

Cabinet Meeting

**Moot Hall, Town Hall, High Street,
Colchester, CO1 1PJ
Wednesday, 09 June 2021 at 18:00**

The Cabinet deals with the implementation of all Council services, putting into effect the policies agreed by Full Council and making recommendations to Full Council on policy issues and the budget.

Information for Members of the Public

Access to information and meetings

You have the right to attend all meetings of the Council, its Committees and Cabinet. You also have the right to see the agenda (the list of items to be discussed at a meeting), which is usually published five working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Dates of the meetings are available here:

<https://colchester.cmis.uk.com/colchester/MeetingCalendar.aspx>.

Most meetings take place in public. This only changes when certain issues, for instance, commercially sensitive information or details concerning an individual are considered. At this point you will be told whether there are any issues to be discussed in private, if so, you will be asked to leave the meeting.

Have Your Say!

The Council welcomes contributions and representations from members of the public at most public meetings. If you would like to speak at a meeting and need to find out more, please refer to the Have Your Say! arrangements here:

<https://colchester.cmis.uk.com/colchester/HaveYourSay.aspx>.

Audio Recording, Mobile phones and other devices

The Council streams some public meetings for live broadcast over the internet and the recordings are available to listen to afterwards on the Council's YouTube channel. Audio recording, photography and filming of meetings by members of the public is also welcomed. Phones, tablets, laptops, cameras and other devices can be used at all meetings of the Council so long as this doesn't cause a disturbance. It is not permitted to use voice or camera flash functions and devices must be set to silent. Councillors can use devices to receive messages, to access meeting papers and information via the internet. Looking at or posting on social media by Committee members is at the discretion of the Chairman / Mayor who may choose to require all devices to be switched off at any time.

Access

There is wheelchair access to the Town Hall from St Runwald Street. There is an induction loop in all the meeting rooms..

Facilities

Toilets with lift access, if required, are on each floor of the Town Hall. A water dispenser is available on the first floor.

Evacuation Procedures

Evacuate the building using the nearest available exit. Make your way to the assembly area in the car park in St Runwald Street behind the Town Hall. Do not re-enter the building until the Town Hall staff advise you that it is safe to do so.

Telephone (01206) 282222 or textphone 18001 followed by the full number you wish to call

e-mail: democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk

www.colchester.gov.uk

COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
Cabinet
Wednesday, 09 June 2021 at 18:00

Leader and Chairman	Councillor Paul Dundas (Conservative) Councillor Crow (Conservative) Councillor Ellis (Conservative) Councillor Laws (Conservative) Councillor Lissimore (Conservative) Councillor B. Oxford (Highwoods Independent)
---------------------	---

AGENDA
THE LIST OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING
(Part A - open to the public)

Please note that Agenda items 1 to 5 are normally dealt with briefly.

Live Broadcast

Please follow this link to watch the meeting live on YouTube:

[\(107\) ColchesterCBC - YouTube](#)

1 Welcome and Announcements

The Chairman will welcome members of the public and Councillors to the meeting and remind those participating to mute their microphones when not talking. The Chairman will invite all Councillors and Officers participating in the meeting to introduce themselves.

2 Urgent Items

The Chairman will announce if there is any item not on the published agenda which will be considered because it is urgent and will explain the reason for the urgency.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillors will be asked to say if there are any items on the agenda about which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest which would prevent them from participating in any discussion of the item or

participating in any vote upon the item, or any other pecuniary interest or non-pecuniary interest.

4 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Councillors will be invited to confirm that the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2021 are a correct record.

10-03-21

7 - 24

6 Have Your Say! (Hybrid meetings)

Members of the public may make representations to the meeting. This can be made either in person at the meeting or by joining the meeting remotely and addressing the Council via Zoom. Each representation may be no longer than three minutes. Members of the public wishing to address the Council remotely may register their wish to address the meeting by e-mailing democratic.services@colchester.gov.uk by 12.00 noon on the working day before the meeting date. In addition a written copy of the representation will need to be supplied for use in the event of unforeseen technical difficulties preventing participation at the meeting itself.

There is no requirement to pre register for those attending the meeting in person, although please note that there is very limited public seating available in view of the social distancing requirements.

5 Decisions Reviewed by the Scrutiny Panel

The Councillors will consider the outcome of a review of a decision by the Scrutiny Panel under the call-in procedure. At the time of the publication of this agenda, there were none.

7 Economy, Business and Heritage

7(i) Queen Street Grow On and Digital Working Hub Facility 25 - 30

Cabinet will consider a report seeking approval for delegation of the key contracts for the delivery of the 43 Queen Street Grow-on scheme and digital working hub to the Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage. The report also provides a general update on this scheme.

7(ii) Review of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on Colchester Borough Council's Strategic Arts Partners: The Mercury Theatre, Colchester Arts Centre and Firstsite. 31 - 36

Cabinet will consider the recommendations contained in draft minute 297 of the Scrutiny Panel meeting of 18 March 2021.

8 Resources

8(i) Request for Delegated Authority to Agree New Insurance Contract 37 - 40

Cabinet will consider a report seeking authority to delegate responsibility for agreeing the new long term insurance contracts to the Portfolio Holder for Resources.

8(ii) Local Authority Remote Meetings Call for Evidence 41 - 50

Cabinet will consider a report inviting it to approve a response to the Government's Call for Evidence in respect of remote meetings.

8(iii) Policy Panel Work Programme 51 - 52

Cabinet will consider the recommendation contained in draft minute 15 of the Policy Panel meeting of 3 March 2021.

9 Environment and Sustainability

9(i) Review of Bus Services 53 - 60

Cabinet will consider the recommendations contained in draft minute 294 of the Scrutiny Panel meeting of 16 March 2021.

10 Strategy

10(i) Appointments to External Organisations and Council Groups and Abolition of Revolving Investment Fund Committee 61 - 102

Cabinet will consider a report proposing appointments to a number of external organisations and Council groups and reporting on the work undertaken by appointees to external organisations and Council groups in 2020-21. It also proposes the abolition of the Revolving Investment Fund Committee.

11 Exclusion of the Public (Cabinet)

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and in accordance with The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public, including the press, from the meeting so that any items containing exempt information (for example personal, financial or legal advice), in Part B of this agenda (printed on yellow paper) can be decided. (Exempt information is

defined in Section 100I and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).

Part B
(not open to the public including the press)

<p style="text-align: center;">CABINET 10 March 2021</p>
--

Present: - Councillor Cory (Chairman)
Councillors Fox, Goss, Higgins, King, Lilley and J. Young.

Also in attendance: - Councillors Barber, Barlow, Coleman, McCarthy, G. Oxford and Willetts

547. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

548. Have Your Say

Fabian Green addressed Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5(1) of the Remote Meetings Procedure Rules. He noted that Cllr Goss had stated publicly that lost parking spaces at Britannia car park must be replaced and had mooted an idea of a multi-storey car park. Was this a plan other Cabinet members supported? Was it correct parking had to be replaced and if so, what sort of ideas did the Cabinet have for this and where?

Councillor Lilley, Portfolio Holder for Communities, Wellbeing and Public Safety explained that both Vineyard Street and Britannia had been identified as sites for housing in the Local Plan since 2005. A review of parking provision across Colchester would be undertaken, looking at the entire parking estate and would identify whether other sites were needed. Some sites, such as St Johns and St Marys, were currently underused. The Council would also work with BID to understand their views on parking provision. The Council was also looking to bring make other parking sites available to the public at weekends, such as Rowan House and the Institute. Building a new multi-storey car park would very expensive. The review would report in summer 2021.

