



# East Cambridgeshire District Council

## **Minutes of a Meeting of the Finance & Assets Committee** Held at The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE at 4:30pm on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### **Present:**

Cllr Anna Bailey (substitute for Cllr James Lay)  
Cllr Christine Colbert (substitute for Cllr Robert Pitt)  
Cllr Lorna Dupré  
Cllr Mark Goldsack  
Cllr Martin Goodearl (substitute for Cllr Ian Bovingdon)  
Cllr Bill Hunt  
Cllr Mark Inskip (substitute for Cllr Caroline Shepherd)  
Cllr David Miller  
Cllr Alan Sharp (Chairman)  
Cllr John Trapp  
Cllr Alison Whelan

### **Officers:**

Sally Bonnett – Director Community  
Maggie Camp – Director Legal Services & Monitoring Officer  
Ian Smith – Director Finance  
Isabel Edgar – Director Operations  
Spencer Clark – Open Spaces & Facilities Manager  
Kieran Carr – Economic Development Officer  
Nicole Pema – HR Manager  
Tracy Couper – Democratic Services Manager & Deputy Monitoring Officer  
Jane Webb – Senior Democratic Services Officer

### **In attendance:**

Angela Briggs – Community Infrastructure Manager

6 members of the public

## **63. Public Question Time**

A statement was read out by Councillor Andrew Prevett Chairman of Stretham Parish Council, a copy of which is attached at Appendix 1 to these Minutes, relating to the Growth and Infrastructure Fund (GIF) application for The Link Community and GP Surgery Facilities by Stretham and Wilburton CLT detailed in Agenda item 11.

In connection with the statement, Councillor Prevett emphasised that no match funding for the project had been considered or committed by the Parish Council.

Councillor Prevett questioned the extent of local support for the project, as he had been unable to see the letters of support referred to in the application and no consultation had been carried out of residents of the village. Councillor Prevett stated that the Parish Council supported the provision of a GP Surgery for the village, as required by the S106 obligation on Stretham and Wilburton CLT, but the addition of other community facilities had confused the matter.

The Director Community responded by apologising for the typographical error in the Minutes of the GIF Scoring Panel at Agenda item 11 and clarifying that the £340K match funding for the application was from Stretham and Wilburton CLT and not the Parish Council. This was clearly stated in the application and the Panel had scored the application on that basis.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Prevett for his statement on behalf of the Parish Council and stated that Members would take this into consideration in conjunction with Agenda item 11.

#### **64. Apologies and substitutions**

Apologies for absence and substitutions were received as follows:

Councillor Ian Bovingdon - Cllr Martin Goodearl substituting.  
Councillor James Lay – Cllr Anna Bailey substituting.  
Councillor Robert Pitt – Cllr Christine Colbert substituting.  
Councillor Caroline Shepherd - Cllr Mark Inskip substituting.

#### **65. Declarations of interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

#### **66. Minutes**

The Committee received the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2023.

A question relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from a Member and this, along with the answer provided by officers, was set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the Minutes of the Finance & Assets Committee meeting held on 23 November 2023 be confirmed as a correct record and be signed by the Chairman.

#### **67. Chairman's announcements**

The Chair acknowledged the invaluable contribution made by Emma Grima serving as Lead Officer to the F&A Committee for the past ten years and thanked her for all her hard work. He also welcomed the Director Community,

Sally Bonnett, as the new Lead Officer for the Committee and expressed his assurance that she would do an equally good job.

**68. 2024/25 Annual Treasury Management Strategy, Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy**

The Committee considered a report, Y114 previously circulated, that detailed the 2024/25 Treasury Management Strategy, the Annual Investment Strategy and the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement.

A question relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from a Member and this, along with the answer provided by officers, was set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

*Councillor Inskip arrived at 4.47pm*

Members commended the fact that the Council had no external borrowing.

**It was resolved unanimously to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL:**

**That approval be given to:**

- 1. The 2024/25 Treasury Management Strategy**
- 2. The Annual Investment Strategy**
- 3. The Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement**
- 4. The Prudential and Treasury Indicators**

It was further resolved:

That the Director Finance be authorised to amend the Strategy between Committee and Council to build into it any changes required to reflect the decision made at this Committee with regard to the Bereavement Centre project.

