

## **SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet held on  
Thursday, 9 July 2015 at 6.00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Councillor Simon Edwards (Deputy Leader of the Council & Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder)

|                     |                 |  |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| <b>Councillors:</b> | Mark Howell     | Housing Portfolio Holder                               |
|                     | Mick Martin     | Environmental Services Portfolio Holder                |
|                     | Peter Topping   | Corporate and Customer Services Portfolio Holder       |
|                     | Robert Turner   | Planning Portfolio Holder                              |
|                     | Tim Wotherspoon | Strategic Planning and Transportation Portfolio Holder |
|                     | Nick Wright     | Economic Development Portfolio Holder                  |

Officers in attendance for all or part of the meeting:

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Alex Colyer    | Executive Director, Corporate Services                     |
| Fiona McMillan | Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Monitoring Officer |
| Graham Watts   | Democratic Services Team Leader                            |

Councillors Anna Bradnam, Nigel Cathcart, Grenville Chamberlain, Kevin Cuffley, Sue Ellington, Lynda Harford, Alex Riley, Ben Shelton, Bridget Smith, Hazel Smith, Bunty Waters and Aidan Van de Weyer were in attendance, by invitation.

---

### **Procedural Items**

---

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ray Manning, Leader of the Council, and Jean Hunter, Chief Executive.

#### **2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 February 2015 were signed as a correct record.

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 as he had previously worked with Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, who was in attendance to jointly present the report on the Housing Development Agency.

#### **4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, welcomed Councillor Peter Topping to his first meeting of Cabinet since his appointment as Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services. Councillor Edwards took this opportunity to thank Councillor David Whiteman-Downes for his contributions as the former Portfolio Holder.

Councillor Edwards announced that the Council had recently gone through its Investors In People assessment. He and the Leader of the Council had been interviewed as part of the process and initial feedback from the assessment had been excellent. He reported that the assessors were very impressed with the organisation itself and the members of staff that they had met as part of the assessment, stating that the Council's values were some of the best they had seen in terms of what they stood for and how they were embedded. The assessor's final report would be submitted to the Council shortly. It was noted that the Council aspired to achieve gold category status having previously been accredited as a silver organisation.

## **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions had been received.

---

### **Operational Items**

---

## **6. SHARED SERVICES**

Cabinet considered an overview report on shared services, together with three separate reports setting out the individual business cases for shared service proposals in respect of ICT, Legal and Building Control.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Finance and Staffing Portfolio Holder, presented the overview report which set out the overall framework that had been taken to develop these shared services proposals with Cambridge City Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. He highlighted that, as part of the governance arrangements, it was proposed for a Joint Committee to be established to oversee the operation of shared services that would be supported by an officer Board. Councillor Edwards stated that the Leaders of the three Councils would make up the membership of the Joint Committee, but emphasised that it would have no delegated decision-making power. He referred Cabinet to the sovereignty guarantee set out in the report which supported this.

In terms of the sovereignty guarantee, it was agreed that the third sentence should be amended to reflect that that the commissioning or delivery of services together was specifically designed not to change the experience of services, unless there was an improvement in those services. This meant that those using the service should experience the same level of service or an improved service, but not a reduced service as a result of this collaborative working. It was also suggested that the term 'users' as well as 'residents' should be used within the same sentence. This was also agreed.

The following points were noted during discussion on the overview report:

- a question was asked as to how the shared services arrangements already in place and taken forward over the last few years, as referred to at paragraph 10 of the report, had performed. Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, referred to the Home Improvement Agency and acknowledged that some unexpected cultural differences had been experienced which did have an initial impact. Shared values and outcomes were now in place and he was of the view that lessons had been learnt as a result of this particular shared service which should have a positive impact on developing and implementing new shared services. Councillor Edwards reported that shared payroll and internal audit

services were working well, with the Council's Corporate Governance Committee content with the internal audit service in particular;

