

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Record of Decisions

THE COUNCIL'S COMPREHENSIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader
Reference:	04/STR/01
Date of decision:	26 January 2004 Recorded: 27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Not a key decision.
Matter for Decision:	To receive the results of the City Council's Comprehensive Performance Assessment and to delegate to the Chief Executive the authority to draw up and agree the City Council's service improvement plan with the Audit Commission.
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The government and the Audit Commission have yet to announce the arrangements for the refresh of district council CPA results but it is probable that there will be a check against progress in implementing the service improvement plan one year on from the original assessment date (Autumn 2004 for the City Council). We need, therefore, to progress the development and agreement of the plan as quickly as possible to allow time for improvement actions to be taken and outcomes to be achieved. This would best be progressed through the delegation of this responsibility to the Chief Executive without the need for referral back to the Scrutiny Committee.
The Leader's decision(s):	That the Chief Executive be authorised to agree the City Council's Service Improvement Plan with the Audit Commission.
Reasons for the decision:	These are described in the report.
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendation for the Leader by 7 votes to 0.
Report:	Agenda Item 5 of the Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.
Conflicts of interest:	No conflicts of interest were declared.
Comments:	The Chief Executive would copy the draft Service Improvement Plan to the Leader, Chair and spokes.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ACT 2003

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader		
Reference:	04/STR/02		
Date of decision:	26 January 2004	Recorded:	27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Not a key decision.		
Matter for Decision:	What procedures are needed to implement certain provisions of the Act.		
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The dispersal provisions in the Act are now in force. It would not be lawful for the Council to decide that it will never agree to the use of the powers, as the Council would be "fettering its discretion", which it may not do. Each request for consent to use the powers would need to be considered on its merits. Giving or withholding consent is a matter for the Executive and falls within the remit of the Leader. The Leader could delegate this responsibility to officers but the officers suggest that, given the sensitivity of this issue, decisions should be made at member level. However, there is likely to be a need to respond promptly to requests from the Police and this would not be compatible with pre-scrutiny of requests by the Strategy Scrutiny Committee.		
The Leader's decision(s):	1) To make decisions of the following kind without the Scrutiny Committee being first consulted: <i>Responding, on behalf of the Council, to requests from the Police for the Council's approval to the designation of localities within the City for the purposes of section 30, Anti-social Behaviour Act, 2003 (dispersal of groups and removal of persons under 16).</i> That any such requests from the Police, along with the Leader's decision are reported to Group Leaders immediately and to the next available meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.		
Reasons for the decision:	These are described in the report. In addition, the decision had been amended on the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to include notifying Group Leaders.		
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee agreed to recommendation by 7 votes to 0.		
Report:	Agenda Item 6 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.		
Conflicts of interest:	No conflicts of interest were declared.		
Comments:	The Scrutiny Committee agreed 'That the Council propose to the police that Mill Road should be considered for designation as a locality for dispersal of groups and removal		

of persons under 16.' See Scrutiny Committee minutes for further information

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

SERVICE PLANS AND GENERAL FUND REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGETS – REVISED 2003/04, DRAFT BUDGETS 2004/05 AND FORECAST 2005/06

Decision of: Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader

Reference: 04/STR/03

Date of decision: 26 January 2004 **Recorded:**

Decision Type: Key decision.

Matter for Decision: Parts One and Two of the Service Plans set out the performance over the 2002/03 financial year and performance to date for 2003/04. Part Three looks at the service proposals, objectives and budgets for 2004/05 and forecast for 2005/06. This information will enable the Scrutiny Committee to consider whether service priorities and resources may need to be refocused to enable objectives and targets for the current and future years to be met.

Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options): Service Plans and draft budgets are key elements of the Council's budgetary and policy framework.

The Leader's decision(s):

Performance Targets:

- a) For 2003/04, note and agree the changes since the November committee (as highlighted), to the performance against targets and objectives (see table in Services Plans, Part 2).
- b) For 2004/05 and future years, agree the service objectives and proposals (see table in Services Plans, Part 3) and the performance indicators and targets (see Appendix A).

Revenue Budgets and Cash Limits:

- c) Approve the revised revenue budget for 2003/04, as shown in Appendix A, for submission to Council, including reduction in use of reserves of £32,000.
- d) Agree proposals for revenue savings and bids, as set out in Appendix B, which have been incorporated into the budgets presented to this committee.
- e) Note the amendments to the cash limit for 2004/05 as shown in Appendix C.
- f) Agree Priority Policy Fund (PPF) bids, as shown in Appendix B, and indicate their relative priority for submission to Council.
- g) Approve, the budget for 2004/05 as shown in Appendix A, for submission to Council.

