

HUNTINGDONSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the CABINET held in the CIVIC SUITE (LANCASTER/STIRLING ROOMS), PATHFINDER HOUSE, ST MARY'S STREET, HUNTINGDON, PE29 3TN on Tuesday, 16 April 2024

PRESENT: Councillor S J Conboy – Chair.

Councillors L Davenport-Ray, S W Ferguson,
B A Mickelburgh, B M Pitt, T D Sanderson, S L Taylor and
S Wakeford.

80 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19th March 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

81 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor T D Sanderson declared a registerable interest under Minute No 85 (8) and by virtue of his membership of Huntingdon Town Council. He left the room during the discussion on this item.

Councillor S Wakeford declared a registerable interest under Minute No 85 (8) and by virtue of him being a Ward Member for Huntingdon North. He left the room during the discussion on this item.

Councillor S L Taylor declared a registerable interest under Minute No 85 (4) and by virtue of her being a Member of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Fire Authority. She left the room during the discussion on this item.

Councillor B M Pitt declared a registerable interest under Minute Nos 85 (4) by virtue of his membership of St Neots Town Council. He left the room during the discussion on this item.

82 SUPPORTING RESIDENTS - DOMESTIC ABUSE POLICY

With the aid of a report prepared by the Council's Housing Needs & Resources Manager (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Cabinet received a report inviting consideration of those recommendations regarding the Council's Supporting Residents – Domestic Abuse Policy.

By way of background the Executive Councillor for Executive Councillor for Customer Services reported that Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) is committed to ensuring that all residents experiencing domestic abuse are responded to in an appropriate and sensitive manner and that staff act in a believing, non-judgemental way. This policy sets out the level of service that HDC aims to provide. At all times it is the organisation's intention to increase victim safety, housing security and hold perpetrators to account for their harm. It also aims to improve staff confidence in identifying and dealing with domestic

abuse and links to the internal looking Domestic Abuse Staff Support Policy which covers how the Council support staff who may be affected by domestic abuse. The staff policy has recently been adopted through the Employment Committee.

The Cabinet noted that for the purposes of this policy: (i) the statutory definition of abuse applies and incorporates behaviours of violence as well as other forms of abuse, including economic abuse and coercive control; and (ii) both policies have been developed following good practice from the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA), the leading specialist domestic abuse organisation supporting Councils and housing providers to improve their response to domestic abuse.

Members were pleased to observe that HDC already responds to residents experiencing domestic abuse in many types of situations. The most common of these is where a resident requires advice and assistance regarding their housing rights and options when wanting to leave an abusive relationship, although this is not the only type of situation. The Policy explains how HDC will treat all reports of domestic abuse with respect, sympathy and confidentiality and will listen to the needs and wishes of the victim in agreeing an appropriate course of action. It was noted that the safety and security of those experiencing domestic abuse will always be the paramount consideration.

Cabinet observed that the Policy also explains how HDC will ensure that residents are linked into specialist support providers where necessary and how HDC works with a range of other agencies to ensure that victims are fully supported. It was noted that this multi-agency network also extended to collaborative working to manage certain perpetrators and the risks that they may pose.

Members were informed that as HDC has joined the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) it is supported in improving the response to domestic abuse, through a membership model, accreditation framework and training packages. It was noted that the DAHA framework and model of response to domestic abuse is nationally recognised as best practice, through the Domestic Abuse Act Statutory Guidance 2022, and is endorsed by the Domestic Abuse Commissioner for England & Wales. It was noted that this Policy before Members follows the DAHA good practice model, and HDC will be working towards full DAHA accreditation in 2024.

Cabinet agreed that by embedding best practice and approving policies that demonstrates that HDC is demonstrating a commitment to supporting residents and staff in the best way possible.

Members attention was drawn to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel in particular it was noted that as a result of questions raised by (i) Councillor Bywater, that HDC had a good relationship with local housing providers and that many social landlords were also working towards the same DAHA accreditation as the Council; and (ii) Councillor Hunt, the Panel had heard that the team were working hard to meeting the accreditation requirements and were working with the assessor to ensure compliance. It was also observed that training would be rolled out for both staff and Councillors later in the year.

After careful consideration of the report the Chair Moved and Cabinet:

RESOLVED

To approve the Supporting Residents - Domestic Abuse Policy.

