Hall. She had also requested the Council's legal advice on the limitations of the Heritage Act as to any protection of free access at all, and in perpetuity, of the public to Castle Mound and the Green Space. If there was no such legal advice then she asked what was the Council's understanding as to the Heritage Act's limitations in that regard, based on what and, further, a clear adumbration of precisely what the Council meant by its assertion that the lease to Brookgate would 'significantly enhance the environmental layout of the site' and 'enshrine and increase public access both to the site and the historic Castle Mound', together with a clear statement of the Council's intentions as to the Castle Mound and the Green Space in relation to the lease to Brookgate, and what provision and/or protection was intended for the Civil War earthworks. In blunt and readily to be understood terms, Castle Mound could be fenced, a charge made for entry onto Castle Mound could be levied, candy-covered awnings covering a stand/s or booth/s could be erected for the selling of tickets, as the Heritage Act did not prohibit this and, further, the Green Space was not covered by the Heritage Act – meaning an hotel could prohibit public access, to benefit hotel guests.

In the absence of Mr Michael Page, the Democratic Services Manager, read out his question "Will all of the green space outside the proposed Shire Hall apart-hotel be legally protected for use by members of the public at all times, and the operators of the hotel prohibited from cordoning off any outside green space for the use of hotel residents, guests or third-party operators?"

The Assistant Director of Property reported that the Council had issued a press release regarding Shire Hall on 28 June 2021 and a copy of the release could be found on the council's website here:

Revised plans for the future of historic Shire Hall complex come under new Strategy and Resources committee spotlight. - Cambridgeshire County Council

The press release reflected the proposals for the development of the Shire Hall site to provide the refurbishment and redevelopment of the Shire Hall building and surrounding properties into a modern and environmentally efficient aparthotel and offices. The primary buildings would be to BREEAM Excellent standards. This would be in parallel to the improvement in environmental quality, amenity, and public access to the Shire Hall site and the heritage assets located within it.

The Council was fully aware of the critical importance of the heritage and amenity of the Shire Hall site to the City and wider area, and it had been fundamental to the strategy for the site that this was not only protected but enhanced as part of any scheme. The Council had been working extensively with Brookgate to produce proposals that achieved these goals. This included specific proposals to improve access to and heritage appreciation of, the Castle Mound and associated Scheduled Ancient Monuments and ensuring the continuity of access across the site.

The Council was aware of the town green application, along with a Rights of Way application submitted separately. The existence of such applications did not preclude or prevent the Council from engaging in the appropriate management of its properties or engagement with stakeholders on its proposals. Members of the public were entitled to submit such applications as they considered appropriate. The Council would follow and comply with the respective application processes.

The proposals for the site itself would, if passed by Members, be subject to full scrutiny through planning and related processes. This would include a wide range of environmental, archaeological and other evaluations and reports prior to any decision by the planning authority and other bodies as required.

Upon completion of the scheme, if approved, the Castle Mound, the wider Scheduled Ancient Monument (including Civil War earthworks) and wider green space on the Shire Hall site would remain under the ownership, control, and management of Cambridgeshire County Council. The proposals included a potential increase in the green space and full and open access to the entire green space including the Castle Mound. Legal advice had not been obtained in respect of limitations of the Heritage Act as there was no such legislation. However, Council members had previously been briefed on the legal aspects of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Act 1979.

Neither Brookgate or the Council had plans for long term fencing off of the Castle Mound or limiting access, nor charging entry to the site or having canopy covered awnings. Temporary limitations of access might be required during the development phase to facilitate archaeological investigations or other works on the site and would be carried out in strict accordance with all relevant legislation.

A key plank of the commercial negotiations by all parties had been the retention of a high-quality public and open amenity space surrounding the proposed aparthotel and offices to provide a high quality environment to attract customers and tourists to Cambridge and the heritage assets. The aparthotel did not have any rights to occupy or use the lawn or green space or restrict access to those areas. The detailed plans remained under discussion; however these included proposals to remodel parts of the site to increase the area of lawn and green space by the removal of currently developed areas.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- queried when the impact on neighbours of the 60 decibel noise level of the air conditioning units at the Shire Hall site would be taken into consideration. It was noted that the issue of noise featured within the building and planning regulation processes.