Capital:

h) Seek approval from Council to carry forward resources of £52,000 from 2003/04 into 2004/05, as detailed in Appendix D to fund rephased capital spending, subject to the final outturn position. Also to carry forward any Safer City Capital Grant underspend not allocated by 31st March, subject to the application(s) being for over £5,000.

Reasons for the decision:

These are described in the report.

Scrutiny consideration:

The Scrutiny Committee agreed the recommendations for the Leader by 6 votes to 0.

Report:

Agenda Item 7 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.

Conflicts of interest:

No conflicts of interest were declared.

Comments:

See Scrutiny Committee minutes for information on specific changes to Part 2 of the Service Plan.

h) was amended by the officers to include the reference to Safer City Capital Grant.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

SERVICE PLANS AND GENERAL FUND REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGETS – REVISED 2003/04, DRAFT BUDGETS 2004/05 AND FORECAST 2005/06 - OVERVIEW
--

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader		
Reference:	04/str/04		
Date of decision:	26 January 2004	Recorded:	27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Not a key decision.		
Matter for Decision:	Service Plans have been presented to the Scrutiny Committees. The report summarises the financial information for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and the Capital Plan and recommends that the Leader agree a budget for approval by the Executive, which will recommend a budget to Council.		
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The Leader must propose a budget for the Executive to consider at its meeting on 29 January 2004.		
The Leader's decision(s):	Budget 2003/04: a) Approve, the overall revised budget for 2003/04, as shown in Appendix B a, for General Fund Services. b) Approve the carry forward of £64,930 (replacing the £56,190 reported to the November Committee) from the 2003/04 budget into the 2004/05 budget (included in the Cash Limit adjustments) [paragraph 4.6 refers]. Budget 2004/05: c) Agree the action with regard to the PPF bids made, and confirm the approach to decisions. d) Approve the overall base budget for 2004/05 and the relevant Prudential Indicators highlighted at Appendix O, Annex. e) Recommend to Council the Council Tax base , as per Appendix E, and the level of Council Tax for 2004/05, based on a 98% collection rate [Table 5 refers]. <i>Subject to changes as a result of the second homes discount being reviewed.</i> f) Recommend to Council to approve: (i) the Prudential Indicators (ii) the Annual Investment Strategy (iii) the changes to the Council's approved lending list set out in paragraphs 3, 8 and annex respectively of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement at Appendix P. g) Delegate to the Director of Finance authority to finalise		

changes relating to the reallocation of support service and central costs in accordance with the CIPFA Best Value Accounting Code of Practice [paragraph 6.14 refers].

Capital Plan: [Paragraph 10 refers]

a) Approve the new capital bids in the January cycle, K , and Project Appraisal in Appendix L, for inclusion in the Capital Plan, where no additional funding is required.

b) Agree whether the bids outlined in Appendix K should be approved for inclusion in the Capital Plan, or on the Hold List, including the additional use of reserves required as indicated in the Appendix.

c) Consider any additional allocation of resources to fund further capital expenditure.

d) Agree the re-phased Capital Plan as presented to committees and reproduced as Appendix Ha, as amended by the above decisions.

e) Note the impact of revenue, capital and other approvals and approve the level of reserves to be used to:

a. support the 2003/04 budget

b. support 2004/05 and future years

[Section 11 refers].

Reasons for the decision:

These are described in the report.

Scrutiny consideration:

Report:

Agenda Item 8 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.

Conflicts of interest:

No conflicts of interest were declared.

Comments:

A paper tabled at the meeting updated the Council's overall budget following the decisions taken after the Council's Scrutiny Committees had met. The paper also presented the Leader's proposals for the Executive's consideration at its meeting on 29 January.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

CITY COMPACT WITH VOLUNTARY SECTOR

Decision of: Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader

Reference: 04/STR/05

Date of decision: 26 January 2004 **Recorded on:** 27 January 2004

Decision Type: Key decision.

Matter for Decision: To adopt the basic Compact text agreed, to date, with the city's voluntary sector.

Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options): The Government requires local statutory agencies to adopt compacts.

The Leader's decision(s):

- 1) To adopt the basic Compact text given in Appendix 3. Plus Part 2, which had been tabled at the meeting by Cambridge Council for Voluntary Services.
- 2) To appoint the Executive Councillor for Community Development & Leisure and one officer to represent the City Council on the proposed Compact forum.
- 3) To invite individual local voluntary organisations to adopt the amended text and its proposed management structure.