Councillor G. Oxford attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed Cabinet on the redevelopment of Vineyard Street and Britannia car parks. He expressed concern about the density of the developments and the proximity of development to heritage assets. Concern was also expressed about the potential loss of income from the two car parks and the economic impact on the town centre of the loss of parking provision. The inclusion of commercial units within the developments was noted, but it was hoped that this would not include fast food units. Car free developments were unrealistic. In terms of parking it was important that existing provision for accessible parking be retained and highlighted that height limiters in car parks prevented access for those with disabilities, who often drove taller vehicles.

Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, explained that bringing housing into the town centre would increase footfall and stimulate economic development. The developments would be mixed use, including commercial, although the concerns about the possibility of fast-food developments were noted. Heritage would be protected, and the developments were aimed to improve access to St Botolph's Priory and the Roman Wall.

Councillor Barber attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed Cabinet to invite the Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation or other Cabinet member to meet with residents and the Environment Agency to discuss issues relating to flooding at Middle Mill, as he did not feel that the issues were properly understood.

Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation, explained that he would be providing a full response to Councillor Barber shortly, which he could share with residents. However, he had discussed these issues with Environment Agency and Brandon's. All operating procedures had been complied with and no changes in procedures were required by the Environment Agency. If sufficient budget was available, the Environment Agency had committed to the installation of a gauge in a suitable location. The Environment Agency had also invested heavily in flooding software and its processes were largely data driven.

549. Redevelopment of Vineyard Street and Britannia Car Parks

The Assistant Director, Place and Client Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Higgins, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, introduced the report and highlighted that both sites had been allocated for housing led redevelopment in the Local Plan in 2005 and the St Botolph's Masterplan. The Vineyard Street redevelopment would restore previous the street scape that had ben destroyed to build the car park. Access to the Roman Wall would be enhanced. Accessible car parking would be retained and there was other car parking available nearby and on the outskirts of the town centre such as Napier Road. The car free aspect was important, as it would help improve air quality, which was a major concern in the town centre. In terms of Britannia, it had never been intended to be a permanent car park site. Again, the redevelopment would help improve air quality in the town centre. Both sites were sustainable with good access to public transport links, and the increase of housing in the town centre would help generate footfall and economic development. This was the start of a process and there would be further consultation and the precise nature of the development would be decided following a feasibility study.

Councillor Willetts attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet. He considered that there was considerable conflict between some of the Council's policies in the town centre, such as the desire to generate income from car parking and stimulating economic development whilst also seeking to reduce car access to the town centre and converting shops and offices to residential uses.. The administration had a history of closing car parks such as Sheepen Road. These developments were based on a Plan from 2005 so were not forward thinking. The town centre would only survive if it

succeeded in attracting medium and high spenders, whose preference was to use private transport or trains and trams. The Council was proposing to reduce car parking and rely on walking, cycling and scooters, which would not attract this demographic. To survive the town centre needed more rather than less car parking. The administration should do whatever it took to attract footfall to the town centre and should support the modes of transport that shoppers and visitors wanted to use.

Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, stressed that partners and external stakeholders supported the Council's vision for the town centre, as was demonstrated by the significant external investment that had been secured. It was backed by public, private and third sector organisations and the Council enjoyed an excellent relationship with the BID. The review of parking would assess the need for parking in the town centre.

Councillor J. Young, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Performance, stressed the heritage aspect of the developments. Advice was being sought from Historic England and the developments would seek to preserve and protect historic assets. The Britannia development would give better access to St Botolph's Priory and the Roman Wall and restore the medieval street pattern.

Councillor Lilley, Portfolio Holder for Communities, Wellbeing and Public Safety, highlighted that the 2005 Local Plan had been drafted by a Conservative administration. The administration was not closing car parks: Sheepen Road remained open and it was looking to increase provision on other sites. It was also developing an app in conjunction with the BID which would offer discounts and offers linked to town centre parking, whilst it was also developing and promoting sustainable public transport options.

Councillor Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing highlighted, the contribution the developments could make to providing affordable housing in the town centre. Housing development in the town centre would bring guaranteed footfall to town centre businesses. Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, thanked the speakers for their contributions. There was a need to have a balance between car parking and other transport options, and to secure safe routes for cyclists and pedestrians into the town centre. It was important that residents had confidence that the final schemes, which would be developed after consultation, were well designed developments with a high quality of architecture. The Council was sensitive to business needs and would continue to engage with business as plans developed.

Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder Waste, Environment and Transposition, highlighted the planning policy history of the sites, which were included in the Local Plan which had been subject to rigorous public examination and adopted by Full Council, with support from representatives of all groups. It was emphasised that this was just the beginning of the process with further consultation to come before final plans were brought forward.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The development of Vineyard Street as a housing-led, mixed-use site with active and commercial ground floor uses and public realm improvements that will enhance the heritage and culture offer of the Town Wall, be explored.

(b) The development of Britannia Car Park as a housing-led, mixed-use site that could also accommodate some active uses, open spaces that enhance the setting of the Augustinian Priory and surrounding listed buildings, as well as maximise links to sustainable transport, be explored.

(c) It be noted that the sites would be explored as set out in the Assistant Director's report, then reviewed at the end of RIBA Stage 2 (viability), prior to proceeding to RIBA Stage 3 (planning application) at which time a more detailed business case and delivery model would be considered.

REASONS

The proposal meets two very specific Strategic Plan priorities relevant to this site and the Council's companies, as well as many wider priorities. Specifically, Strategic Plan states that the Council will agree some "Phase 2" housing sites to be developed by Colchester Amphora Homes Ltd (CAHL), the Council's wholly owned company, as well as "work to deliver a scheme redevelopment for Vineyard Gate car park to showcase the Town Wall and provide a welcoming arrival point for visitors to the historic town...".

There is a need for almost 1,000 new homes per year in Colchester; with the Council keen to see 30% affordable housing within new developments. The Council is taking a proactive lead in delivering high-quality homes through CAHL, which was set up in 2018. The agreement to develop these sites will provide a continuing pipeline in accordance with the company's objectives, to help Colchester deliver more, high-quality, sustainable, and affordable homes for the benefit of the local community.

The Council is also keen to act as a catalyst for the economic recovery of Colchester, through numerous measures that includes providing support for others as well as delivering direct growth and opportunities for employment. Several sources of national research highlighted in the Assistant Director's report have shown how town centres need to evolve and remain fit for the future, with mixed-use, sustainable, liveable neighbourhoods being created.

The strong rationale for building new residential development in highly walkable "liveable neighbourhoods" cannot be better met than in the town centre, as the most sustainable location. The sites can create places that are highly connected by active and sustainable modes of travel; near key services and assets that people need. This accessibility provides greater opportunity for people to live with less dependence on car use.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Not to develop the sites; which would retain direct income from car parking but would miss a wider-reaching opportunity to provide high quality housing and improvements to the public realm, as well as growth and employment opportunities. It would also be inconsistent with long-held regeneration proposals, the emerging Local Plan, sustainable transport projects and the overarching Climate Emergency Declaration (2019) as well as the recent Positive Parking Strategy.

