

SCHEDULE OF ITEMS RECOMMENDED FROM COMMITTEES AND OTHER MEMBER BODIES

Committee: Council

Date: 22 October 2020

Author: Democratic Services Manager

[V90]

Member Body	Report No.
<p>1. FINANCE AND ASSETS COMMITTEE – 23 JULY 2020</p> <p><u>Treasury Operations Annual Performance Review</u></p> <p>The Committee considered a report which summarised the Council's Treasury operations during 2019/20.</p> <p>In the absence of the Finance Manager, the Senior Accountant presented the report, stating that cash investments totalled £10,877 million as at 31st March 2020, an increase of £4,686 million on the previous year.</p> <p>The outstanding value of the Council's loan to ECTC was £4.22 million at the 31st March 2020.</p> <p>Interest received during the financial year was £332,949, which was £34,949 above the budget of £298,000. This figure was made up of £97,360 from investment in money markets and other short, fixed term investments and £235,589 from the loan to ECTC.</p> <p>Referring to the final sentence on page 4 of the Review document, a Member said that it should read 'The loan to East Cambridgeshire Trading Company is due to be repaid on or before 31st March 2021.' They believed there should be a further note added to say that at the time this report was written, the Company was due to pay the loan back, but had since informed the Council it would be unable to make the repayment on the due date.</p> <p>The Member asked if the report would be changed to reflect that, and was advised it would be taken into account. Whereupon,</p>	<p>V41 (attached at Appendix A)</p>

<p>It was resolved:</p> <p>To note the contents of this report on the Council's Treasury operations during 2019/20, including the prudential and treasury indicators as set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report; and</p> <p>It was further resolved:</p> <p>To recommend to Full Council approval of the report.</p> <p>2. LICENSING COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2020</p> <p><u>Licensing Act 2003 Licensing Authority Statement of Licensing Policy – Five Year Revision</u></p> <p>The Committee considered a report that sought approval of the revised version of the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy for recommendation for approval by Council.</p> <p>The Senior Licensing Officer reminded the Committee that it had agreed to put the draft Statement out to public consultation, at its meeting on 24th June 2020. Subsequently, two formal replies to the consultation had been received. Table 1 in the report set out the changes requested by the replies. One related to updating the LAPE website information and the other sought clarification over when free advice ended. These changes were considered by officers and Table 2 set out the suggested amendments to the Statement. The first suggestion was to change the web address where information could be found.</p> <p>The second was to amend the wording in paragraph 1.99 of the Statement to clarify matters. These changes had been incorporated in the revised Statement on page 18. With regard to the advice that could be offered, it had never been the intention to turn people away but to introduce a charging practice similar to that of other professional bodies. The amended wording would clear up any possible misunderstandings.</p> <p>In response to the Committee's questions and queries, the Senior Licensing Officer explained that 'community premises' was a phrase taken from the relevant legislation and such premises could apply to have the mandatory condition for a designated supervisor to be cancelled. This only applied to premises designated as 'community premises'.</p>	<p>V57 (attached at Appendix B)</p>
---	--

<p>'Other persons' was also defined in the Regulations but did not include local authority officers. Certain persons could make objections on some types of applications but objections to other applications were limited to responsible authorities.</p> <p>The County Council, as a responsible authority, received copies of new licence applications so they could assess them. The Public Health Directorate did not provide information to the Licensing department but if there were Police concerns then that information could be brought in. The Licensing department had never applied for that information but they should not be any issues obtaining it. The Environmental Services manager had close liaison with those authorities so might be able to get that information and distribute it to Members if they wished. It was expected that there would be no charge for this.</p> <p>Although there had only been two responses to the consultation, this was not a concern, because the changes to the Policy had been very minimal. The previous consultation had only elicited one response.</p> <p>It was resolved TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) That the draft Statement of Licensing Policy, including the amendments shown as tracked changes in Appendix 2 in their entirety, be approved; (ii) That the approved Statement of Licensing Policy be recommended for adoption by full Council to come into effect on 7 January 2021. 	
<p>3. FINANCE AND ASSETS COMMITTEE – 24 SEPTEMBER 2020</p> <p><u>Corporate Risk Management – Policy and Update</u></p> <p>The Committee considered a report which sought approval of the updated Risk Management Policy and to provide Members with a copy of the latest Corporate Risk Register and framework.</p> <p>Ms Ashley-Caunt reminded Members that updates on the Corporate Risk Register were provided on a six monthly basis, and the Committee had last received an update in February 2020. The updates to the Register were facilitated by Internal Audit but remained the responsibility of senior management. The Corporate Risk Register had been</p>	<p>V63(attached at Appendix C)</p>

<p>updated to reflect the latest risks for the Council, including those posed by the Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>It had been three years since the policy had been adopted and a review had therefore been undertaken by senior management, with guidance from Internal Audit to ensure that it remained fit for purpose.</p> <p>A Member asked when formal management training had last been carried out. Ms Ashley-Caunt said she would have to check this and would confirm with Members.</p> <p>Another Member believed the document was a really good blend in that it was inclusive in capturing risks but also struck a good balance. This was echoed by a further Member who thought it was a very powerful document; it highlighted the risks and mitigated them. In particular, the score and RAG for Risk No. A4 (Homelessness in the District) was coded green and they considered that this was due to the fantastic work carried out by the Council; it was a reflection of where the Council found itself.</p> <p>A Member said they could not find risk appetite in the Policy and believed that a definition should be included. The Policy was too two dimensional and officers were being asked to manage a high level of risk.</p> <p>A Member contended that a number of the scores should be red rather than green, and with reference to A4, queried why the term 'genuine' affordable housing had been used. There was a cumulative effect with one of the Trading Companies posing a financial risk. They felt that there was a flaw in the way that the Register had been put together and this needed to be addressed.</p> <p>Another Member made the point that with the pandemic likely to last another six months, people were being encouraged to work from home. As Council staff were already doing so, there must surely be an additional risk from them using their own equipment, and there did not seem to be a specific risk description to address this.</p> <p>With regard to B3 (Failure to plan for and accommodate the impact of Brexit), a Member said they had been told by senior people in the equine industry that there was a quite detailed plan for post-December.</p> <p>A further Member considered B1 (Inability to balance the Council's budget) to be understated and they could not see</p>	
--	--

<p>how it was under control. The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) said there was a high risk and they queried why it had been coded amber. The Finance Manager replied that there was a balanced budget for 2021/22 and there was time to find savings for 2022/23.</p> <p>The Member continued, highlighting their concerns regarding Risks C2, C4, C6 and D8 and said they would be interested to know what was being done to bring them more into the green score. Ms Ashley-Caunt said the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) was an area of concern; she had an action to check progress and would report back to the Committee. With regard to contracts, she wanted consistent advice, but there was not a fundamental concern about contracts.</p> <p>In connection with affordable housing, a Member made the point that it was governed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Whilst the Council would like to see 30 or 40% deliverability, viability had to be a consideration. It was not just affordable housing that was struggling to be built, but also private housing.</p> <p>A Member responded, saying that the Policy was 30% affordable housing in Ely and 40% in the south of the District. This was not being delivered and there needed to be work to mitigate this. The Register had to be honest and actions must be taken to do this.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To recommend to Full Council that the updated Risk Management Policy, as set out in Appendix 3 of the report, be approved. (ii) That the Corporate Risk Register, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, be noted. 	
--	--