83 UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUNDING UPDATE

With the aid of a report prepared by the Regeneration and Housing Delivery Manager the Cabinet received an update (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) that provided details on the programme of activity funded through the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) and Rural England Prosperity Fund (REPF) in Huntingdonshire.

By way of background the Executive Councillor for Jobs, Economy, and Housing reported that the UKSPF and REPF supported the delivery of HDC priorities and in alignment with other external funding streams maximised the opportunities to deliver the best outcomes for residents, businesses, and district.

Cabinet observed that the UKSPF and REPF is a central pillar of the UK Government's Levelling Up agenda that will provide HDC with a total of £2.71 billion of new funding for local investment by March 2025. All areas of the UK received an allocation from the fund via a formula. The UKSPF fund enables areas to target funding where it is needed most; building pride in place, supporting high quality skills training, supporting pay, employment, and productivity growth, and achieving improved life chances, this it was noted is structured into three pillars: (1) Communities and Place, (2) Supporting Local Businesses, and (3) People and Skills.

Members noted that (A) Huntingdonshire had received an allocation of £1,878,645.43 UKSPF after a fixed 4% programme administration was removed, this 4% was shared equally between the Council and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA). In addition, a further £304,749.89 was set aside to support Cambridgeshire wide activity; and (B) REPF funding is administered through the CPCA with Huntingdonshire's allocation totalling £957,788.00, this is capital funding only. The REPF is different to the UKSPF allocation in that match funding is required via an intervention rate for each business or organisation in receipt of REPF.

Members attention was drawn to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel in particular it was noted that: following an enquiry from (i) Councillor Gardener on the progress and implementation of the Electrical Vehicle Charging Scheme, it was noted that the Panel had been informed that whilst there were updates on project deliveries within the Appendix to the report, the Electrical Vehicle Strategy was still in the implementation process but that progress would be reported back to the Panel in due course; and (ii) Councillor Jennings enquired how the team would be managing the success of projects where the measure was stated to improve perception. Following which the Panel had been assured that work was underway on how to better demonstrate and articulate project success and that this measure would be developed into a more tangible measure and that this would be further elaborated in a future report.

In conclusion after careful consideration of the report the Chair Moved and Cabinet:

RESOLVED

To note the progress on the projects within the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) and Rural England Prosperity Fund (REPF) programme that supported the delivery of the best outcomes for residents, businesses, and the District.

84 MARKET TOWNS PROGRAMME SPRING UPDATE

With the aid of a report prepared by the Regeneration and Housing Delivery Manager the Cabinet received an update (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) that provided details on the 2023/2024 Q4 update on the Market Towns Programme (MTP).

By way of background the Executive Councillor for Jobs, Economy, and Housing reported that the MTP is an ambitious programme of economic led interventions to renew and reshape our town centres and high streets in a way that promotes growth, improves experiences, and ensures sustainability in the future.

It was noted that the MTP is funded through a combination of external funding from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC), Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and National Highways.

As a result of discussions on the report Cabinet noted that (1) the Digital Information Screen project has now been extended to all Market Towns (Ramsey, St Ives, St Neots and Huntingdon); and (2) the Council has completed a procurement process and awarded a contract for delivery to the supplier Trueform. HDC are now working closely with Town Council partners and others including Huntingdon BID to plan the deployment of the Digital screens. This work will include confirming the information with partners that will be provided via the screens alongside the overall branding and messaging specific to each location.

Members attention was then drawn to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, in particular the response to (A) an enquiry from Councillor Pickering, it was noted that the planning application for the Priory Centre was primarily the same as the application presented during the public engagement events but had some amendments to reflect comments received during the engagement events. It was also noted that the Panel heard that the application had been submitted and a link to the application on the portal would be circulated once the application became live. Finally, it had been confirmed that the application allowed for a scope of budget scenarios depending on the funding available once the project was underway; and (B) a question from Councillor Cawley, it was noted that the Shop Fronts Grant Scheme was currently only available to shops within the four market towns due to restrictions within the funding streams, however alternatives were being investigated to allow a similar scheme to be developed for Key Service Areas within the district.

In conclusion after consideration of the report the Chair Moved and Cabinet:

RESOLVED

To note the progress within the Market Towns Programme.