Reasons for the decision: These are described in the report.

Scrutiny consideration: The Scrutiny Committee agreed the recommendations for the Leader by 6 votes to 0.

Report: Agenda Item 9 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.

Conflicts of interest:

Comments: The Cambridge Council for Voluntary Services had submitted comments on 26 January. These were tabled and included as referred to in 1) above.

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Record of Decisions

SAFER CITY GRANTS

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader		
Reference:	04/STR/06		
Date of decision:	26 January 2004	Recorded:	27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Not a key decision.		
Matter for Decision:	Whether to support the funding of a Domestic Violence Project Coordinator through Safer City revenue grants for a further three years.		
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The funding for this post ends in March 2004. The alternative would be not to contribute the £6,000 p.a. for three years.		
The Leader's decision(s):	To support the funding of a Domestic Violence Project Coordinator through Safer City revenue grants for a further three years (April 2004 - March 2007).		
Reasons for the decision:	The contribution to funding this post is currently not putting an unhealthy strain on the Safer City Revenue Grants budget; Domestic Violence is a priority area for the Cambridge Community Safety Partnership of which the City Council is a member; there are likely benefits to some of the Council's core services, particularly around informing Housing Needs.		
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee agreed with the recommendation for the Leader by 7 votes to 0.		
Report:	Agenda Item 10 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.		
Conflicts of interest:	No conflicts of interest were declared.		
Comments:			

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Record of Decisions

BANKING CONTRACT

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader		
Reference:	04/STR/07		
Date of decision:	26 January 2004	Recorded:	27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Key decision.		
Matter for Decision:	Whether to negotiate a new banking contract with the Council's current bank for 3 years or subject the contract to a tendering exercise.		
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	The banking contract ends in March 2005. Any decision whether to tender or not must be taken now.		
The Leader's decision(s):	1) To agree to the Director of Finance opening contract negotiations with the Council's incumbent banker, HSBC Bank plc, in accordance with section 9, paragraph 9.10, of Part 3 of the Constitution (Discharge of Functions – Delegations to the Director of Finance: Executive Functions). 2) To waive the requirement to expose the service to a competitive tendering procedure as provided in paragraph 6.2 of Part 4G of The Constitution – Contract Procedure Rules (waiver of the Code) for the reasons set out in this report.		
Reasons for the decision:	These are contained in the report, which is exempt from publication, paragraphs 8 and 9 as defined in the Constitution pages 181-3.		
Scrutiny consideration:	The Scrutiny Committee agreed with the recommendation for the Leader by 6 votes to 0.		
Report:	Agenda Item 13 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.		
Conflicts of interest:	No conflicts of interest were declared.		
Comments:			

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Record of Decisions

EAST AREA COMMITTEE/CHANGE FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS

Decision of:	Ian Nimmo-Smith, Leader		
Reference:	04/STR/09		
Date of decision:	26 January 2004	Recorded:	27 January 2004
Decision Type:	Not a Key decision.		
Matter for Decision:	Whether to change the current practice of Area Committees meeting once every 8 weeks.		
Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):	<p>Councillor Durrant as Chair of the East Area Committee has requested that Civic Affairs Committee agree to amend the Constitution so that East Area Committee can consider planning applications only, at one meeting in a committee cycle, with all other business plus open forum considered at another meeting in the cycle. This would facilitate the conduct of business and improve the information given to applicants and residents about the date and time that each planning applications would be heard.</p> <p>This is based on experience that the first two East Committee meetings in October and December had to be adjourned with further meetings arranged to finish off business.</p>		
The Leader's decision(s):	<p>To await the review of Area Committees to be undertaken in the summer.</p> <p>Area Committee Chairs may make provision for a second meeting in each cycle if the business requires it, but that this should be determined cycle by cycle by the Chair and officers rather than accepted as the usual practice.</p>		
Reasons for the decision:	<p>The Leader was of the view that it was too early to take a view on the workload and process issues of Area Committees. The planned review of the Council's Decision Making in the summer would look at the matter closely.</p>		
Scrutiny consideration:	<p>The Scrutiny Committee debated the matter prior to the Leader making his decision, but did not take a vote.</p>		
Report:	<p>Agenda Item 11 of Strategy Scrutiny Committee on 26 January 2004.</p>		
Conflicts of interest:	<p>No conflicts of interest were declared.</p>		
Comments:			