- a question was asked as to why these proposals had not included a pilot scheme to test their success before committing to formal arrangements. In answer to the question it was noted that it would be difficult to run pilot schemes for these shared services proposals. Pilot schemes would have created unnecessary uncertainty amongst staff and it was important to be assured that clear structures were in place to provide opportunities as part of the proposals for each service;
- some of the shared services proposals were hybrids, effectively halfway between a district and unitary authority, so clarity around who was responsible for what would be important. Councillor Edwards agreed that the shared services proposals were hybrids, but cited the joint waste service with the City Council as an excellent example of where it made sense to work together to make savings, improve efficiency and deliver improved services. He also emphasised the importance of the sovereignty guarantee in respect of each Council maintaining its decision-making power for each of the shared services proposals;
- South Cambridgeshire District Council maintained a tradition of keeping services as close as possible to communities, residents and service users and a concern was expressed that this could be lost as part of these proposals. Councillor Edwards felt that services would continue to be delivered in the same way, or improved, as a result of the shared services proposals;
- there should be elected Member involvement in the recruitment of senior positions to shared services. Councillor Edwards confirmed that elected Members would be involved in the recruitment processes of senior positions for each shared service, which had recently occurred with a senior appointment to the joint waste service;
- a question was asked as to why these three significant service areas would be amalgamated into formal shared services simultaneously. It was suggested that the ICT shared service should be embedded before any of the others were put in place. Councillor Edwards reassured Cabinet that a lot of work in the background in relation to ICT had already taken place. Councillor Peter Topping, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, accepted that there were dependency risks between these proposals but said that they would be managed very carefully. He also added that these shared services would not all commence on one day, but would consist of a series of managed activities between the autumn and April 2016;
- a question was asked as to why the same governance model that was in place for Local Government Shared Services had not been included as part of the proposals for these shared services. It was noted that the Local Government Shared Services model included devolvement of powers from each partner Council through a formal joint committee, with delegated decision-making power. The proposal as part of the shared services for Legal, ICT and Building Control, at this stage, was to retain decision-making powers within each partner Council so that the joint committee was only advisory.

Councillor Peter Topping, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, presented the business case for shared legal services and the rationale for the establishment of a Practice was noted as follows:

- to enable a reduction in the externalisation of legal work through the broader sharing of legal capability;
- to increase output from lawyers by managing non-lawyer work away from them;
- to create a single point for commissioning legal services to improve value for money from the process of externalising legal work;

- to increase the opportunity for income generation by offering legal services to public and voluntary sector bodies;
- to improve staff recruitment, retention and development.

Discussion ensued and the following points were noted:

- the three partner Councils had three different cultures, with the City Council supporting urban needs, South Cambridgeshire District Council supporting rural needs and Huntingdonshire District Council supporting a mixture of the two;
- each Council currently benefited from legal officers who were familiar with each respective authority and understood historical cases. A question was therefore asked as to whether consistency would be lost as a result of the shared service proposal. Councillor Edwards was confident that this would not be an issue and that sound legal advice would be provided by any professional officer from within the legal shared service at any time;
- the City Council appeared to have significantly more legal professional staff than the other two Councils, which meant that the City Council would make more of an efficiency saving resulting from the shared service proposal. A comment was made that South Cambridgeshire District Council, with its smaller workforce, was being penalised for being more efficient and so a question was raised as to the modelling used. Councillor Edwards reminded Cabinet that the City of Cambridge was very different to rural South Cambridgeshire, with huge commercial estates to manage as well as dealings with University and College estates;
- the main driver behind the shared services proposal was to make the service more resilient and to provide better opportunities for staff currently within each of the individual Councils' legal teams.

Councillor Peter Topping presented the business case for the shared ICT service and the rationale behind the proposal was noted as being to:

- create shared applications systems and technical infrastructure to facilitate wider shared service delivery for all Council services;
- reduce overall costs;
- increase resilience and capacity and improve staff recruitment, retention and development.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- there were savings to be made from the technical changes as well as from staffing through amalgamating systems and being in a stronger position to negotiate with suppliers;
- a question was raised as to what provision had been put in place for ongoing maintenance and upkeep of legacy servers in order that information could still be accessed going forward. Councillor Edwards provided Cabinet with an assurance that technical considerations such as this would be managed as part of the transition.