- highlighted the impact on neighbours of cars parking around the area now that the car parks at the front of the Shire Hall site were going to be removed. It was noted that Cambridge City Council planners would take this issue into account.
- expressed sadness at the report, and thanked officers, on behalf of the Joint Administration, for reviewing the situation. It would appear that Shire Hall had been left in such neglect that it was sadly prohibitive to make it an economically viable building. It was felt that the former administration had taken a decision which had failed to be motivated by the fact that Cambridge was an historic city in the county, and the heritage of the site in public use. The public questions relating to access were a fair challenge and the Council would take note of the issues in relation to the National Heritage Act 2002. The Council had been left a fait accompli by the previous administration which was to be regretted. Another Member shared the sadness expressed but was of the view that retaining Shire Hall was not a sustainable option on environmental and financial terms. However, it was felt that Northstowe, which had good public transport links, would have been a much better choice than Alconbury Weald. The Joint Administration therefore had to make the best of the current situation for the people of Cambridgeshire.
- queried what had changed in relation to the statement that public transport to Alconbury Weald was more restricted than expected at the time the location was selected. Another Member highlighted the actions taken by the Combined Authority Mayor in relation to scrapping the mass transit proposal, and the fact that the East Coast Main Line train station was now in doubt and defended the choice of Alconbury.
- welcomed the recommendation proposing a revision of the revenue/capital split by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council which would provide more certainty and create an additional revenue stream to spend on services.
- noted that a 5% discount rate had been applied to the two financial summaries on pages 124 and 125 to calculate the net present value (NPV). The justification for this rate was queried as it seemed to be quite high. The same Member also asked for information on the sensitivity analysis into the selection of this rate. He commented that it was unfortunate that the calculation of the 45% rent had not been provided in NPV terms. The CFO reported that there was more information in the confidential appendix comparing the approaches. It was noted that this project had been assessed against the 5% cash flow, and he offered to share the sensitivity analysis which sat behind this approach. **Action Required.**
- expressed surprise that 50% rent was the marginally optimum option in absolute cash terms. It was suggested that the recommendation based on absolute cash terms was irrelevant and misleading. The CFO reported that the results of all the scenarios in absolute cash and NPV terms were all quite close to each other. It was then possible to make a more qualitative judgement on the reasons for taking additional flexibility through the rental return.
- queried who was taking the risk in terms of the archaeology set out in Section 7.6.3. It was noted that the archaeological and all other construction risks sat with the developer.

- acknowledged that there would be a certain amount of car usage and queried the provision of electric charging points. The Assistant Director of Property confirmed that the points formed part of the BREEAM excellent rating for the aparthotel building.

Councillor Schumann proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Fuller, to look to place a legal covenant on green space to maintain public access and enjoyment. He explained that regardless of his continued commitment of the last four years to maintain public access, there seemed to be general concern within the city of Cambridge about the public access. Another Member commented that a legal covenant would give an assurance that the promises relating to public access in the report were enforced.

The Chair reported that she was happy to take the issue away to see what could be done but had reservations about accepting the amendment because the report was a final decision so the amendment could have an impact on the overall business case. The CFO reported that it was difficult to consider fully the implications on the spot. The Town Green application was being considered by Suffolk County Council, and the County Council would be the operator/manager of the green spaces. He expressed concern that the Council was at an advanced stage of the negotiations, and whilst there was no disagreement in substance regarding the protection of the green space, it could have unintended consequences to introduce, as a condition, an unforeseen further legal agreement at this stage.

Some Members were concerned that the Council was being bounced into a situation without the relevant legal advice. One Member reported that groups on the Council had been pushing the former administration do this for about three years and was of the view that the proposed amendment was effectively a wrecking amendment to the report. In response, the mover of the amendment reported that he had submitted his amendment in a timely fashion as organisations did not enter into legal covenants until contracts were drawn.