**69. Revenue Budget, Capital Strategy and Council Tax 2024/25**

The Committee considered a report, Y115 previously circulated, detailing the Council's proposed revenue budget, capital strategy, and the required level of Council Tax in 2024/25.

The recommendations in the report were moved by Councillor Bailey and seconded by Councillor Goodearl.

In introducing the paper, the Director Finance highlighted a number of areas where further information had come to light since this report was published or would become available before Council. He stated that he would include these in the Council report.

Speaking in support of the Budget, Councillor Bailey highlighted the announcement, the previous day, that Government would be providing

additional Rural Services Delivery Grant and thanked the Director of Finance for his efforts, as part of a LGA Special Interest Group, in lobbying Central Government for additional grant to assist with the costs of Internal Drainage Boards. She referred to the fact that the Council was proposing a Council Tax freeze for its residents for an 11th year and still had a balanced Budget for the next 2 years. In addition, there were no built-in efficiency targets and the Council budgeted for a full staffing establishment. However, the Council had a track record for prudence and making savings.

Councillor Bailey also drew Members attention to the following items built into the Budget:

- Environmental improvements
- New refuse and street cleansing fleet
- Additional Waste Disposal costs
- Purchase of new wheeled bins as consequence of Government Waste Strategy
- Drafting of new Local Plan
- Upgrade to Council website

Another Member highlighted the measures taken to make East Cambridgeshire a welcoming place to visitors such as:

- Free parking
- Free moorings
- Excellent public conveniences
- inviting and varied markets

**It was resolved to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL:**

**That approval be given to:**

- 1. The draft revenue budget for 2024/25 and MTFs for 2025/26 to 2027/28, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.**
- 2. The Statement of Reserves, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report.**
- 3. The Capital Strategy and financing, as set out in Appendix 3 of the report.**
- 4. The 2024/25 Fees and Charges, as set out in Appendix 4 of the report.**
- 5. The extension of the Retail, Hospitality and Leisure 75% Business Rate relief (and potentially other reliefs) (which will be fully funded by the Government through Section 31) as detailed in Sections 6.5 to 6.7 of the submitted report.**

It was further resolved:

That the Director, Finance, in consultation with the Chairman of the Finance & Assets Committee be authorised to adjust the use of the Surplus Savings Reserve in 2024/25 and future years (as available), to ensure that the net budget and Council Tax as detailed in 2.1 of the report remain unchanged (in the event of changes arising, principally in relation to the decision of Committee to recommend / not recommend the construction of the Crematorium to Full Council, the Final Local Government Settlement and / or the NNDR1 return). These adjustments to be made in advance of the report being presented to full Council on the 20 February 2024.

## **70. Finance Report**

The Committee received a report, Y116 previously circulated, containing budget information for services within the remit of Finance & Assets Committee and then, as part of its corporate remit, for the Council as a whole.

A Member queried the reasons for the Business Rate relief for The Grange and the Director Finance agreed to provide a written response to Members of the Committee. The Member also commented that the Council should take measures to maximise any benefits resulting from the completion of solar farms within the District.

It was resolved:

That the following be noted:

- That the Finance & Assets Committee has a projected yearend underspend of £1,187,500 when compared to its approved revenue budget of £6,030,783.
- That overall the Council has a projected yearend underspend of £ 852,000 when compared to its approved revenue budget of £16,856,960.
- That the overall position for the Council on Capital is a projected outturn of £4,838,121, which is an underspend of £1,862,666 when compared to the revised budget.

## **71. Assets Update**

The Committee considered a report, Y117 previously circulated, giving an update on Council owned assets.

The Open Spaces and Facilities Manager informed Members that the new nursery at 72/74 Market Street, Cathedral View Childcare, had opened and commended the quality of the facilities provided largely at their own cost. In addition, the Changing Pod at Soham had been completed and was ready to use.

Two questions relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from a Member and these, along with answers provided by officers, were set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

*Councillor Dupre arrived at 5.03pm*

The Assets Champion, Councillor Hunt, and another Member commended these two excellent community facilities and commented that it demonstrated that the Council provided for residents of all ages.

It was resolved:

That the update on Council-owned assets and the Expenditure Tracking Sheet at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be noted.

## **72. UK Shared Prosperity and Rural England Prosperity Business Grant Scheme**

The Committee considered a report, Y118 previously circulated, detailing the Council's proposed UK Shared Prosperity and Rural England Prosperity Business Grant Scheme.