Only to develop one car park; which would retain some income and car parking, but would

miss wider-reaching, and cumulative impacts, of the combined opportunity to provide high quality housing and improvements to the public realm, as well as growth and employment opportunities. It would again be inconsistent with long-held regeneration proposals, the emerging Local Plan, sustainable transport projects and the overarching climate emergency declaration (2019) as well as the Colchester Future Transport Strategy and Positive Parking Strategy.

To develop in a different way; however, commercially led schemes have previously been explored at Vineyard Gate and have not proven viable, and with current market climates they would be unlikely to have improved since. Britannia car park has been anticipated to become a future housing site since the 2005 St Botolph's Quarter Masterplan.

550. "Turnstone" Development at Colchester Northern Gateway

The Strategic Director, Policy and Place, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Higgins, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, introduced the report and explained that it was necessary to amend the agreement with Turnstone to reflect some modifications needed because of the Covid 19 pandemic. This had led to a slippage in the timescales for the development.

Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, and Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, emphasised the importance of the Turnstone development in terms of the economic recovery post Covid. It was a key element of the Northern Gateway and would complement other attractions such as the Sports Park and the Walk. The changes in the scheme would help ensure that it reflected changes in public demand following the pandemic, with an increased emphasis on leisure uses.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The new "Turnstone" Development Agreement be finalised to reflect changes since the Development Agreement was entered into with TEL, by the Council.
- (b) Authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Policy and Place or other nominated officer of the Council to complete a Deed of Variation to the Development Agreement and other arrangements, in consultation, with the Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, the Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, the Monitoring Officer and the Head of Finance.

REASONS

The Colchester Northern Gateway is a flagship development for the Council, and the town, that has been planned over the last decade. This growth area is now coming forwards at an increasing rate, with the Council's new Sport Park now completed and due to open in April 2021, as well as commencement of "The Walk" linking to existing developments such as David Lloyd (opposite the Turnstone site). The "Turnstone" development therefore delivers a fundamental part of a much wider, strategic mixed-use development at the CNG South site with a heat network, and highway improvements including the Rapid Transit

System (RTS).

The development of this site is very important; as a visually prominent gateway location into Colchester from junction 28 on the A12, and a key catalyst for the wider development of the remaining land at the Northern Gateway. The development of this site has otherwise stalled since it was first agreed (in 2015), and planned for longer, and needs unlocking as it meets the Council's key objectives for the growth of the Northern Gateway to:

- support wider economic growth targets and deliver infrastructure to enable regeneration,
- create a new destination within the Borough to promote new sports participation and provide a regional quality leisure experience,
- generate significant new income streams to support the Council to maintain quality services with social value.

This development is even more important now, given the economic impacts of the global pandemic, and the economic road to recovery.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Colchester Borough Council could refuse to collaborate on any amendment to the approved scheme and maintain a status quo. This option would not see the site come forward at present, with the current operator that the Council has entered into the Agreement with in 2015.

The Council could sell the freehold of the land, which would generate a capital receipt; but would lose control of the site, have no guarantee that would bring development forward faster, or preserve as much control over quality, and would not provide an ongoing revenue stream to support Council services beyond the capital receipt.

The Council could refuse to amend the financial structure of the development as set out in the accompanying Part B report (not detailed in this public report due to the inherent commercial sensitivity of any land transactions and development proposals). However, this would constrain the development outcomes achieved on this important site, which would then remain a legacy for the lifetime of the development; or would mean a reduced income to the Council that would not meet best value for disposals of a site by a public authority (meaning such a deal would not be possible and the current agreement for developing the site would probably need to be abandoned entirely).

551. Colchester Town Deal

The Assistant Director, Place and Client Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Coleman attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet to stress that a Youth Zone must be delivered from the Town Deal funding as this was the best opportunity the Council would have to develop a Youth Zone. The benefits of a Youth Zone were stressed. There was comparatively little provision of youth services within the borough and it would provide a safe place for young people to meet. It would help them develop academically, physically and mentally. There would also be benefits in terms of reduction in anti-social behaviour, improved health outcomes, potential regeneration of

town centre site, increased footfall in the town centre and the development of a feeling of unity amongst young people in Colchester. Youth Zones had proved resilient financially through the pandemic so there was nothing to fear in financial terms.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, thanked Councillor Coleman for his work in promoting the concept of a Youth Zone in Colchester. The Heads of Terms which had been agreed by the We Are Colchester Board made reference to the provision of a youth facility, but there was still some way to go and a process to be followed before any schemes were agreed. Councillor King explained that the Cabinet were invited to agree the Heads of Terms in addition to the other recommendations in the Assistant Director's report.

Matthew Brown, Economic Development Projects Manager, made a presentation to Cabinet highlighting that Colchester had been awarded £18.6 million as part of the Town Deal. Whilst slightly less than was bid for this was an extraordinary opportunity for Colchester. Other sources of funding were being looked at so that all the projects identified by the Town Deal Board could be delivered. The range of the projects and the benefits they would bring was highlighted. These included town centre projects and a large scheme in Greenstead, together with projects to improve links to the town centre. Each specific project would be reviewed and projects prioritised to deliver the maximum benefits and outcomes for Colchester within the funding available.

Councillor Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing, thanked the officers involved and the Town Deal Board for their work in securing this award. It would help the Council deliver its strategic priorities and help preserve iconic sites such as Holy Trinity Church and Jumbo. Councillor Coleman's arguments about the lack of youth provision on Colchester were endorsed. The digital skills hub would help provide support for young people. The improved cycling infrastructure was also welcomed, as was the support for affordable housing.

Councillor J. Young expressed her support for the investment in Greenstead, which was a community that had been left behind. The funding would provide the opportunity to revive the Tamarisk Way development scheme which would provide 139 high-quality new houses, a community hub and attractive public space in the centre of this community. It would also help provide more effective and joined up delivery of public services. The proposals had been developed with community involvement.

Councillor Higgins, Portfolio for Commercial Services, stressed the importance of provision of youth services and emphasised the need to ensure that the possibility of a Youth Zone was properly examined.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, emphasised that this a transformational step change that would deliver improvements in a number of connected ways. Additional funding and the process to secure a Youth Zone would be looked at further. It had been a collective effort and he thanked both partners and officers for their work in securing the award. Cabinet was invited to take the next steps by agreeing the Head of Terms.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The principles of the 'We are Colchester' programme and its future governance and management be noted and agreed and the specific projects which were submitted within our Town Investment Plan be noted.
- (b) The draft Heads of Terms for the Colchester Town Deal be approved and authority to sign the Heads of Terms be delegated to the Chief Executive.
- (c) Colchester Borough Council's ongoing commitment to the Town Deal Programme be agreed, including contributing to and overseeing the development of a suite of business cases that build on the project concepts that were submitted within the Town Investment Plan; throughout 2021.
- (d) The proposed governance, committee, and accountability arrangements for Colchester Borough Council in its role as accountable body to the resultant capital programme including S151 approval, in the programme delivery timeframe to 2026 be agreed.
- (e) Colchester Borough Council's ongoing role as secretariat to Town Deal Board be noted.
- (f) It be noted that as part of the next stages work of developing full business cases, full consideration will be given to the ongoing revenue implications of for example the maintenance and management of physical assets created through this programme, notably enhanced public realm and green infrastructure.
- (g) The principle whereby the costs of developing business cases are recovered from the overall Town Deal funding allocations from Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government be noted
- (h) The partnership structures which are in place and planned to facilitate the development of next stages of work (Business Case) be noted.
- (i) It be noted that development of Business Cases (throughout 2021) will include significant and on-going engagement and consultation.