As set out in Part 4 - Rules of Procedure, Part 4.4 – Procedure Rules for Committee and Sub-Committee Meetings, Section 18 of the Council's Constitution, five or more Councillors requested a recorded vote. On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost. Councillors Boden, Criswell, Fuller, Goldsack, Howell, Hoy, and Schumann voted for the amendment and Councillors Dupré, Howitt, Meschini, Murphy, Nethsingha, Sanderson, Slatter, and Wilson voted against.

Councillor Howitt proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Dupré, (f) to note that this included binding arrangements for public ownership and access to the green space on this site. Councillor Schumann asked the mover of the amendment to make an alteration to investigate whether a legal covenant could be placed on the green space, which was not accepted. In response to a query regarding the legality of this action, the Assistant Director of Property reported that although the Council retained overall ownership and management of the site, the proposed action set out in the amendment would require legal advice. Another Member queried how the Committee could note something which was binding when it was not clear how it would be binding and on whom. On being put the vote, the amendment was carried.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) note the updated commercial arrangements as set out in the report.
- b) note the due diligence report of the proposed hotel provider as set in confidential Appendix 3.
- c) approve the commercial proposals as set out in confidential Appendix 2 including the revision of the revenue / capital split described in section 8 and 9 of this report.
- d) note the resulting provision of office accommodation across the County as a result of the whole Cambs 2020 programme, and commit to keeping this closely under review as office usage changes post-pandemic, addressing areas where there is a shortage of service provision emerging, as described in section 1.5; and
- e) delegate agreement of the final terms and consequential or minor amendments to the contractual documentation, as set out in paragraph 10.6, to the Director of Resources in consultation with the Chair & Vice Chair of this Committee.
- f) note that this included binding arrangements for public ownership and access to the green space on this site.

## 8. Independent Living, Princess of Wales Development – Outline Business Case

The Committee received a report to enable further preparations and detailed design work for constructing the Council's own independent living service for older people who required care and support. Subject to the Committee's agreement, it was proposed to then to proceed to a full business case and update the 2021/22 Business Plan with additional capital provision. It was noted that a report had been presented to the Adults and Health Committee, which had approved the underlying service strategy.

Attention was drawn to the background to the proposal, which was about offering older people with higher levels of needs with a new way of retaining their independence by flexing and wrapping services around their particular set of circumstances. The report signalled to the care market that the Council was looking for more tenancy based homes for life, which were self-contained and digitally enabled. It was hoped that this approach could be accelerated around the County. Attention was drawn to the particular benefits of the location of the Princess of Wales site. It was noted that the Council would be building on the planning application already submitted by the NHS and approved by the District Council. Although there were many risks, the Council would be working to mitigate them or transfer to the right party. In conclusion Members were advised of the reasons why proposal 3 was the preferred option.

The Chair asked the Democratic Services Manager to read out a response from the Local Member, Councillor Whelan as follows:

“Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee. I apologise for not being able to be present today, but would like you to note my views on the Independent Living proposals for Ely. This is a project that I strongly support. The integration of care and health in this way should prove to offer many benefits, not least of which is the proximity to the planned new hospital.

The low carbon design and the wraparound care possibilities that will enhance people’s lives are just 2 of the positive points that come from the plans. The growth in residents in East Cambridgeshire, combined with increasing number of older people requiring care demonstrates a need for this facility. Despite the low carbon design, it is a pity that only 5 EV charging points are proposed. The facility for all car parking spaces to access EV charging should be built into all designs going forward. However, even EV cars are not carbon neutral and currently have other environmental impacts that need to be avoided. As such, there needs to be much greater emphasis on both public transport and on accessible active travel.

There is currently significant additional development going on where this development is proposed and all forms of transport are lacking. Road junctions are unlikely to cope well with the increased volume of road traffic. The cycle routes suggested along Lynn Road are not suitable particularly with the increased vehicular traffic. Local cycling groups have raised concerns about these routes. It would be relatively easy for improved accessible active travel routes to be developed from Kings Avenue, entering Heaton Drive at the water tower and continuing to the proposed location of the ILS, thus allowing cyclists, pedestrians and users of other pedestrian controlled vehicles to avoid the need for cars.