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, presented the business case for the building control shared service which would enable each partner local authority to undertake its statutory duty in implementing and enforcing the building regulations in their respective areas, whilst providing a more sustainable and resilient business model for future service delivery and cost effectiveness. It would also enable the development of a five year business plan to generate additional income and create efficiencies which

would support enhanced competitiveness in a commercial market.

A question was raised in relation to the sovereignty guarantee in respect of the user experience, as it was suggested that the experience of users would change should officers not be retained on the sites of their existing local authorities. The point was made that Building Control Officers were often away from the office on-site in any case, but that there would be ways of ensuring they could be contacted through technology and remote or mobile working.

The Scrutiny and Overview Committee, at its meeting on 7 July 2015, endorsed the recommendations to Cabinet as set out in the Shared Services Overview report and in the shared Legal, Building Control and ICT services reports. The Committee also recommended:

- that performance of the Legal, Building Control and ICT shared services be monitored monthly at the Partnership Board for Shared Services and the Joint Committee, for the first six months of the shared services;
- that the Legal Practice Business Plan for 2016/17 be available for scrutiny by February 2016.

Cabinet **AGREED:**

- (1) That the approach to shared services outlined in the report be endorsed.
- (2) That approval be given to the establishment of a Joint Committee without delegated powers to oversee the delivery of shared services.
- (3) That the Leader be confirmed as the Council's representative to this Committee and a deputy be appointed.
- (4) That the proposed sovereignty guarantee in paragraph 36 of the report be approved, subject to the inclusion of the words 'and users' after 'residents' in the third sentence and the same sentence being amended to reflect that the commissioning or delivery of services together was specifically designed not to change how residents and users experienced services, unless there was an improvement in services.
- (5) That the approach to cost sharing principles and partnership agreement as outlined in the report be approved.
- (6) That the approval of the final partnership agreement be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
- (7) That, subject to the approval of the business cases for ICT, Legal and Building Control Shared Services, formal consultation commences with Trade Unions/Staff Council and affected staff on 24 July 2015, closing on 1 September 2015.
- (8) That the business cases for ICT, Legal and Building Control be approved and the Executive Director (Corporate Services) be delegated to make decisions and to take steps which are necessary, conducive or incidental to the establishment of the respective shared service in the business case.

- (9) That performance of the ICT, Legal and Building Control shared services be monitored monthly at the Partnership Board for Shared Services and the Joint Committee, for the first six months of the shared services.
- (10) That the Legal Practice Business Plan for 2016/17 be available for scrutiny by February 2016.

## 7. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Cabinet considered a report which proposed the establishment of a shared housing development service with Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council as the Greater Cambridge City Deal local authority partners.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, presented the report and set out the proposal to establish the Housing Development Agency as an operational model through which the City Deal partners' collective resources in terms of land, finance and staff skills could be applied to complement the market driven housing development process and smooth the peaks and troughs of market delivery. The shared service model was the option proposed at this stage, with a view to entering into a wholly partner owned local company model as soon as possible. It was noted that the Greater Cambridge City Deal Joint Assembly and Executive Board had endorsed this approach.

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, referred to the governance arrangements behind the Housing Development Agency, where it was noted that the Portfolio Holders for Housing at Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council would be appointed onto the governing body, together with the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee representing Cambridgeshire County Council. He highlighted that the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee would need to have powers delegated to him from the Committee in order that he could act on the governing body, which would not be necessary for the Portfolio Holders since they already had the delegated authority to take decisions.

Councillor Howell also questioned the number of posts that would make up the joint team, as referred to in the report, which he thought seemed excessive and was concerned that the Managing Director post had not been scheduled to be one of the first appointments. Alan Carter, Head of Strategic Housing at Cambridge City Council, reported that the size of the team would be demand-led, depending on how many schemes were being undertaken, but stated that a core team within the three partner Councils could be immediately shared when necessary. The point about the appointment of the Managing Director had been made at the meeting of the Greater Cambridge City Deal Executive Board where it was reported that this appointment should now be made earlier than originally anticipated.