REASONS

The prompt acceptance and completion of our Heads of Terms Agreement with Government will enable Colchester Borough Council as the lead Local Authority to proceed to the delivery phase of the 'We are Colchester' programme quickly and effectively. Thereafter, delivery of this programme will greatly boost Colchester's

opportunities to realise its economic development, place-making, inward investment, and regeneration ambitions now and on a long-term basis, through delivery of a specific programme of coherent, targeted interventions.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options have been presented to Cabinet. Town Deal is recognised as a once in a generation opportunity for Colchester, and there are no other current or anticipated sources of funding and investment of comparable size and scope. Some of the interventions proposed in the Town Investment Plan see Town Deal as the funder of last resort as they are unlikely to attract suitable investment from other sources; and cannot be funded within the council's resources, particularly in the light of the current financial situation arising from Covid-19.

552. Decarbonisation and Regeneration of Rowan House

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, introduced the report and explained that the proposals would be a great step forward in helping the Council meet its carbon reduction targets, would help transform a tired office building and would reflect changes in working practices, whilst providing a better working environment for officers. The proposals should be cost neutral and he paid tribute to officers for bringing forward the proposals so quickly, given the other priorities the Council was facing.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The works outlined in the Assistant Director's report to reduce the carbon footprint of Rowan House be approved.
- (b) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Corporate and Improvement, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources to undertake appropriate procurement in line with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and to award contracts to contractors that score highest against evaluation criteria within the approved budget.
- (c) The revised use of Rowan House as detailed in the Assistant Director's report be approved, including transforming the way the Council uses the building and to release a floor that can be leased to generate income to fund regeneration of the building.

REASONS

To reduce the Council's carbon footprint and support the transformation of Rowan House and our model of office-based working.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The alternative would be to not conduct works to decarbonise Rowan House and to not transform the way the building is used. This would mean the Council would not be able to

deliver against net zero carbon commitments previously made.

553. Capital Expenditure Monitor Quarter 3 2020/21

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, introduced the report and explained that spend on the capital programme had been less than anticipated as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic. A number of projects had been significantly delayed. The forecast for 2021/22 had been adjusted to take account of these delays. The report also proposed new investment in medically qualified staff to enable the Disabled Facilities Grant programme to move forward.

RESOLVED that progress on the 2020/21 capital programme as set out in the Assistant Director's report be approved.

REASONS

To demonstrate that spending on projects is within agreed scheme budgets,

To evidence timely project delivery supporting service objectives.

To evidence that the Council makes good use of its available capital resources in accordance with the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and statutory requirements.

To provide assurance that key risks of the capital programme are being managed whilst achieving efficient and effective delivery.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were proposed.

554. Approval of application for Homes England Investment Partner Status or to join a consortium for the opportunity to bid for Affordable Housing Grant

The Assistant Director, Place and Client Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing, introduced the report and explained that the Council wanted to explore a funding opportunity from Homes England to maximise affordable housing provision over the longer term. Homes England Affordable Homes Programme would make £7.39 billion available to deliver affordable homes in England from April 2021. This could be applied for either by securing Investment Partner Status or through joining a consortium to bid with others. The Council had a good track record of securing funding and working with other parties to deliver its objectives.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The Council explore the option of an Investment Partner Status application or join a

consortium to enable the Council to bid for an allocation of grant funding from the Affordable Homes Programme 2021-2026 and other subsequent programmes.

(b) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Place and Client Services to approve bids to Homes England for grant funding for the Affordable Homes Programme 2021-2026.

(c) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Place and Client Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing to consider the obligations and benefits of committing to a funding allocation with Homes England and to enter into a grant agreement as an Investment Partner or through a consortium, if it is beneficial for the Council to do so.

REASONS

In January 2019, the Council agreed to explore potential schemes that could deliver up to 350 new council homes over 5 years to 2024, borrowing up to £75m which would deliver the first newbuild Council Homes since the Phase 1 Garage sites were developed in 2015.

The Council's affordable homes programme is gaining pace and developing a track record with increasing certainty of delivery, so it is the appropriate time for the Council to explore the funding opportunities available to make best use of existing resources and maximise the number of affordable homes that can be delivered.

If the Council gains Investment Partner Status or joins a consortium, it can bid for Affordable Housing Grant to subsidise some of the affordable housing in its development programme up to 2026 and will also be well placed to bid for funding in future affordable homes programmes; ultimately reducing the borrowing requirement within the HRA.

The Council already has an ongoing relationship with Homes England. Delivering through the 2021-26 Affordable Homes Programme with Homes England will build on that relationship and will demonstrate that the Council is committed to delivering additional affordable homes in the borough and is willing to explore opportunities to maximise delivery.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Not to apply for Investment Partner Status or join a consortium to bid for Affordable Housing Grant. This would mean that the Council would not have the opportunity to receive funding from the Homes England Affordable Homes Programmes.

The Council can continue to deliver all newbuild affordable housing using its own resources and will not utilise any additional grant funding to make the Council's own resources go further.

The Council can decide to apply for Investment Partner Status or join a consortium and bid for funding in the future, but this will mean that it could miss out on the opportunity for grant funding towards the Phase 3 garage sites or the development of any other additional

homes in the immediate future.

555. Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd (CCHL) Business Plans 2021 - 2024

The Assistant Director for Place and Client Services submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member together with draft minute 248 of the Governance and Audit Committee meeting of 21 January 2021.

Councillor Higgins, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, stressed that the Council's commercial companies' achievements had been remarkable. They had continued to deliver a dividend to the Council despite the challenges of the pandemic. The Business Plans for 2021-24 had been scrutinised by the Governance and Audit Committee in their role as the shareholder committee. She expressed her thanks to officers of both the Council and the Companies, but highlighted the contribution of Andrew Tyrrell, Client and Business Manager.

Councillor Barlow, Chair of the Board of Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd, also addressed Cabinet. Whilst 2019-20 had been a very challenging year, Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd and its subsidiary companies had coped very well. Thanks were due to the Governance and Audit Committee, for their work as shareholder committee, and to the staff of the companies. It was emphasised that the Council retained full control of the companies and was able to direct their activities to ensure the retention of a public sector ethos and to ensure the maximum benefits to residents.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The new Colchester Commercial (Holdings) Limited Business Plan for 2021-24, and those for the subsidiary companies be agreed.
- (b) Given current global uncertainties, to shift to a 'rolling' three-year Business Plan period model to replace the set three-year Business Plan period used for 2018-2021.
- (c) The achievements of the Council's companies in 2020/21 and the ongoing governance arrangements which are in place be noted.

REASONS

The Governance and Audit Committee, as the shareholder committee for Colchester Commercial (Holdings) Limited (and its subsidiaries), has recommended that the Business Plans be agreed. The Cabinet has reviewed this recommendation, alongside the performance information and Business Plans of the companies, and agrees with the views of the shareholder committee.