85 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING ALLOCATION

With the aid of a report prepared by the Chief Planning Officer (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) the Cabinet received a report inviting consideration of those recommendations relating to infrastructure projects seeking funding in whole or in part from an amount of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies received to date.

By way of background the Executive Councillor for Planning Councillor T. Sanderson reported that Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of the district that helps to deliver across the priorities in the Council's Corporate Plan 2023 - 2028 specifically Creating a better Huntingdonshire for future generations by improved housing and forward-thinking economic growth e.g. influencing delivery of infrastructure including East West Rail, A428, A141 Strategic Outline Business Case and future Transport Strategies.

Cabinet noted that the latest funding round was launched on 27th November 2023 with a closing date of 22nd January 2024. Bids received within that round for CIL funding towards infrastructure projects have been assessed by officers to reach the recommendations within this report. The outcomes of this round do not preclude applicants from submitting future applications to future rounds, and they will be considered against the adopted criteria at the time of determination.

Cabinet was advised that a review of CIL governance is underway and anticipated to be presented to Cabinet in the summer of 2024. Subsequent to the adoption, a communication strategy will be developed, ensuring that all Partners, Towns/Parish Councils are aware of the new process.

The Executive Leader, Councillor S J Conboy then advised the Cabinet that the intention tonight was for a detailed discussion and vote on each individual recommendation instead of considering and voting on en-bloc the recommendation as this would ensure that that for complete transparency so that the applicants would be able to see that their application gets a fair hearing. In addition, to ensure openness and transparency during tonight's meeting where Members of the Cabinet have an interest in a particular recommendation they should consider if their continued presence is incompatible with the Council's code of conduct and if appropriate disclose that interests and withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of that particular recommendation.

Members attention was drawn to the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel in particular Councillor Corney regarding why so many applications had been unsuccessful in the funding round, the Panel were advised that applications need to demonstrate the need for growth within their community. It was observed that during previous funding rounds, the Parish Forum had provided the opportunity for preliminary discussions on applications and that work would be undertaken to ensure applicants were educated about the requirements for a successful application and that applicants, upon submitting their application, should receive a confirmation confirming the submission.

Councillor Harvey had enquired about the review of the CIL process which had been discussed at a previous meeting of the Panel and why funding was ongoing during that process. The Panel heard that the review was proving to be a lengthy process and having been appraised that several applications were ready for funding, it had been decided to progress with the current round.

In response to a question from Councillor Jennings about further delays to the foot and cycleways within Riverside Park, St Neots, the Panel heard that more detailed information would be sought and relayed back to the Panel. Whilst the Panel were reassured, following a question from Councillor Harvey, that funding could be offered subject to certain qualifications being met and that this applied to both smaller and larger projects.

It was noted that the determination of CIL requests as set out in the report had been considered in accordance with the Councils adopted governance procedures for CIL, as well as ensuring compliance with the fundamentals as set out in the established legislation. This is important to ensure a fair, transparent, and lawful process, which is robust to challenge and/or complaint. Officers have undertaken the assessments on this basis.

The Cabinet agreed that it is important to be able to demonstrate how a decision has been reached, with clear reasons, in order to uphold the integrity of the process, and ensure that the decision can be understood even if it is not agreed with as Members may reach alternative conclusions to those as recommended by this report, provided those reasons are clearly articulated and evidenced where possible.

Cabinet noted that project bids for £50,000.00 or less had been considered at a meeting on 21st March 2024, in accordance with delegated authority. Information on these bids were attached at Appendix 2 of the report, including the decisions reached.

The Cabinet then went on to review the detail on the bids submitted in response to the current round for over £50,000.00 CIL funding, which requires the approval of the Cabinet. The main points of the discussion on the recommendations may be summarised as follows.