The report before you highlights the proximity of a bus stop, but fails to mention that the bus service is two hourly and then for only a limited part of the day. The report, to its credit, does mention public transport network assessment work that is currently going on, but such assessment does not guarantee the improvements that are needed. In approving this expenditure, as I hope you will, I would urge you to take this opportunity to ensure improvements to the public transport network and also to the accessible active travel network.”

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- welcomed the report and expressed support in principle to independent living schemes and hoped they would be replicated in other parts of Cambridgeshire. However, attention was drawn to a few warning signs in the outline business case, which needed to be explored more carefully before moving to the full business case. It was hoped that there would be a more detailed sensitivity analysis in the full business case, as it was important to understand the assumptions being made in relation to the financial benefits. The weight the Joint Administration put on social benefits was acknowledged but there was concern about the impact on the Council’s financial position if the financial benefits were ignored.
- highlighted the need for greater Member involvement in the ILS programme. The same Member expressed disappointment at the lack of certainty from the Chair of Adults and Health Committee regarding the Member reference group on this issue.

The Chair confirmed that she would together with the Chair of Adults and Health Committee work very closely to make sure the project was well managed.

- confirmed, as Chair of Adults and Health Committee, that his committee had been very supportive of this scheme. He welcomed the contribution of the Local Member, which would be listened and responded to by the officers. It was noted that the Adults and Health Committee had deferred the appointments to the reference group for further review. He praised the fact that the Council was financing and developing the scheme rather than getting someone else to. However, he had asked officers to keep the outsourcing of care and housing under review. He acknowledged that the financial risks were complicated but was reassured about the amount of due diligence in the report before the final business case.
- highlighted the need for fit for purpose accommodation and requested assurance that it was not just a matter of consultation and that expert advice would be sought, right from the beginning from organisations such as the Papworth Trust. It was suggested that live in carers were often the key to a lifetime home as they kept people out of hospital.
- expressed concern about the size of the accommodation. The Head of Commissioning for Commercial explained that the Council would undertake a wide ranging consultation, which had already started with Healthwatch. He added that the a live in carer was part of the Council's domiciliary support which was in place now. The equivalent for housing with care was care, support and supervision 24 hours a day and that was driven by a social care assessment, as well as a nursing assessment. The size of the units would be picked up as part of the consultation.
- acknowledged the concerns raised by the Local Member in relation to transport. It was reported that the site was very busy with this development and the redevelopment of the hospital. There were also a large number of homes which had been refurbished and sold, and further development was planned on the green spaces in between the sites. It was therefore important that this development was a good neighbour to existing residents by making sure people could get easily to the site by bus. It was hoped that this Council would make representations to the Combined Authority on this issue. There also needed to be provision for decent electric car charging, which would grow in the future. Finally, there needed to be arrangements for active travel to, out of and through the site avoiding where possible using the busy Lynn Road.
- expressed concern regarding how couples would be accommodated given that the 80 flats were all single occupancy with 16 being rented out to the NHS.
- queried whether the Council was considering potential customers and people using the facilities already as part of its market testing. It was noted that this had started as part of the current phase.
- highlighted the financial model in Section 2.3.1 and noted that the tenant in this type of service had the right to choose his/her care provider.

- acknowledged the ambitious payback period of 23.9 years, which would be reviewed as part of the full business case.
- queried who would be making the allocation of properties. It was noted that the Council would retain 100% nomination rights to all the properties. However, it was important to also note that the Council was renting out part to the NHS.
- queried the employment of people with learning disabilities and noted that it was 3 people.
- queried the ratio of nursing care on the premises. It was noted that there would be a registered nurse for each shift and associate nurses supporting the registered nurse, which amounted to approximately 40% of the ratio of all staff. The Committee was informed that this amounted to 80 to 100 staff over 24 hours.
- acknowledged that one of the benefits of the scheme was to separate out the housing and social care costs so there was a saving to the Council as people could claim back part of the costs in housing benefit. It was therefore queried whether the rent charge exceeded the local housing rates thereby potentially shifting the financial burden on to District Councils. It was noted that the Council had consulted District Councils on the rent charge. They were only able to give an absolute estimate on an actual application. The Council had therefore worked with other housing providers and services to look out current actual charges. The tenants would have access to special accommodation rates which were higher than the housing allowance.