The Cabinet has satisfaction regarding the companies' performance to date and, importantly, the forecast continuation of their business over the next three years. The Business Plans align to the Strategic Plan of the Council and will lead actions on many of the priorities that Council wishes to advance. This includes, but is not exclusive to, the economic recovery of Colchester, place-making, climate change, housing event and other important development that provides the infrastructure that the community will need over coming years.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Not to agree the Business Plans which would mean that alternative Business Plans would then be required, contrary to the recommendations of the shareholder committee.

Not to change to a rolling Business Plan period which may mean that some of the assumptions made now have change over the next 3 years, but are not reflected as agilely, and again be contrary to the recommendations of the shareholder committee.

556. Corporate Key Performance Indicator Targets 2021/22

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor J. Young, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Performance, introduced the report and explained that Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were part of the Council's robust corporate performance monitoring framework. The performance against KPIs was regularly reported and scrutinised by the Scrutiny Panel. It was proposed that a number of KPI targets be changed to make them more appropriate and to challenge and stretch performance. This supported the Council's ambition to deliver high performing services. The proposed targets would also be considered by the Scrutiny Panel at a meeting later in the month.

RESOLVED that the Corporate KPI Targets for 2021-2022 be set as proposed in the Assistant Director's report.

REASONS

To ensure there is a robust corporate performance monitoring framework.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

To consider alternative KPI Targets than those proposed.

557. Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill

Draft minute 18 of the Environmental and Sustainability Panel meeting of 28 January 2021 was submitted. a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Cory, as Chair of the Environment and Sustainability Panel, explained that the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill had been brought forward by Caroline Lucas MP and was currently supported by 108 MPs, representing all the major political parties. The Bill sought to introduce a legal framework to ensure the delivery of targets on carbon emissions which were currently aspirational.

RESOLVED that the following motion on the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill be approved and adopted:-

“Motion to Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill

Preamble

Humans have already caused irreversible climate change, the impacts of which are being felt in the UK and around the world. Global temperatures have increased by 1 degree Celsius from pre-industrial levels. Atmospheric CO₂ levels are above 400 parts per million (ppm) and continue to rise. This far exceeds the 350ppm deemed to be a safe level for humanity.

Without more significant and sustained action, the world is set to exceed the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C limit between 2030 and 2040. Therefore the current UK target of net zero by 2050 is not satisfactory. It is too little too late.

The increase in harm caused by a rise of 2°C rather than 1.5°C is significant. This is described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C published in October 2018. According to the IPCC, limiting heating to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector and local communities. The costs of failing to address this crisis will far outstrip the investments required to prevent it. Investing now will bring many benefits in the form of good jobs, breathable cities and thriving communities.

Council notes that

- i. This council has declared a climate and ecological emergency;
- ii. Many local authorities have established Citizens' Assemblies that are playing an important role in assisting them in their plans to achieve net zero by 2030 or before; and that
- iii. There is a Bill before Parliament—the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill (published as the "Climate and Ecology Bill")—according to which the Government must develop an emergency strategy that:
 - a. requires that the UK plays its fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial temperatures;
 - b. ensures that all the UK's consumption emissions are accounted for;
 - c. includes emissions from aviation and shipping;
 - d. protects and restores biodiverse habitats along overseas supply chains;
 - e. restores and regenerates the UK's depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, maximising their capacity to absorb CO₂ and their resistance to climate heating;
 - f. sets up an independent Citizens' Assembly, representative of the UK's population, to engage with Parliament and Government and help develop the emergency strategy.

Council therefore resolves to:

- i. Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill
- ii. Inform the local media of this decision;
- iii. Write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill; and
- iv. Write to the [CEE Bill Alliance](#), the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, expressing its support (campaign@ceebill.uk)."

REASONS

Cabinet supported the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill which sought to introduce a legal framework to ensure the delivery of targets on carbon emissions which were currently aspirational.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

It was open to Cabinet not to approve and adopt the motion.

558. Policy Panel recommendation on Grounds Maintenance Contract Review

The Assistant Director, Environment, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member together with the draft resolution from the Policy Panel meeting of 3 March 2021.

Councillor McCarthy, Chair of the Policy Panel, attended and addressed the Cabinet. He welcomed the collaborative approach that the Policy Panel had taken to their consideration of this matter and the contributions all members of the Panel had made. Grounds Maintenance was one of the Council's main externalized services. The contract with Idverde was due to expire in October 2023 and was worth £10.4 million. The Panel had been invited to review the possible future operating models and make a recommendation to Cabinet. In doing so it should consider aims of a community asset based service, a service that demonstrated exemplary management of the environment, ensured budget control and was transformative.

The Panel had held a number of workshops and had conducted a survey of 32 partners, members of the Panel and the Environment and Sustainability Panel. The Panel had also been well supported by the Association of Public Service Excellence. The conclusion of the review was that an in-house service model was the most appropriate way forward and the best way of securing the aims set out. It was felt this was the best way of enabling residents and ensuring they were able to report issues directly, so services reflected their priorities. This conclusion was not based on financial considerations alone. Whilst Idverde provided a generally good service there was evidence that KPI monitoring was not as effective as it could be.

Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation and Councillor Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing expressed their support for the proposals. An inhouse solution would secure community engagement and enable the most care to be taken with service delivery without reference to other priorities. It would also best secure the involvement of local residents in the delivery of the service and the upkeep of their local areas.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The recommendation of the Policy Panel, at this pre-business case stage, of a new in-house operating model to deliver grounds maintenance as described in Assistant Director's report, be supported.
- (b) A detailed business case be brought back to Policy Panel for review before final recommendations go to Cabinet for a formal decision on the operating model to be delivered at the end of the current Grounds Maintenance contract.

(c) At this pre-business case stage, a report to Cabinet be taken forward with the recommendation of a new in-house operating model to deliver grounds maintenance as described in the report received by the Policy Panel its meeting on 3 March 2021.

REASONS

A review of the current service, consultation with various stakeholders on the objectives of a future delivery model of the ground's maintenance service and analysis on different operating models has been undertaken. The Policy Panel have determined an in-house operating model as described within the Assistant Director's report is the preferred route.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Alternative delivery model options have been explored by the Policy Panel as part of the review process and are set out within the Assistant Director's report.

A robust approach from outline to full business case development will be followed. If at any stage this process identifies the need to stop or review the progression of the recommended model of delivery, then arrangements will be put in place to consider again potential alternatives based on information that comes to light through the detailed business case planning process.

559. Progress of Responses to the Public

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services, submitted a progress sheet a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

RESOLVED that the contents of the Progress Sheet be noted.

REASONS

The progress sheet was a mechanism by which the Cabinet could ensure that public statements and questions were responded to appropriately and promptly.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were presented to the Cabinet.

560. Councillor Higgins

Councillor Higgins indicated that this would be her last meeting before she retired at the local elections in May 2021. She wanted to take the opportunity to thank her Councillor colleagues and officers for the support and help they had provided to her in her long and enjoyable period of service. Councillor Cory, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, thanked her for her service.

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to

Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

561. Minutes – Not for publication extract

RESOLVED that the not for publication extract from the minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

562. Update on the “Turnstone “ Development at Colchester Northern Gateway

The Strategic Director, Policy and Place, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The Council enter into the new “Turnstone” Development Agreement to reflect changes since the Development Agreement was entered into with TEL.
- (b) Authority be delegated to the Strategic Director of Policy and Place and the Chief Executive of the Council to finalise the negotiation of and complete a Deed of Variation to the Development Agreement and all other necessary legal documentation, in consultation, with the Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, the Portfolio Holder for Commercial, the Monitoring Officer and the Head of Finance.