Discussion ensued on risk management and questions were raised as to whether the document sufficiently assessed risk and mitigation, especially since there was no reference within it to the Local Plan. Councillor Edwards stated that the additional houses would need to be delivered in any case, irrespective of what happened to the Local Plan or whether the Housing Development Agency was established.

Cabinet **AGREED** to approve the establishment of a Housing Development Agency under shared governance with the City Deal local authority partners (Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council) and delegate authority to the Executive Director (Corporate Services) to make decisions

and to take steps which were necessary, conducive or incidental to the establishment of the shared housing development service in accordance with the business case.

## **8. BUSINESS HUB PROJECT BUSINESS CASE REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which updated Cabinet on work that had taken place to progress a joint Business Hub partnership between South Cambridgeshire District Council's Health and Environmental Services, Cambridgeshire County Council's Trading Standards and Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue.

Councillor Mick Martin, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, presented the report and likened the proposal to a 'one-stop-shop' for regulatory services business advice services from Trading Standards, Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue and South Cambridgeshire District Council to promote joint Primary Authority Agreements and associated commercial activities. He explained that the Business Hub would initially commence as a twelve month pilot.

Cabinet **NOTED** progress towards the creation of a multi-agency "Business Hub" on a trial basis for 12 months to create a start-up phase to draw together key business advice services from both Trading Standards, Cambridgeshire Fire Service and South Cambridgeshire District Council to promote joint Primary Authority Agreements and associated commercial activities.

## **9. NORTHSTOWE: S.106 HEADS OF TERMS AND CIVIC HUB**

Cabinet considered a report which set out the draft requirements for a Section 106 Agreement for the Northstowe Phase 2 Outline Planning Application.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation, presented the report and reminded Cabinet that this item provided Members with an opportunity to consider any corporate implications arising from the draft requirements for Northstowe Phase 2. He added that it was essential to ensure that development of Northstowe Phase 2 secured appropriate provision of services and infrastructure to meet its needs properly and to ensure that development was acceptable in planning terms. This included financial contributions towards the provision and maintenance of infrastructure, services and facilities.

Councillor Wotherspoon referred Members to Appendix 1 of the report which set out an indicative timeline for delivery of community resources and anticipated housing trajectory for Northstowe. He also presented Appendix 2 which listed proposed Section 106 items and triggers for phase 2 of the Northstowe development, which comprised of the following four categories:

- education;
- civic hub and community support;
- sport and open space;
- transport.

Referring to the Community Hub, Councillor Wotherspoon reported that by the time this building was designed there would be a substantial number of Northstowe residents. It was therefore proposed that the Section 106 agreement was written so that Northstowe residents, potentially through a future town council or a community trust, would be able to steer the design and specification of the actual building and set their own priorities.

It was noted that the Homes and Communities Agency's costings and assumptions for Northstowe Phase 2 had been tested and accepted by Her Majesty's Treasury as part of the Government's process for granting approval to its agencies to deliver particular projects. Through negotiation, the following position was recommended:

- various items would be provided as part of the site infrastructure and therefore not secured through Section 106 payments;
- clear identification of contingency items;
- £73 million funding towards the Section 106 package;
- a review of viability to assess whether the level of affordable housing may be increased, to take place part way through the build-out of Phase 2.

In respect of affordable housing, the District Council's policy requirement was for 40% subject to viability. The planning application stated 20% and this had been tested through the viability assessment. It had been agreed with the Homes and Communities Agency that the level of affordable housing should be reviewed in order to re-assess the viability and determine whether the level of affordable housing may be increased. It was proposed that such a review took place in 2019, if development had not commenced by this time, and also three years following implementation of the permission.