Kieran Carr, Economic Development Officer, reported that a total of £310,511 would be available via the two funding streams and the Economic Development Team had experience of successfully delivering similar grant schemes in the past.

In response to a question by a Member, it was confirmed that the grant funding would be awarded on a 'first come first served' basis. The Member then queried if an alternative approach could be considered, e.g. having a window of 2 weeks after the opening date before considering applications for funding. It was reported that there were advantages to a 'first come first served' approach to prevent delays in awarding funding and enabling projects to be progressed quickly. In addition, the fund would not be opened until 1 April, allowing businesses to prepare their applications in advance of this date. However, this could be discussed further by the relevant officers and the Chair of the Committee outside of this meeting. Members suggested that there should be extensive advance publicising of the Scheme.

It was resolved unanimously:

1. That the proposed grant funding arrangements for the scheme as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report be approved.
2. That the fund open on Monday 1 April 2024 and close no later than Friday 27 September 2024 at 23:59hrs.
3. That if the fund is fully utilised before the closing date, the Council reserves the right to close the fund to pending or new applications.

### **73. Growth and Infrastructure Fund Scoring Panel Recommendations**

The Committee considered a report, Y119 previously circulated, detailing the recommendations from the Growth and Infrastructure Fund Scoring Panel.

The Director Community again highlighted the typographical error relating to the Stretham Wilburton CLT Link project application on page 3 of Appendix 1, referred to under Public Question Time, and reiterated that the £340K match funding for the application was from Stretham and Wilburton CLT and not the Parish Council. This was clearly stated in the application and the Panel had scored the application on that basis. The Director Community explained that there had been 18 letters of support referred to in the application and listed the local bodies that these had been received from. Those letters of support had been provided to the GIF Scoring Panel.

During detailed discussion of the Stretham Wilburton CLT Link project application, questions and comments were raised by Members as follows:

A Member queried the level of 'due diligence' undertaken on the application in the light of the comments made at this meeting and the fact that their research could not find any filed accounts for the CLT since 2021. The Director Community confirmed that, as detailed in paragraph 4.4 of the report, the following conditions would need to be met before the payment of any funding awarded -

Evidence being provided that:

- All necessary permissions are in place
- Match funding is secured
- Funding is only utilised for Capital elements
- Payment be made on receipt of invoices

Some Members questioned the validity of the letters of support on the grounds that they may have been written under a misconception about the project being solely for GP facilities and not the other community facilities proposed. Those Members expressed the view that this should be confirmed before the application was awarded funding. They also referred to the requirement for the CLT to provide a medical facility under the S106 Agreement.

However, other Members commented that it was clearly stated in The Link project application that it was about delivering both a GP surgery and other community facilities and that the letters of support recognised this. The application had been scored highly by the GIF Scoring Panel on that basis and no funding would be released until 'due diligence' had been undertaken as detailed in paragraph 4.4 of the report. A number of Members also highlighted the pressures on GP services in Stretham itself and surrounding villages in the North of the District. Therefore, those Members expressed strong support for the project due to the community benefits it would bring.

At this point Councillor Whelan declared an Interest as a representative on the Patient Participation Group for Mereside Medical. In addition, Councillor Goldsack declared an Interest relating to the Soham Town Rangers funding application.

Some Members requested that a separate vote be taken on the Stretham and Wilburton CLT Link project and on the other recommendations in the report. This was acceded to by the Chair.

It was resolved:

1. To increase the Growth and Infrastructure Funds from the allocated £707,182.62 to up to £1,138,066.
2. To approve funding of the following projects:
  - a) (by a majority) £700,000 to Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust, The Link project;
  - b) £423,107.60 to Witchford Parish Council, Ely Road Cycleway project;
  - c) £14,958.40 to Wilburton Parish Council, Wilburton Recreation project.
3. To delegate authority to the Director Community, in consultation with the Chair of Finance & Assets Committee, to complete funding agreements for the funding and projects identified in 2. a) - c) which will contain the conditions set out in paragraph 4.4 of the submitted report.

#### **74. Community Infrastructure Funding Requests**

The Committee considered a report, Y120 previously circulated, detailing two funding requests for the allocation of up to £510,000 to the Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust The Link project and up to £125,000 to the Soham Village College (Staploe Education Trust) Soham Village College 3G Pitch project from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

A number of Members reiterated the concerns they had expressed in the preceding item regarding the Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust Link project.