REASONS

The Colchester Northern Gateway is a prestigious development for the town provided by the Council, that has been planned over the last decade. This growth area is now coming forwards at an increasing rate, with the Council's new Sport Park now completed and due to open in April 2021, as well as commencement of “The Walk” linking to existing developments such as David Lloyd (opposite the Turnstone site). The “Turnstone” development therefore delivers a fundamental part of a much wider, strategic mixed-use development at the CNG South site with a heat Network, and highway improvements including the Rapid Transit System (RTS).

The development of this site is very important; as a visually prominent gateway location into Colchester from junction 28 on the A12, and a key catalyst for the wider development of the remaining land at the Northern Gateway. The development of this site has otherwise stalled since it was first agreed (in 2015), and planned for longer, and needs unlocking as it meets the Council's key objectives for the growth of the Northern Gateway to:

- support wider economic growth targets and deliver infrastructure to enable regeneration,
- create a new destination within the Borough to promote new sports participation and provide a regional quality leisure experience
- generate significant new income streams to support the Council to maintain quality services with social value.

This development is even more important now, given the economic impacts of the global pandemic, and the economic road to recovery.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The Council could refuse to collaborate on any amendment to the approved scheme and maintain a status quo. This option would not see the site come forward at present, with the current operator that the Council has entered into the Agreement with in 2015.

The Council could sell the freehold of the land, which would generate a capital receipt; but would lose control of the site and have no guarantee that would bring forward any development faster, or preserve as much control over quality, and would not provide an ongoing revenue stream to support Council services beyond the capital receipt.

The Cabinet resolved under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements)(Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012 to exclude the public from the meeting for the following item as it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

563. Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd (CCHL) Business Plans 2021 - 2024

The Assistant Director, Place and Client Services, submitted appendices to the report considered at minute 553, constituting the Business Plans of Colchester Amphora Trading Ltd, Colchester Amphora Energy Limited and Colchester Amphora Housing Limited, copies of which had been circulated to each Member.

RESOLVED that Cabinet noted that the updated Business Plans 2018-2021 for Colchester Commercial (Holdings) Limited and its 3 subsidiary companies had been approved under minute 553.

REASONS

As at minute 553.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

As at minute 553.

Cabinet

Item
7(i)

9th June 2021

Report of	Assistant Director Place and Client Services	Author	Matthew Brown ☎ 507348
Title	Queen Street Grow-on & Digital Working Hub facility		
Wards affected	Castle Ward		

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks Cabinet approval for delegation of the key contracts for the delivery of the 43 Queen Street Grow-on scheme and digital working hub to the Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage. The report also provides a general update on this scheme.
- 1.3 The core 43 Queen Street Grow-on scheme provides much-needed enterprise infrastructure. It responds to a long-standing identified need and market failure; providing local businesses in the creative and digital sector of the economy wishing to expand with attractive, affordable accommodation. In turn, this enables business incubation facilities such as the adjacent 37 Queen Street Business Centre to fulfil their primary role; stimulating churn and thus generating new start-up businesses and local jobs growth.
- 1.4 This scheme will form a key part of the Town's employment and enterprise infrastructure and plays a key role within the St Botolph's regeneration programme. It recently received planning and grant funding approval, and is now progressing towards final delivery.
- 1.5 With the recent confirmation of Colchester's 'Town Deal' award from Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG); the scope, outputs, impact, and profile of this scheme are significantly magnified. The Town Deal funding enables this scheme to incorporate Colchester's first digital working hub, and stimulates Colchester's emerging 5G connectivity; greatly increasing the innovation, appeal and added value of the facility.
- 1.6 To summarise the planned key milestones in this project:
 - Develop business case for the integral Digital Working Hub and 5G infrastructure (*as part of the Town Deal 'fast track' projects): Summer to Autumn 2021.
 - Prepare supplemental planning application for; and commence preparatory on-site works (demolition of existing structures etc): Summer 2021.
 - Complete further on-site surveys as required. Finalise design and prepare construction tender: Summer 2021.
 - Construction: Summer 2021-Summer 2022.
 - Normal operation commences: Late summer 2022.

2. Recommended Decision

- 2.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:
- a) Agrees to delegate decisions on all consequential matters related to the 43 Queen Street Grow-on scheme and digital working hub and therefrom, including contractual, financial, and legal, to the Assistant Director, Place and Client.
 - b) Agrees to the proposed approach to appointment of a managing operator for the new facility, via a delegation to the Assistant Director for Place and Client in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage.
 - c) Notes the general updates provided in this report which supplement the related report presented to and approved by the cabinet meeting held on Wednesday 27th January 2021.

3. Reason for Recommended Decision

- 3.1 Progress of this programme meets a long-standing local and regional need to provide space for businesses to grow. This facility will substantially boost the capacity and capability for small businesses in the vital creative and digital sector to expand. This will bring significant job creation to the town and alleviate pressure on business start-up or incubation facilities.

The integral Digital Working Hub and 5G sub-projects (funded under the Town Deal programme) significantly boost the attractiveness, distinctiveness, and quality of this facility. Together these innovative features maximise the scope of this scheme to stimulate the tech sector of the local economy; recognised as crucial to its diversification.

The facility will play a vital role in helping to retain the boroughs highly skilled residents; boosting skills, increasing the availability of training and employment opportunities, and inspiring our young people. The scheme helps the town centre diversify through new uses, and complements recent investment in this recognised regeneration zone.

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 No alternative options have been presented to Cabinet. The business case for the core 43 Queen Street grow-on scheme, associated grant funding and planning application have been approved. Colchester's Town Deal (which encompasses the digital working hub and 5G projects) has been approved and Heads of Terms signed by MHCLG, the council and the Town Deal Board chair.

5. Background Information

- 5.1 Following the approvals outlined in 4.1 above, the project is now moving into its delivery phase. To enable this, a number of contracts will need to be entered into between the council and a number of suppliers.

- 5.2 No further contract for architecture is required, as the architect who undertook the concept, pre-application and planning application stages of scheme design will also undertake the final stages of design.
- 5.3 A contract will need to be developed and then entered into between the council and a contractor for the main construction phase of the scheme, so this report seeks approval to delegate the authority to enter this contract to the Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage.
- 5.4 A separate contract covering the managing and operation of the new facility is being prepared and a tender process for this will begin shortly. The intention is to appoint a single managing operator who will be responsible for day-to-day operation of the building, developing the brand/identity and vision of the facility, and attracting and retaining tenants.
- 5.5 This managing operator will also play a key role (in partnership with the council) in developing the final vision and specification of the digital working hub / 5G facilities. Once the facility opens to tenants and users, they will manage and monitor the delivery of the outcomes and outputs prescribed in the final business case which was approved under South East Local Enterprise Partnership's 'Local Growth Fund' programme.
- 5.6 The specific digital working hub / 5G facilities will be developed through the preparation of a business case as part of the Town Deal programme. Following a project confirmation submission to MHCLG in June 2021, detailed business case development for all Town Deal projects commences. There is an imperative for all business cases to have been developed no later than March 2022, at which time formal letters of approval must be submitted to MHCLG in readiness for initial release of funds. Appropriate reports will be brought to Cabinet in a timely manner to reflect such programme milestones.
- 5.7 Elements of the overall 43 Queen Street scheme may include (dependent on viability and demand) one or more of virtual/augmented reality studio facilities and development space, digital music production facilities, digital video production and broadcast facilities, digital maker space. From its inception, the building will have 10Gb broadband connectivity installed, a first for Colchester and the region.
- 5.8 It was reported in the January 2021 cabinet report that this scheme creates an unsupported revenue pressure in the early years of operation where annual scheme costs initially exceed scheme income. This risk has now been fully mitigated; as the Town Deal funding includes a small revenue allowance (max 10%), part of which can be used to bridge this initial revenue funding shortfall.
- 5.9 The planning application for this scheme was approved under delegated authority in February 2021. Whilst the general design and external treatment of the building notably its front and rear elevations were covered in detail through the planning approval process, the final internal designs and layout are under development and will be finalised in partnership with the managing agent once appointed, to ensure they support all the specific uses which the building will need to accommodate (see 5.6 above).

6. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

- 6.1 Consideration has been given to equality and diversity issues in respect of this scheme through the development of the final business case which included an Equality Impact Assessment.
- 6.2 CBC will ensure that all remaining work required to bring this scheme to final delivery including all contracts for management & operation and final design include further and more detailed Equality Impact Assessment, including ensuring engagement and consultation with key user groups and representatives.

7. Strategic Plan References

- 7.1 The following Strategic Plan (2020-2023) references are relevant to this scheme:

Growing a fair economy so everyone benefits:

- Ensure our borough becomes stronger post Covid-19 by supporting businesses to recover, adapt and build resilience.
- Work with partners to facilitate a high skill, high wage, low carbon workforce.
- Work with our partners to enable Colchester town centre to be more vibrant, resilient, and adaptable to future change.
- Tackle local skills shortages working with businesses, University of Essex, Colchester Institute, and other partners.

Work with partners to deliver a shared vision for a vibrant town:

- Work with partners to deliver a shared vision for a vibrant town.
- Continue to regenerate Colchester Town Centre using Council assets, aligned private investment, the Town Deal and Town Investment Plan.

Create an environment that attracts inward investment to Colchester and help businesses to flourish:

- Ensure our strategy for inclusive economic growth supports the ambitions outlined in the North Essex Growth Strategy, the Local Industrial Strategy, and our Town Deal.
- Ensure a good supply of employment land and premises to attract new businesses and allow existing firms to expand and thrive.
- Ensure the Council's assets continue to contribute to economic growth and opportunity.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 The scheme was developed through consultation with Historic England, Planning, and key local stakeholders. Further discussions have been held with key local businesses, BID board, and other sector and local representatives.

- 8.2 Further consultation will be undertaken throughout the remaining stages of finalising the detailed design and scope of the facility including the development of the business cases for the Town Deal funded elements of the scheme and the project delivery plan.

9. Publicity Considerations

- 9.1 None specific to this report. The scheme is subject to a communications and engagement plan.

10. Financial implications

- 10.1 The financial parameters of the core 43 Queen Street Grow-on scheme were set out in the January 2021 cabinet report. The scheme, which is majority grant funded will provide an attractive new building, delivering a dynamic business space which will create jobs and develop new business in line with the Council's strategic priorities as set out above.
- 10.2 The operational phase of the core grow-on scheme will be delivered firmly within the principles of financial sustainability, whereby its long-term costs of operation, maintenance and upkeep are fully met by income derived from the users and tenants of the facility. Thus it does not create any unsupported revenue pressure for the Council.
- 10.3 Whilst the Town Deal funded elements of the project are yet to have their business cases developed, these features will also be developed and delivered within the financial resources available, and the council and partners will look to leverage wider and private sector investment alongside the core MHCLG funding where practicable.
- 10.4 As outlined in the January 2021 cabinet report, the capital costs of the core 43 Queen Street grow-on scheme are being met through a combination of the SE LEP Local Growth Fund grant secured, and council's Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing, also agreed through the January 2021 cabinet report approval.
- 10.5 The scheme is expected to make a small positive financial return once the operation has been established. The anticipated unsupported revenue pressure in the initial years of operation due to the difference between expenditure and income can and will legitimately be met and mitigated through deploying part of the Town Deal funding.

11. Health, Wellbeing and Community Safety Implications

- 11.1 There are no specific implications but generally the proposal aims to promote positive health and well-being for our residents.

12. Health and Safety Implications

- 12.1 There are no specific concerns at this stage of the development of the scheme. Risk will be identified and assessed as part of the project delivery process.

13. Risk Management Implications

- 13.1 No implications are identified at this stage. A risk register has been prepared for the core 43 Queen Street grow-on scheme as a component of developing the business case. The supplemental work to develop the associated business cases for Digital Working Hub and 5G facilities will include risk management.

14. Environmental and Sustainability Implications

- 14.1 Environmental and sustainability considerations are considered of paramount importance and are a cross-cutting theme within the Town Investment Plan. The scheme will be considered in relation to the Climate Emergency Action Plan to ensure that the Council's climate change, environmental and sustainability ambitions and policies are actively addressed and promoted throughout the development of the scheme.

Located close to several transport hubs and planned walking & cycling infrastructure, the scheme strongly supports the councils travel planning policies including promoting active and sustainable travel. The energy performance of the building will be considered and optimised within the final technical specification of the building.

Appendices: None.

Background Papers: None.

Extract from the draft minutes of the Scrutiny Panel meeting of 18 March 2021

297. Review of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on Colchester Borough Council's Strategic Arts Partners: The Mercury Theatre, Colchester Arts Centre and Firstsite.

The Chairman welcomed guests and viewers and gave an overview of the range of dynamic arts organisations operating within the Borough, and the invaluable outreach work that they carried out for the Borough's communities.

Councillor Julie Young, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Performance and Deputy Leader of the Council, described the Council's investment in the Borough's cultural organisations. These organisations were held up to be important to the future recovery of the Borough and the Council was proud of the partnership working that was carried out between them and the Council. Additional investments were being made to ensure Colchester provided the best possible cultural offerings.

Steve Mannix, Chief Executive of the Mercury Theatre, highlighted the diverse programme of activities provided by his organisation. The Mercury had also worked to provide support to those who depended on it for work, including the setting up of a hardship fund for casual and freelance members of staff. This fund had totalled around £45k.

118 online events had been carried out by the Mercury during the pandemic. A pantomime had been held and viewed 419,000 times, with free screenings provided to care homes. Fundraising was being carried out to enable the Theatre to conduct future live-screened events. 214 creative engagement sessions had been held during the past year. A syndicated production had also been possible with the BBC.

21 new jobs had been created to support the Theatre's work, with funding provided by the European Support Fund. Engagement with schools had been carried out and the Theatre had worked with 19 disabled young people to achieve nationally recognised qualifications.

The pandemic had caused a delay of around seven months to the Mercury Rising project, but as much progress was carried out as had been possible, and 25 April had been set as the expected completion date. £864k had been obtained from the government's cultural funding, and details were provided on the slides shown to the Panel. However, the Chief Executive informed the Panel that the Theatre was now being let down by Essex County Council, which was withdrawing its funding.

