



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of East Cambridgeshire  
District Council held in the Council Chamber,  
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Tuesday  
11 April 2017 at 6.00pm

---

## **PRESENT**

Councillor Christine Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Julia Huffer
Councillor David Ambrose-Smith	Councillor Mark Hugo
Councillor Sue Austen	Councillor Bill Hunt
Councillor Anna Bailey	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor Derrick Beckett	Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Ian Bovingdon	Councillor Andy Pearson
Councillor Mike Bradley	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor David Brown	Councillor Hamish Ross
Councillor Steve Cheetham	Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Paul Cox	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Peter Cresswell (Vice- Chairman in the Chair)	Councillor Carol Sennitt
Councillor Lorna Dupré	Councillor Alan Sharp
Councillor Lis Every	Councillor Stuart Smith
Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh	Councillor Jo Webber
Councillor Richard Hobbs	

### 70. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No public questions were submitted.

### 71. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs, Allan, Alderson, Chaplin, Edwards, Green, Hitchin, Tom Hunt, Dan Schumann, Shuter and Stubbs.

### 72. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interests were received.

### 73. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2017 were received. The Chairman thanked Councillor Hobbs for chairing that meeting in the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the amendment of the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph of Minute 62 on the Waste Service Options review to read:

‘Councillor Huffer, as Member Champion for Waste, stated that she would deliver regular reports to full Council.’

74. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No announcements were made by the Chairman.

75. **PETITIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

76. **MOTIONS**

No motions were received.

77. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

No questions from Members were received.

78. **SCHEDULE OF ITEMS RECOMMENDED FROM COMMITTEES AND OTHER MEMBER BODIES**

**Asset Development (Shareholder) Committee - 27 March 2017**

**East Cambridgeshire Trading Company (ECTC) Annual Business Plan**

Council considered a report, R263 previously circulated, detailing recommendations from the Asset Development (Shareholder) Committee on 27 March 2017 regarding the ECTC Annual Business Plan.

Councillor Hunt, as Chairman of the Asset Development (Shareholder) Committee, stated that this was a significant report and wanted to highlight a couple of points. All Members of this Council and the Trading Company were part of the Council, so it was not a ‘them’ or ‘us’ but ‘we’. Councillor Hunt drew Members attention to the statement in the fourth paragraph of the covering report that stated that the Company would repay the loan from the Council and this commitment was taken very seriously, with the Company working to the goal of repaying the loan within 5 years. Page 2 of the covering report referred to the request for a 10 year loan of the Market Place by the Company, to enable viable investment in improvements. Councillor Hunt particularly highlighted Mission Statement on page 2 of the overall Business Plan, to

provide a high quality service in everything the company does. He also referred to the recommendation that the Trading Company should not move premises without a decision by the Shareholder Committee. Councillor Hunt urged all Members to take an interest in the Company.

Councillor Dupré stated that she would not be going through the detailed figures in the Business Plan, as this was the role of the Shareholder Committee. However, she did not believe that the statement repeated in the Business Plan that 'what is good for ECTC is good for the Council' was an accurate reflection of the relationship. The Council needed to fulfil its role as sole shareholder in the Company via the Shareholder Committee and what might be in the interests of the Company might not necessarily be in the interests of the Council in every instance, e.g. if it led to costs for the Council, that were not repaid.

Councillor Beckett commented that this was a good Business Plan and he hoped that the figures would 'stack up' and that the Company be a benefit to the Council. Councillor Beckett referred to the reference on page 9 of the Commercial Services Business Plan that the Company would be providing a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) maintenance service. He expressed concern regarding the offering of such a service, since developers only provided a sum for maintenance of SUDS for a particular period of time, after which maintenance would become a liability for the Council. The Director Commercial explained that Grounds Maintenance staff had been through appropriate training in the maintenance of SUDS and understood the requirements. The liabilities and need to mitigate costs to the Council would be reflected in the quotes submitted for such work. Management contracts would be entered into for a defined period of time and when this expired consideration would be given as to whether to re-tender in the light of circumstances.

Councillor Beckett queried if there was a veto in place in the event of an attempted Management buy-out of the Company. The Director Commercial confirmed that the Shareholder Agreement stated that this would require the consent of full Council.