In response to a question by a Member, the Director Community confirmed that the funding for both applications would be from the District CIL allocations pot.

It was resolved:

That approval be given to:

- a) (by a majority) The allocation of up to £510,000 to the Stretham and Wilburton Community Land Trust The Link project.
- b) The allocation of up to £125,000 to the Soham Village College (Staploe Education Trust) Soham Village College 3G Pitch project, subject to the



Football Foundation awarding the project the remaining funding required by July 2024.

#### **75. Service Delivery Plans 2023/24 – Six Month Update**

Further to discussions at the meeting held on 23 November 2023 (Minute 52 refers) the Committee considered a report, Y121 previously circulated, detailing an update on the Service Delivery Plans 2023/24.

It was resolved:

That the Service Delivery Plans 2023/24 six-month update report be noted.

#### **76. Internal Drainage Boards Update**

The Committee considered a report, Y122 previously circulated, proposing the appointment of representatives to vacant positions on Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs).

The Democratic Services Manager reminded Members that at the meeting of the Committee held on 3 July 2023, the Committee requested that former District Councillors be invited to continue in their roles where there were still vacancies on IDBs. Former Councillor David Chaplin had been approached and responded on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2023 confirming that he would like to be considered to continue in his position on Waterbeach Level Internal Drainage Board which he had held since 2015.

At the meeting of the Committee, it also was reported that Councillor Goodearl had expressed an interest in the vacancy on the Burnt Fen IDB.

It was resolved unanimously:

That former Councillor David Chaplin be appointed to Waterbeach Level IDB and Councillor Martin Goodearl to Burnt Fen IDB.

#### **77. Forward agenda plan**

The Committee received the updated Forward Agenda Plan for the Committee.

A question relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from a Member and this, along with the answer provided by officers, was set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

It was resolved:

That the Forward Agenda Plan be noted.

## 78. Bereavement Centre Full Business Case

The Committee considered a report, Y124 previously circulated, containing the Full Business Case (FBC) for the proposed development of a Bereavement Centre, consisting of a crematorium and modular functions room, with associated natural burial and pet cemetery facilities at the Council owned site, Ireton's Way, Mepal.

The Director Operations highlighted two typographical errors in recommendations 2.1 iv & v which should read section 4.11 and 4.16 respectively. The Director Operations then gave a detailed overview of the Business Case for the project for the benefit of Members of the Committee.

The Chairman reminded Members that all of the appendices relating to the project were Exempt. Therefore, the Press and Public would need to be excluded for any questions and discussion on these appendices. The Committee then would return to public session to take a decision on this item. A number of Members indicated that they had questions/points to make on the Exempt appendices. Therefore, the Chair invited questions/comments on the Public report prior to exclusion of the Press and Public.

During detailed discussion on the Public report, questions and comments were raised by Members as follows:

A Member queried if a 3.6% return, as detailed on page 5 of the report, was considered an appropriate level, bearing in mind the degree of risk and investment involved. The Member also questioned the reliability of the specialist VAT advice on the proposed operating model of in-house Council operation of the Bereavement Centre.

Some Members queried how the closer working with the publicly owned neighbouring crematoria referred to in paragraph 4.6 iii of the report would operate and whether this could be considered as a 'Cartel'. The Director Operations stated that this was more about working in partnership with the public sector to mutually complement the offer and better managing the peak operating months.

Some Members referred to the fact that the Council was proposing to commit over £9m of CIL income with the potential to only achieve a breakeven position on the funding. In response, the Director Operations stated that a key objective was to provide community infrastructure for the residents of the District that was not presently available, without impacting on the MTFs position. However, any surplus could support the MTFs in the future.

A Member queried whether the Council could offer pre-paid plans. The Director Operations reported that this was a rapidly changing area and further investigation would be undertaken on the issue.

A Member challenged the re-branding of the Crematorium as a Bereavement Centre and the use of CIL funding to potentially subsidise the Council Tax.

They expressed the view that the location was unpopular with the public and would be convenient to only a small proportion of residents of the District. The viability could also be dependent upon a price war with neighbouring competitors. The Member expressed concern at the secrecy, lack of preparation, research and risk analysis for the scheme. Two other Members echoed these concerns and stated that the £9.03M of CIL funding could usefully be spent on more appropriate community facilities.