Discussion ensued and the following points were noted:

- it was suggested that the Homes and Communities Agency at a recent meeting of the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee had made a commitment regarding the area of the town park in the town centre that contradicted the combined area of 1.2 hectares as stated in the report. Councillor Wotherspoon indicated no recollection of this point at the meeting, but did confirm that a letter of intent had been received from the Homes and Communities Agency to bring forward the burial ground and provide a timetable;
- the £73 million would be indexed linked over the time period up to 2030 in accordance with standard practice;
- it was very positive that a review mechanism had been included with regard to affordable housing as part of negotiations;
- reference was made to a letter that had been received from the Homes and Communities Agency in respect of existing surface water flood risk to Oakington and the surrounding area. The letter stated that the solution to localised flooding relied upon collaborative working between the Homes and Communities Agency, South Cambridgeshire District Council, and the Environment Agency, along with members of the Oakington Parish Council Environment Sub-Group of the Village Plan Committee to scope, identify and plan a series of interventions to address the issue of flood risk. Councillor Edwards made the point that Oakington Parish Council was a key body that needed to be consulted as part of this collaborative working and not solely the Environment Sub-Group;
- in requesting that the future maintenance of flood attenuation ponds in Oakington be included in the Section 106 items list, it was noted that this could not occur as the ponds did not form part of the Phase 2 planning application. It was noted, however, that consideration could be given to maintaining the Dry Drayton Road ponds out of the £3 million allocated for the long term maintenance and maintenance of onsite Sustainable Urban Drainage systems;
- the overall total of the Section 106 items, including capital, revenue and contingencies, totalled £75,590,196, which was more than the £73 million that was proposed to be provided.



Cabinet **AGREED** to:

- (1) Endorse the draft requirements for a Section 106 Agreement for the Northstowe Phase 2 Outline Planning Application, which will be considered by the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee (NJDCC), including: the list of items and triggers; and draft outline specifications for the health centre and library with community use, and the community hub.
- (2) Delegate to the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation, in consultation with the Director of Planning and New Communities, the authority to make any minor changes to the draft requirements prior to inclusion in the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee report for the Phase 2 development.

## **10. RIGHT TO BUILD VANGUARD**

Consideration was given to a report which enabled Cabinet to consider the next steps for the Right to Build project.

Councillor Tim Wotherspoon, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation, presented the report which outlined progress on the Right to Build project following South Cambridgeshire District Council becoming a Vanguard Authority in September 2014 and having received £50,000 in grant funding.

A question was raised as to whether this project had been explored with the Homes and Communities Agency in respect of the Northstowe development. It was noted that discussions with the Agency on this issue were already taking place.

Cabinet **AGREED**:

- (1) To continue to take forward the Right to Build project.
- (2) To buy the registration module and continue to promote the scheme, to be developed and programmed alongside the re-procurement of the sub-regional housing register, and to the implementation of the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act.
- (3) To write a Supplementary Planning Document for the Right to Build, to sit alongside the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.
- (4) To further developing land and finance options, to be the subject of a report at a later date.

## **11. CORPORATE PLAN FORWARD LOOK AND STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER**

A report was considered which set out the refresh of the Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy, bringing together a revised profile of the district, a review of the corporate cycle and a review of the Corporate Plan.

Councillor Peter Topping, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, presented the report and commended the corporate cycle illustrated at Appendix F of the report. He recommended a development of a fuller review of the Council's evidence base in 2016, comprising the approach set out in paragraphs 22(i) to 22(iv) of the report and took this opportunity to thank Richard May, Policy and Performance Manager, for the excellent work he had done in respect of this report.

During discussion a suggestion was made to include reference to apprenticeships within the Corporate Plan, particularly in view of the fact that this had been identified as an objective within the Greater Cambridge City Deal. Councillor Topping agreed to pick this point up as part of the review but it was noted that apprenticeship schemes were already included as part of the Council's Organisational Development Strategy.

Cabinet:

- (1) **NOTED** the policy and financial context for the annual refresh of the Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy, as set out in the report and appendices.
- (2) **APPROVED** the Strategic Risk Register and Matrix, as set out in Appendices D and E of the report.
- (3) **AGREED** the Corporate Cycle for the development of the Corporate Plan 2016-2021, as set out in Appendix F of the report, and **APPROVED** the commencement of a fuller review of the evidence base in 2016, comprising the elements set out in paragraph 22 of the report.
- (4) **ENDORSED** the provisional priority areas to inform the development of the Corporate Plan 2016-2021, identified in paragraphs 24-26 of the report.