1. **Hilton Cricket Pavilion works:** It was noted that the bid was for the Renovation of the cricket pavilion to include decoration, insulation, re-wiring, new central heating, replacement kitchen and toilets. However it was understood that (i) there was not enough supporting evidence with this application to show why this project was a local priority and what improvements this will make to the bookings for the hall, (ii) there was no evidence of research into how this project would improve the use of the pavilion, just an assumption it would, (iii) there was no evidence of community support for it beyond non-councillor members of the committee, (iv) overall given the limited local growth, lack of evidence for local support and the fact the majority of the works were maintenance did not make this project suitable for CIL Strategic funding.
2. **Sawtry Pavilion Works:** It was noted that this is a second application for this scheme. A previous application had awarded £80,000 towards the cost of an £800,000 a Pavilion Redevelopment scheme by Cabinet on 12th October 2022 (Minute 43 refers). However, this had been withdrawn due to the applicant finding a cheaper solution as outlined in this

application. The Cabinet understood that: (a). the works would give Sawtry more community space and increase the number of changing rooms and toilets, also making the space more accessible, (b) the need for more community space in Sawtry is recognised in the IDP and Sawtry Neighbourhood plan recognises a priority need for the premises to be expanded. , (c) funding has been secured towards this scheme under a S106 legal agreement associated with planning permission 20/01407/OUT. The development of the site has not yet commenced and until that happens and associated triggers within the agreement are reached, no obligations will be due to be paid. The Cabinet agreed that the high level of growth in Sawtry and amount of match funding along with the fact that CIL funding help to bring forward early delivery of this infrastructure need whilst potential future S106 receipts could repay the investment, the project is considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round. It was also agreed that if approved this recommendation was subject to: 1) funding being repaid upon the receipt of the S106 funds from application 20/01407/OUT and as it was not clear that the funds are going to the Parish, Cabinet agreed that this would need to be clarified, 2) confirmation that the works are permissible under the Elizabeth II Trust, 3) clarity on funding amount, the cost of project ex VAT (which can be reclaimed) is slightly less than their contribution and the £66k they are applying for and if the figure is lower than the Strategic CIL then the amount would be reduced accordingly.

3. **The Guardroom Community Hub, Bury (the Hub):** Cabinet noted that (i) the full community facility is not a priority in the Neighbourhood Plan, (ii) the building is not yet owned by the Parish, (iii) the project does not have Planning Permission, (iv) applications have not been made for other funding, apart from Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), (v) this project had not mentioned in Parish comments on recent Planning Applications until this year, or in S106 discussions, (vi) it would appear this site would also be used by commercial operators, developers and may have a museum but this is unclear, (vii) whilst resident feedback about the use of the outside with community gardens it had not been not reflected in the submission, (viii) residents seemed to be concerned that footfall would be low, and as this facility would be in addition to the existing village hall and that there was no evidence to clarify this position, (ix) there is no clear evidence of current village hall footfall, prospective users, and any income from this: and (x) given the high cost of this project with high level of funding ask and lack of evidence of the need or sustainability of the building, the project was not seen to be suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
4. **St Neots Community Fire Station Modernisation and Extension Project:** Cabinet observed that (i) there was insufficient evidence of links to growth and the need for a bigger gym and community space, (ii) the quote provided excludes items like furniture, IT, gym equipment and based upon drawings no planning permission has been agreed and therefore may change. Therefore, the total cost may differ, especially as this is the pre-tender cost. In addition, there was not enough evidence of this being a priority for the Fire Service within the District given the minor modifications proposed for the works, (iii) no support had been sought from the Town Council or other funding sources, (iv) there was a lack of evidence that this has links to community use beyond there being a