However, another Member of the Committee expressed disappointment at the disrespect shown to the work and motivation of officers by some of the above comments and referred to the fact that a level of secrecy had been necessary due to the fiercely competitive nature of the market and potential for legal challenge by competitors. The Member challenged the assertion of lack of support for the proposed facility with alternative facts and figures and reminded Members of the long history of the site that had led to the closure of the original outdoor centre, attempts to find an alternative leisure operator and the incidents of vandalism and arson to the buildings. The proposed facilities would enhance the beautiful natural setting and offer a welcome and tranquil place for residents to remember loved ones at the saddest time of their lives. The designation as a County Wildlife Site limited the uses for the land. The CIL funding pot was constantly being replenished leaving further funding available for other community projects. This scheme represented a great use of the site and would deliver a high-quality community facility providing an excellent service for residents.

Other Members supported the above views and highlighted the benefits of the location being on good road and bus routes. They also referred to the fact that this was a true community facility that everyone would need to use and was not available in the District at present.

*At 6.51pm the meeting was adjourned for a comfort break and to go into Exempt session. On resumption in Public session at 7.24pm:*

The recommendations in the Public report were moved and seconded and a recorded vote was requested. Upon being put to the vote, the recommendations were declared to be carried with voting as follows:

FOR (6): Councillors Bailey, Goldsack, Goodearl, Hunt, Miller, Sharp.

AGAINST (5): Councillors Colbert, Dupré, Inskip, Trapp, A Whelan.

ABSTAIN (0):

**It was resolved to RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL:**

**That approval be given to:**

- 1. The full business case as detailed in appendices 1-4 of the submitted report.**
- 2. A Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allocation up to £9.06m for the capital build.**
- 3. Authorise the Director Finance to secure alternative funding where CIL is not available, in consultation with the Chair of Finance and Assets Committee (as detailed in section 5 of the submitted report).**
- 4. Secure provision of a partner to manage fishing rights on the site as set out in section 4.11 of the submitted report.**
- 5. Approve the future operating model of the Bereavement Centre as set out in section 4.16 of the submitted report.**

**79. Exclusion of the Public including representatives of the Press**

It was resolved unanimously:

That the press and public be excluded during the consideration of the remaining items because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the item there would be disclosure to them of exempt information of Categories 1, 2, 3 & 4 of Part I Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

**80. Bereavement Centre Full Business Case - Exempt Appendices**

The Exempt appendices were considered and discussed by Members in conjunction with the preceding item.

Questions relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from Members and answers provided by officers.

It was resolved:

That the Exempt appendices be received and noted.

**81. Ely Riverside Moorings Leases**

The Committee considered a report regarding the renewal of moorings leases at Ely riverside.

A question relating to this item had been provided prior to the meeting from a Member and an answer provided by officers.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the renewal of leases for moorings at Ely Riverside be granted as detailed in the submitted report.

## **82. Write-off of Irrecoverable Debt**

The Committee considered a report regarding the write-off of irrecoverable debts.

It was resolved unanimously:

1. That the write-off of one irrecoverable general debt as detailed in the submitted report be approved.
2. That the write-off of two irrecoverable general debts under delegated powers be noted.

## **83. ECTC Board meeting Minutes**

The Committee received the Minutes of the ECTC Board Meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2023.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2023 be noted.

## **84. Appointments, Transfers & Resignations**

The Committee received a report giving details of staff appointments, transfers and resignations for the period 1<sup>st</sup> July to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023 and a summary of Exit Questionnaire responses.

It was resolved:

That the contents of the report be noted.

## **85. Flexible Retirement Request**

The Committee considered a report detailing a flexible retirement request from an employee of the Council.

Following discussion of the application, Members of the Committee requested that formal recognition and thanks be placed on record for the excellent service of the employee to the Council.

It was resolved:

That the flexible retirement request as detailed in the submitted report be approved.

The meeting concluded at 7:50pm.

Chairman.....

Date            28 March 2024



18th January 2024

Sally Bonnett - Director Community (Lead Officer)

Tracy Couper - Democratic Services Manager

Complaint of misrepresentation by Stretham & Wilburton CLT

As Chairman of the Stretham Parish Council I would like to raise the following points of concern to both the Finance & Assets Committee and The Growth and Infrastructure Funding Scoring Panel regarding the details submitted for the 'Scoring of Applications' and the summary of the Director Community following the meeting held via Teams 4 January 2024.

