

## **Appendix 1**

### **Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre Review Forward to the Review – Cllr. M. Shellens**

#### **FORWARD**

This report is a post-project appraisal for the Cambridge Library Enterprise Centre (CLEC) project.

The terms of reference were set by Council when it agreed the recommendations contained in Cllr Hickford's motion of 21<sup>st</sup> July. Those terms of reference are set out in Appendix D to the report.

#### **Methodology**

Input to the review was sought from council members, residents and officers.

Submissions were received from 17 councillors and 11 residents.

To assist development of the report some 700 relevant quotes were extracted into a separate document and then individually reviewed.

These were all considered by the team and learning points transferred to this report.

Further comment will be received from an open meeting for all councillors on September 22<sup>nd</sup> and then by discussion at Audit and Accounts that afternoon.

The team is most grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to share with us their thoughts on this matter.

#### **Report content**

After a brief introduction the recommendations and comments arising from the review form the majority of the report.

The report was researched and produced by Internal Audit apart from the section on Spokes. This was considered to be more "Political" and so was compiled by me.

For some matters the recommendation is that Constitution and Ethics Committee give the subject further consideration.

The decision was taken not to include individual submissions in the report itself as it would create a disheartening bulk (over 100 pages).

However, in accordance with our commitment to be fully transparent, all material received is published, in its entirety, in two web documents, document 5a. *CLEC Review - Submissions from Members* dealing with submissions from members, and document 5b. *CLEC Review - Submissions from the public* dealing with submissions from residents.

### **What is not included**

There are two significant matters not covered by this report:

- a) The terms of reference did not require the project team to provide an evaluation or verdict on the correctness of the many decisions taken in the course of the CLEC project;
- b) The project has undoubtedly consumed much council resource in terms of officer time and resource, producing agenda, minutes, drafting heads of terms, legal agreements, leases, architects fees etc. However all that lies in the past and cannot be undone.

This authority continues to face a very challenging financial situation. Initiatives such as CLEC have an important part to play in generating income. This will enable the authority to minimise the loss of services we are able to provide to residents that require them.

The submissions received included many criticisms of past actions. There were calls for attribution, for names to be named. However, as there is no suggestion of illegality the report focuses exclusively on how this authority should conduct itself in future. Rather than rehearse criticisms which would be likely to generate much sterile accusation and counter accusation, the report instead concentrates on the learning points to be derived from these insights.

The recommendations contained in this report are intended to optimise the future by facilitating successful initiatives, much needed by this Authority, that conform to due process and democratic control.