## 12. **POSITION STATEMENT: FINANCE, PERFORMANCE AND RISK (END OF YEAR REPORT)**

Consideration was given to a report which provided a position statement for 2014/15 on finance, performance and risk.

Councillor Simon Edwards, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Staffing, presented the financial elements of the report, which included an update on the provisional 2014/15 outturn position statement on the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and capital expenditure, together with requests for budget rollovers from 2014/15 to 2015/16.

Councillor Edwards highlighted a £1,196,000 favourable variance in the General Fund, which equated to 7.38%, and cited fees received as part of the increased number of planning applications submitted for solar farms as one of the main contributors.

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, reported that a number of recommendations had been approved at his Planning Portfolio Holder Meeting held earlier in the day to ensure that additional work could take place to progress with the Local Plan, following a resolution by Council on 4 June 2015. An additional £150,000 would be required to support this work. The Section 151 Officer advised that this additional required work constituted unavoidable expenditure that could be met from increased General Fund reserves as at 31 March 2015.

Councillor Peter Topping, Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Customer Services, presented the performance and risk elements of the report.

Councillor Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Housing, highlighted that the average monthly spend on Bed and Breakfast accommodation had reduced from £2,075 during 2013/14 to £919 for 2014/15 which was significantly lower than some neighbouring authorities. He also reported that the re-development of the Robson Court hostel site had been completed, having been opened earlier in the day.

Cabinet:

- (1) **NOTED** the Council's provisional financial outturn position, together with the overview of Corporate Plan 2014-2019 achievements and performance against key performance indicators set out in the report and Appendices A to E.
- (2) **APPROVED** the capital and revenue budget rollovers totalling £8,480,664, as listed in Appendix F, to be carried forward into the 2015-16 financial year and **NOTED** that the additional £150,000 required to meet the costs arising from additional work to progress with the Local Plan would be met from increased General Fund reserves as at 31 March 2015.

### 13. **ORCHARD PARK TASK & FINISH GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

A report was considered which set out the interim recommendations of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee's Task and Finish Group that had been established to review the lessons learnt from the Orchard Park development.

Councillor Lynda Harford, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group, presented the report. She outlined that the Working Group was set up on 3 July 2014 and the interim recommendations, as outlined in paragraph 16 of the report, had been drawn up following an analysis of the information gathered during a series of discussions and interviews that had been carried out. Councillor Harford explained that further work was being carried out by the Group, but it was hoped that the interim recommendations would provide useful information to support the Northstowe Joint Development Control Committee in its deliberations regarding Section 106 items and triggers, as well as planning conditions.

Cabinet **ENDORSED** the interim recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee's Task and Finish Group, as set out in paragraph 16 of the report, and **AGREED** that the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning and Transportation and the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group would determine an appropriate way forward for their implementation.

---

### Standing Items

---

### 14. **ISSUES ARISING FROM THE SCRUTINY AND OVERVIEW COMMITTEE**

There were no issues arising from the Scrutiny and Overview Committee, other than those recommendations already considered at this meeting.

### 15. **ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PARTNERSHIPS REVIEW COMMITTEE**

There were no issues arising from the Partnerships Review Committee.

### 16. **UPDATES FROM CABINET MEMBERS APPOINTED TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

There were no updates from Cabinet Members appointed to outside bodies.

**17. REPORTS FROM CABINET MEMBERS ATTENDING PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS**

Councillor Robert Turner, Portfolio Holder for Planning, reported that he had attended a meeting of Hardwick Parish Council to discuss the issue of speculative planning applications. He had been invited to a number of other Parish Council meetings on the same topic which he would also be attending.

**18. REPORTS FROM MEMBER CHAMPIONS**

There were no updates from Member Champions.

---

**The Meeting ended at 9.00 p.m.**

---