- Community Officer based there. Evidence supplied only confirmed its use for the Fire Service and there was analysis of the potential impact on community space availability currently in St. Neots; and (v) given the reasonably high level of CIL ask, the lack of supporting evidence of need and unclear cost of the project due to conflicting figures given, the project was not considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
5. **Sports Provision, Abbey College, Ramsey:** Cabinet agreed that: (i) there was a lack of evidence of links to growth and the priority need for this project, (ii) no evidence on support for this project from CCC. Although this is an Academy, CCC as the Education Authority should be consulted on it., where it sits in their priorities and capital programme and/or how this would address new school place needs from growth; (iii) there was no evidence of support from One Leisure (OL) Ramsey and no evidence of the need for this beyond school wanting, which would appear to take income potentially away from OL, (iv) the project is only at draft estimate stage with no evidence of further funding, (v) no indication of support from Ramsey or Bury T/PC Councils for this project, (vi) no sign details of the full suite of works for this site and why this one has been applied for, and (v) no plans to show works or business plan had been submitted. Finally, the Cabinet was concerned that Given the high percentage of CIL ask at 98%, the lack of any match funding from the Town Council or other funding available, including the Local Education Authority or the Academy Trust, the lack of evidence to new growth and the lack of supporting evidence for the proposed scheme, the project is not considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
 6. **Folksworth Multi Use Games Area (MUGA)** the Cabinet noted that (i) links to growth had not been evidenced, (ii) the project had not been listed in the IDP or infrastructure to support growth, and (iii) no other funding sources had been applied for. In addition, considering the high percentage of CIL ask at 100% and the lack of any match funding as well as the lack of evidence to new growth, makes this project not considered to be suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
 7. **Workshop with storage for Warboys New Parish Centre** The Cabinet observed (i) a lack of evidence for links to the need for a new workshop and growth, (ii) that the workshop is not in the IDP or infrastructure needed to support the growth in the area, (iii) that the CIL ask is for 100% with no other funding resourced from elsewhere, and (iv) that this is a separate project to the Village Hall project. Finally given the above-mentioned together with the lack of any match funding, the lack of previous maintenance planning for the existing facility or medium-long term plan sink funding as well as the lack of evidence to new growth for this type of infrastructure, the project was not viewed as suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
 8. **King George V Pavilion works, Huntingdon** The Cabinet understood that (i) an application had been submitted before in regard to this in 2021 for CIL funding but it had not been supported at Cabinet, (ii) another application scaled down from the first had then been submitted in early 2023 which did not include, as per the first application, the indoor cricket nets or an indoor facility to all of an 8-a-side cricket pitch for training and

tournaments, which would also cater for wheelchair cricket as the whole facility would be accessible. This application had also been declined by Cabinet,(iii) the latest application has reduced the application further to a single storey building with the previous additional indoor sports facility excluded; (iv) there was a lack of evidence of the need for this and any links to growth, (v) there was evidence of community support for this as an infrastructure priority, (vi) no links had been provided to infrastructure priority in Neighbourhood Plan, (vii) no evidence had been provided of both the current usage and improved usage, (viii) the state of repair of the existing building indicates it has not been fully maintained, (ix) it is not clear if there has been a survey into the need for asbestos removal before any demolition. No evidence regarding the full project planning and financing, (x) no other funding sources have been applied for, especially sports and/or community funds. Therefore, given the reasonably high level of CIL ask, the lack of clarity over other funding available, the lack of supporting evidence of need particularly the exclusion of provision of additional indoor sports facilities, the project was not considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.

9. **Extension to the footpath, Colne** the Cabinet noted the (i) lack of evidence that this is related to growth, (ii) project was not in IDP or linked to supporting new growth, (iii) questions over the works being on private property, (iv) high level of CIL ask and lack of funding from other sources, (v) lack of evidence for community support. Therefore, given the high percentage of CIL, the lack of evidence to new growth and concerns of the deliverability and cost of the scheme, the project was not considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding at this time, based on the submission as part of this round.
10. **Community Centre Extension, Ramsey** the Cabinet observed that (i) match funding was in place and number of supporting applications made, (ii) community involvement had evidenced (iii) there was strong links to growth and evidence of need for the infrastructure, and (iv) there were good levels of growth locally. Accordingly given the level of growth in Ramsey, the (potential) amount of match funding, the evidence of community engagement and need for the additional infrastructure, the project is considered suitable for CIL Strategic funding. In light of the need to await decisions on the match funding applications to support the application for the CIL funding, it was agreed that if approved, this would be for 12 months to enable the funding applications to be fully considered.

The discussion concluded after detailed consideration of the report the Chair Moved and Cabinet:

Noted the updates on delivery in relation to the projects previously allocated or in receipt of CIL funding commitments (Appendix 1 as appended to the report refers).

- A. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.2 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for Hilton Pavilion.
- B. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.3 to of the report **APPROVE** funding for Sawtry Pavilion.
- C. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.4 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for The Guardroom community hub, Bury.

- D. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.5 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for St Neots Community Fire Station Modernisation and Extension Project.
- E. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.6 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for Sports Provision, Abbey College, Ramsey.
- F. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.7 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for Folks worth Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).
- G. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.8 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for a new workshop with storage for War boys New Parish Centre.
- H. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.9 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for King George V Pavilion works, Huntingdon.
- I. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.10 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for an extension to a footpath in Colne.
- J. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.11 of the report to **APPROVE** funding for a Community Centre Extension, Ramsey; and
- K. Agreed officer recommendations at Paragraph 4.12 of the report to **DECLINE** funding for MAGPAS internal re-fit and purchase of an aviation tank.