In the summary of applications it was stated:

"Stretham & Wilburton CLT - Members noted the extensive letters of support for the new project. A CIL application also was to be submitted to F&A Committee on 25 January concurrent with this application and £340k of match funding had been committed by the Parish Council."

The Stretham Parish Council has not committed to or been asked to consider an application from the SWCLT for a match funding amount of £340,000 for this project. This fact should be recognised within the Terms of Reference and Scoring Criteria - 'The level of match funding that the project has secured'.

Stretham Parish Council has not given the SWCLT written approval in support of the proposed The Link facility, and we would request sight of the 'extensive letters' of support for this project. They would be of interest because the residents were invited to partake in a formal poll last year, in which they approved the immediate halt of further expenditure and decision making on the original 'Hub project' until after the Parish Council elections in May 2023. This fact should be recognised within the Terms of Reference and Scoring Criteria - 'Evidence of local resident support for the project'.

This matter has led to residents taking to Social Media to express their concerns and raising questions about the Parish Council's involvement with this statement. A detailed explanation is required concerning this statement.

The newly elected members (May 2023) of Stretham Parish Council recognised the views of the residents and that the proposals for the previous 'Hub & Surgery' which

committed the Parish Council to the project were financially unaffordable in the build costs and unsustainable with ongoing service and maintenance costs based on the forecasted budgets by the previous Parish Council and the SWCLT. The decision of the full Council (May 2023) was to cancel any further expenditure and cease the Parish Council's involvement.

Now the positive focus for the future is to refurbish and enhance the Parish Rooms and explore the possibility for the extension of the Pavillion owned by Stretham Parish Council to provide suitable venues for the village residents prudently and sustainably.

In December 2023, with full Council approval, a letter was sent from Stretham Parish Council to Mereside Medical agreeing 'in principle' to their application for funding from the NHS that would allow them to supply a medical service from a facility on the Manor Farm Development and also assured them of our willingness to assist them in affording the residents and surrounding area an essential service.

Stretham Parish Council is aware and mindful of the (Section 106) planning obligation that the SWCLT has to provide a 'Medical Facility' within the Manor Farm Development. The applications made by them, so far, have included ambitious additions of 'The Hub' and now 'The Link' to attract funding which in turn have created progressive delays in supplying a much-needed and required Surgery in simple form. There is no intention from the Parish Council to wish for any further delay in the SWCLT meeting their obligations.

I hope to attend the meeting on the 25th January 2024.

Kind Regards

Andrew Prevett

Chairman

Stretham Parish Council



**FINANCE & ASSETS COMMITTEE**  
**25 January 2024**  
**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE**

**Item 4 & 15 – Minutes & Forward Plan**

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Cllr A Whelan</b>	<p>The Draft Climate Change &amp; Nature Recovery Chapter and the Draft Hedgehog Recovery SPD are stated in the Minutes of 23 November 2023 to be coming to this meeting, but they are missing from this agenda.</p> <p>What is the reason for the delay?</p>	<p>Following the discussion at the November meeting, the items have been moved to the March F&amp;A Committee meeting to enable a Member Seminar on both topics to be held before they are presented to Committee.</p> <p>The Member Seminar is being held on Monday 12 February 2024.</p>

**Item 6 – 2024/25 Annual Treasury Management Strategy MRP & AIS**

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Cllr A Whelan</b>	Are there any differences between the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the CIPFA Treasury Management Code and Prudential Code?	The Director, Finance believes that the Treasury Management Strategy includes all the requirements laid out in the CIPFA Management and Prudential Codes

**Item 9 – Assets Update**

<b>Questioner</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Cllr A Whelan</b>	Please could an interim update on the costs of Depot improvements be provided?	<p>The original budget approved was £543,500 with £295,500 being allocated/spent in 2023/24.</p> <p>Spend to date is £480,549</p>
<b>Cllr A Whelan</b>	<p>Why is the gutter cleaning significantly higher than originally budgeted?</p> <p>£3.6k v £1.5k budget</p>	The original estimate was costed on a mechanical solution, however, once work began a manual solution was needed which required additional resources.