It was resolved unanimously to approve:

- (i) the recommended option as set out in paragraph 2.5.7 and its financial and social justification.
- (ii) the overall capital investment case and in particular elements which affects land and property and the monies required for the next stage.
- (iii) an addition capital provision into the 2021/22 Business Plan as set out in paragraph 2.7.1.
- (iv) an expenditure of £1.1m to complete detailed design works and present an FBC as set out in paragraph 2.7.4.
- (v) delegate approval and sign-off of the inter-authority agreement and the non-binding Heads of Terms to the Chief Finance Officer and Commissioning Service Director.
- (vi) prepare and submit Planning Application for the construction works.
- (vii) the final investment levels forecast including the initial land valuation and plan to refresh both.
- (viii) revised timetable; and

- (ix) preparations on concept and detailed design, and co-production and consequently move towards full business case.

The Committee was also asked to note and comment on:

- (i) the proposed design principles employed for independent living services as set out in paragraph 2.2.3.
- (ii) the plan to put in place a formal agreement between NHS, CCC and a housing management provider about ways of working.
- (iii) the benefits case at this outline business case stage which affected Adult Social Care operating budgets.
- (iv) the general procurement approach for a contract value of £72.6m, and to procure and sign agreement with a housing management provider and a care provider; and
- (v) delegating the award of the new contract to the Executive Director of People and Communities in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Adult and Health Committee.

## 9. Treasury Management Report – Quarter Four Update 2020-21

The Committee considered the quarterly update on the Treasury Management Strategy 2020/21, approved by Council in February 2020.

It was resolved unanimously to note the Treasury Management Quarter Four Report for 2020/21 and forward to Full Council to note.

## 10. Appointments to Outside Bodies and Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and the Appointment of Member Champions

The Committee was asked to appoint to outside bodies and internal advisory groups and panels and appoint Member Champions to lead on specific subject areas. Members acknowledged the increase in the number of representatives on the County Farms Working Group and Member Development Panel to 7 to reflect proportionality.

One Member commented that it would be helpful to have representatives from all groups on these bodies, groups and panels. Councillors Goldsack and Schumann offered to continue as the County Farms Member Champion, and as the Council's representative on This Land respectively.

It was resolved unanimously to:

- (i) review and agree the appointments to outside bodies, and note the vacancies as detailed in Appendix 1.
- (ii) review and agree the appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels, and note the vacancies as detailed in Appendix 2.

- (iii) delegate, on a permanent basis between meetings, the appointment of representatives to any vacancies on outside bodies, groups, and panels, within the remit of the Strategy and Resources Committee, to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee.

## 11. Strategy and Resources Committee Agenda Plan and Training Plan

The Committee noted the agenda plan and the inclusion of business planning for the September meeting. The Director BID added that items had been picked up from various induction meetings, and Chair and Vice Chair meetings, so this information in relation to the Committee's training plan would be circulated to Members for comment.  
**Action Required.**

It was resolved unanimously to note the Committee Agenda Plan and Training Plan.

Chair

**Cambridgeshire County Council**  
**Appointments to Outside Bodies: Policy and Service Committees**

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	Reps Appointed	Representative(s)	Guidance Classification	Committee to Approve
<p><b>Cambridge BID Board</b></p> <p>A five-year initiative set up by Cambridge businesses/organisations to ensure continued investment in Cambridge City Centre</p>	6	1	Councillor G Bird (L)	Regulated Director	Strategy and Resources
<p><b>Cambridgeshire Horizons Board</b></p> <p>Cambridgeshire Horizons still exists as a Limited company to oversee three “live” Rolling Fund investments, two loans and one equity investment, with an initial total value of £20.5m, to support a number of growth projects and developments around Cambridgeshire.</p>	1	1	Councillor L Nethsingha (LD)	Company Director	Strategy and Resources