On a point of clarification, Councillor Rouse stated that Ely had never had a Market Square and that all references should be to the Market Place or Market Hill.

Councillor Hugo highlighted and commended the wording relating to CLTs on page 6 of the Property Services Business Plan, which emphasised the community benefits arising from CLTs. Councillor Hugo thanked the CLT Team for their work with Haddenham CLT.

The Vice-Chairman stated that the Chairman had submitted two written questions relating to the structure of the Company and the TECKAL exemption, which the Director Commercial would be responding to in writing the following day.

Councillor Bailey requested that the reference to Article 50 not being triggered on page 15 of the overall Business Plan be updated. Councillor Bailey commented that it was very exciting to see the how far things had developed in relation to the Trading Company over the past year. She also commended the wording in the Property Services Business Plan which emphasised the community benefits arising from CLTs and welcomed the proposed establishment of a District wide 'umbrella' CLT in 2017, to help bring forward CLT projects in areas where there are insufficient local volunteers. Councillor Bailey stated that in general she did believe in the basic principle that what was good for the Company was good for the Council. Therefore, she asked Members to support the recommendations.

In summing-up, Councillor Hunt stated that this Council 'got things done' but also did so in an open and transparent manner. It showed its strength by ensuring that it would hold the Company to account on particular issues, e.g. any proposal to move the premises of the Company. Councillor Hunt asked Members to support the recommendations and remember that this was not a 'them and 'us' situation.

It was resolved:

1. That the ECTC Annual Business Plan be approved.
2. That no decision be made on the Trading Company moving offices until the matter is brought back to a quorate meeting of the Shareholder Committee.

## 79. **COMMITTEE RE-STRUCTURING**

Council considered a report, R264 previously circulated, detailing proposals to amend the current Committee structure of the Council. The Chief Executive reminded Members that Council in November 2016 had instigated a review of the Committee structure, including consideration of the recommendation of the Shareholder Review Committee to establish a standalone Shareholder Committee. A Member Seminar was held on 29 March 2017, which generated useful discussion and comment and resulted in a number of proposals summarised in paragraphs 4.3 to 4.5 of the report.

Councillor Palmer moved the recommendations in the submitted report which was seconded by Councillor Roberts. In moving the recommendations, Councillor Palmer stated that the Committee structure needed to reflect the current organisational structure and operations of the Council. This was why a separate Shareholder Committee was required to hold ECTC to account in a transparent manner. It was important to make changes now to reflect the current position and keep the structure under review to ensure that it continued to meet changing needs.

Councillor Dupré stated that she believed that there were still a number of issues to be resolved at the heart of the recommended option for the new Committee structure, including the names of Committees; numbers on Committees; balance of workloads between Committees; the creation of a Shareholder Committee; and the retention of an Asset Development Committee in its own right. There were some aspects of the recommended option that she liked, such as the titles of the new Committees, which were more relevant and reflective of what they actually do. However, she did not believe that the continued existence of a separate Asset Development Committee was necessary and the balance of workloads between Committees still was not correct, with some Committees having lighter workloads whilst the workload and number of service areas reporting to the proposed Resources and Finance Committee seemed too high. Therefore, she proposed an amendment which was a variant of option 1B listed at Appendix 2 and the recommended option at Appendix 6, as follows:

- Change the name of the two relevant Policy Committees to Resources and Finance Committee and Community Services Committee;
- Change the relevant Committee sizes to correspond with the sizes in the recommended option at Appendix 6;
- Move Reprographics to Resources and Finance Committee;
- Delete Asset Development Committee and move Asset Development to Resources and Finance Committee.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Austen. In response, Councillor Palmer stated that he understood the amendment, but that his original motion still stood. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was declared to be lost.

Speaking on the original motion, Councillor Bradley, as Chair of the Shareholder Review Committee, stated that he commended the work put into the re-structuring and supported the outcome, particularly in relation to the establishment of a standalone Shareholder Committee. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was declared to be carried.

It was resolved:

1. That the Committee structure detailed in Appendix 6 to the submitted report be approved.
2. That the number of substitute members for each Committee be increased to a maximum of three Members per Political Group.
3. That the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any necessary amendments to the

terms of reference and any consequential amendments to the Constitution arising from these changes.

The meeting concluded at 6.31pm.

Chairman.....

Date            25 May 2017