86 LGA GOVERNANCE PEER CHALLENGE FEEDBACK REPORT

With the aid of a report prepared by the Chief Executive Members (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book) Members were reminded that HDC had invited the Local Government Association (LGA) to undertake an Audit Peer Challenge in March 2023.

By way of background the Executive Councillor for Customer Services reported that the Peers had made a number of recommendations during the review and an Action Plan had been developed to address these points.

It was noted that there is an expectation the LGA peer review team will return to HDC so as to assess progress on recommendations within six months. Following the appointment of the new Chief Executive and growing national interest in local government governance, audit and risk, the Council had invited the Peer Review team to return to assess progress and provide independent advice on questions posed by the Corporate Government Committee and to consider any new recommendations that should be implemented.

The Peer team had (1) returned on the 28th of February 2024, having reviewed a number of documents prior to their arrival and whilst on site, they had gathered more information from twelve meetings; during which they met with twenty-seven people, which included a range of elected Members and Officers, and (2) made five recommendations; the first concentrating on progress of the initial seventeen recommendations from the March 2023 visit, and the remaining four were new, having regard to wider corporate governance aspects.

Members noted that (a) there is a requirement to publish the LGA Governance Peer Challenge report within 12 weeks of receipt and HDC would do this in any

event to promote transparency and good practice may be found at Appendix 1 and the recommendations as set out within pages 6 and 7 of the report (a copy of which is appended in the Minute Book), and (b) the report will be presented to the Corporate Governance Committee on 18th April 2024 and thereafter will oversee the progress against all recommendations. The report will also be presented to Council on 22nd May 2024.

It was noted that the peer team provided helpful insight and suggestions which has enabled officers to reinvigorate progress against the remaining 8 outstanding recommendations. As detailed in Appendix 2 provided updates against those recommendations and also referenced the new recommendations.

Cabinet was informed that one of the main issues raised by the peer team related to the Council's internal capacity to deliver, particularly around risk and internal audit.

Members were pleased to note that the s.151 Officer (i) has identified where additional capacity can be used to support the risk management function and will be recruiting temporary support for an initial period of 9 months. Furthermore, as the annual audit plan is finalised, additional support will be obtained from Binder Djker Otte (BDO), who have also been commissioned to undertake the External Quality Assessment; (ii) is also progressing capacity issues within the procurement function of the Council. Whilst this had not been specifically referenced within any recommendations by the peer team, it was noted that the issue was raised by the Corporate Governance Committee. The Cabinet agreed that contract management and procurement can impact on wider governance of the Council, and it was recognised that the progress being made demonstrates the commitment to ensuring good practice and prioritisation of functions.

After consideration of the report the Chair Moved and Cabinet:

RESOLVED

- a) to receive the LGA Governance Peer Challenge report, Appendix 1, and note the recommendations; and
- b) to note Appendix 2, that provided an update on progress against all the proposed recommendations.

87 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

that the press and public be excluded from the meeting because the business to be transacted contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

88 MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY CONTRACT PROCUREMENT

The Cabinet gave consideration to an exempt report (a copy of which is appended in the Annex to the Minute Book) which provided an update to Cabinet on the progress made to date with the procurement of the new MRF contract.

Having received an update from the Executive Councillor for Executive District Councillor for Leisure, Waste and Street Scene who responded to a number of questions raised and in noting the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth), the Cabinet

RESOLVED

to approve the recommendations as contained within the exempt report now submitted.

89 CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT (CPE) - AGENCY AGREEMENT

The Cabinet gave consideration to an exempt report (a copy of which is appended in the Annex to the Minute Book) which provided an update to Cabinet on the Civil Parking Enforcement – Agency Agreement Report.

Having received an update from the Executive Councillor for Executive District Councillor for Leisure, Waste and Street Scene who responded to a number of questions raised and in noting the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel (Performance and Growth), the Cabinet

RESOLVED

to agree the recommendations as contained within the exempt report now submitted.

Chair