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	Reps Appointed	Representative(s)	Guidance Classification	Committee to Approve
<p><b>England's Economic Heartland Strategic Alliance Group</b></p> <p>Stretching from Swindon to Cambridgeshire and from Northamptonshire to Hertfordshire, England's Economic Heartland brings political and business leaders together in a strategic collaborative partnership with a shared commitment to realise the region's economic potential.</p>	TBC	1	<p>Councillor L Nethsingha (LD)</p> <p>Substitute: Councillor E Meschini (L)</p> <p><i>[this appointment must be the Leader or Deputy of the Council]</i></p>	Other Public Body representative	Strategy and Resources
<p><b>ESPO Management Committee</b></p> <p>Purchasing and contracting service for 6 member Authorities.</p>	4	2	<p>1.Councillor B Goodliffe (L) 2.Councillor N Shailer (L)</p>	Other Public Body Representative	Strategy and Resources
<p><b>ESPO Finance and Audit Sub Committee</b></p>	2	1	Councillor B Goodliffe (L)	Other Public Body Representative	Strategy and Resources

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	Reps Appointed	Representative(s)	Guidance Classification	Committee to Approve
<p><b>ESPO Shareholder representative</b></p> <p>Representing Cambridgeshire's interests with respect to ESPO Trading Limited</p>	-	1	<p>Councillor B Goodliffe (L) Substitute. Councillor N Shailer (L)</p>	<p>Other Public Body Representative</p> <p>(The Council partly owns ESPO Trading Limited (less than 20%) so Cllr Howell is the shareholder rep)</p>	Strategy and Resources
<p><b>Huntingdon BID Board</b></p> <p>BID is the town management vehicle for Huntingdon. It is an arrangement where businesses in a defined area agree improvements they want to make, over and above what the public agencies have to do. The fund is ring fenced and used solely to deliver the agreed set of projects and activities voted on by the businesses within the BID area.</p>	10	1	Councillor T Sanderson (Ind)	Other Public Body representative	Strategy and Resources

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	Reps Appointed	Representative(s)	Guidance Classification	Committee to Approve
<p><b>LGSS Law Limited</b></p> <p>Company jointly owned by Northamptonshire County Council, Central Bedfordshire Council and Cambridgeshire County Council to provide legal services to the owner councils and to other organisations within the public sector and not for profit sector.</p>	4	1	Councillor E Murphy (LD) Consultee Member	<p>Other Public Body Representative</p> <p>[Council's representative on a company it part owns]</p>	Strategy and Resources
<p><b>This Land Board of Directors</b></p>	12	1	<p>Councillor N Gough (LD)</p> <p>Coterminous Officer representative: Steve Cox</p>	Company Director (Non Executive Director)	Strategy and Resources

## Appointments to Internal Advisory Groups and Panels

## Appendix 2

Name of Body	Meetings per Annum	Representatives Appointed	Representative(s)	Contact Details	Committee to Approve
Civic Hub Project Board	12	1	Councillor G Wilson (LD)	Andy Preston <a href="mailto:andrew.preston@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">andrew.preston@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> 01223 715664	Strategy and Resources
County Farms Working Group	4	7	Councillor L Dupre Councillor N Gay (Lab) Councillor P McDonald (LD) VACANCY VACANCY VACANCY VACANCY	John MacMillan <a href="mailto:john.macmillan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">john.macmillan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> 01223 699092  Jack Kennedy <a href="mailto:jack.kennedy@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">jack.kennedy@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a>	Strategy and Resources
Member Development Panel  Oversees training and development for Members.	As required	7	VACANCY (Con) appointment Councillor S Criswell (Con) Councillor E Meschini (Lab) Councillor L Nethsingha (LD) Councillor T Sanderson (Ind) Councillor P Slatter (LD) Councillor M Smith (Con)	Michelle Rowe Democratic Services Manager <a href="mailto:michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk">michelle.rowe@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</a> 01223 699180	Strategy and Resources