The Theatre had worked with the Business Improvement District and the One Colchester Partnership, seconding its staff to assist with communications work and support for the Council, providing volunteers to help foodbanks, local schools and in producing items of personal protective equipment.

Anthony Roberts, Director of Colchester Arts Centre, described the engagements that the Centre had carried out during the past year, which had reached a total of around 219,000 personal engagements with members of the public. 136,000 of these had been via social media. 45,000 people had attended events in person prior to the outbreak of Covid-19, and social media engagement had increased the reach of the Arts Centre and this had been recognised and had encouraged the Centre to find new ways to engage with the public in the future. This could include events, free events, day sessions, clubs and outreach activities. The Arts Centre wished to not only provide performances, but also to find ways to start conversations regarding artistic activities.

A song contest had been held during lockdown, allowing the performance of 30 new artists' works, films had been commissioned, poetry workshops held, and carol shows performed. John Cooper Clarke had held an online show. This had all been carried out whilst £800k of work had been carried out to the Arts Centre's venue, to upgrade the building.

Sally Shaw, Director of Firstsite, emphasised the creative agility which had been necessary over the past twelve months. This included reaching out to artists to ask if they could help Firstsite to help people at home to engage with different artistic forms and activities. Firstsite had worked with national, regional and local artists to produce activity packs to engage people with the arts. There had been a huge spike in the email circulation list going into lockdown, when the first pack had been produced, and a second spike when the second action pack released. The list had gone from around 11,000 email addresses to around 45,000. Activity packs had been downloaded by around 90,000 households. Each one helped to publicise Colchester's arts and had contributed to an increase in new people visiting Firstsite betwixt lockdowns.

Whilst open, Firstsite had conducted its Holiday Club, providing days of free family activities and food. 7,500 meals had been provided since the Club had started, with around 1,500 being provided in Summer 2020. Tate Modern had invited Firstsite to conduct a canteen/meal club in the Turbine Hall in Summer 2021. Firstsite were also looking to replicate the Holiday Club in ten other arts facilities in Essex and were looking for partners in this work.

The Director of Firstsite warned that Essex County Council funding for Firstsite would now end at the end of March, and that their help was desperately needed in order to ensure that Firstsite could continue its art and outreach activities for local communities.

Future work planned included 'The Great Big Artist Exhibition', upcoming shows and works and a continuing project, across Colchester and Ipswich hospitals, to talk with staff and capture their experiences of the past year. These accounts would be displayed, with pictures, to show what life had been like for NHS staff and Covid-19 patients. Counsellors would be on-hand to engage with those affected.

Karen Loweman, Director of Operations at Colchester Borough Homes, emphasised and agreed with the importance and impact of art outreach work to improve life for many residents of Council-owned properties.

The Panel discussed the work of the three organisations over the past year, praising the new ways found to do things that could be kept going, and which engaged with thousands. This had provided people with much needed positivity during lockdowns.

The guests were asked how much of their organisations' future work would involve online productions, outreach work and activities, and whether this was likely to be financially viable.

Tracey Childs, Co-Chief Executive of The Mercury, confirmed that there would be future livestreaming carried out, following on from this having been used during lockdown, including to nursing homes, children and vulnerable individuals. There would be difficulties in obtaining permission to livestream performances (outside of lockdown) and the Theatre was seeking funding to obtain the technology to create inhouse streaming opportunities. It was noted that the provision of high-speed broadband in the Town centre would be key to making this possible.

The Panel praised the work on survival and finding new ways to continue to provide artistic work.

A specific question was asked as to whether the cost overruns reported on the Mercury Rising had been borne by the contractors, the Council or by the Theatre itself. The Chief Executive of The Mercury stressed that there had been no precedent to the Covid-19 situation and that best endeavours had been made to keep capital building projects going. Teams had been able to operate at around 25% the expected rate because of restrictions on workplaces. Most of the project funding had been from Government and Arts funds so overruns had had limited effect on the Theatre or the Council. The project would finish on time and on budget.

Concern was raised by one Panel member regarding the ending of funding from Essex County Council, and the effect that this would have on the arts organisations. The guests were asked what had been discussed and planned for regarding their future financial situations. Sally Shaw, Firstsite Director, elaborated on the situation, explaining that the withdrawal of funding from the County Council would see £100k lost from the budget of Firstsite. The organisations affected were creative and determined to find ways to cope but would find it difficult to absorb the lost funding and did not want to lose the partnership working which had been conducted with Essex County Council. This would be even more of a loss than the cancelled funding. It had been shown that ideas such as the Holiday Fun programme had been heavily in demand and work would be done to sell ideas like this on to other organisations.

[At this point of the meeting, Sally Shaw, Firstsite Director, had to leave the meeting]

Steve Mannix, Chief Executive of the Mercury Theatre, warned that the loss of the connection with Essex County Council would mean the loss of a regional avenue for potential inward investment from larger funding sources and increase the pressure on remaining local funding and Borough Council support. There was currently no

regional tourism strategy and the Chief Executive ventured that it was necessary to produce strategies at sub-regional, regional and national levels.

Members of the Panel praised the quality of the productions made in the Borough, and several members expressed the view that there would be continuing markets for these to be livestreamed and broadcast online. A strong online offering was expected to increase the numbers of people then visiting the venues in person to experience productions. This would then act as an economic driver, with visitors also using local shops and hospitality businesses in the area. The Panel also noted the positive effects of the local economy, such as by contracting local businesses on projects like 'Mercury Rising.' There were also many sources of funding which were not open to the Council, but which were open for applications by the three arts organisations.

A Panel member suggested the Council look at whether it could adopt a procurement model which would help to support local businesses, partners and arts organisations.

The Panel asked for information on the potential for more outdoors performances. Nigel Hildreth, Colchester Arts Centre's Chair of Trustees, explained that various options had been considered, costed and necessary equipment sourced. Some outdoor performances had already been carried out. Steve Mannix detailed carol singing visits carried out by the Mercury, such as to care homes, and explained their outdoor options for the coming Summer. 'Shakespeare in the Park' had been explored as an option, but this had been replaced by performance of 'Baskerville' at the Mercury, with associated events and activities, which could showcase the new building.

Anthony Roberts told the Panel of the Arts Centre's 'Comedy in the Park' events, and noted the possibility of a County-Council funded festival on the green behind St Botolph's.

The Panel and guests discussed the effects of new ways of working on the demographics of audiences. Anthony Roberts confirmed that they had seen changes, although the exact changes were difficult to quantify due to a lack of formal data. It had been possible however to see that the new ways of working during the past year had reached people who had never previously visited the venues. The Panel were informed that the online offerings from The Mercury had reached more younger people and more people with disabilities. Working online, and offering cheaper ticket options, had increased the diversity of audiences and increased uptake by people from lower-income households.

In discussion of the organisations' staffing and use of furlough, the Co-Chief Executive of The Mercury informed the Panel that core staff had continued to work and facilitate the 'Mercury Rising' project, whilst the majority of staff had been furloughed. Social get-togethers had been run online to maintain contact and reduce isolation. Furlough had been very helpful and had helped The Mercury to avoid any redundancies. The advance of grant money from the Council had been very important, especially in the context of around 30% job losses being seen throughout the industry nationwide.

Councillor Julie Young, Portfolio Holder for Performance and Culture, affirmed that the funding from the Borough Council was money well spent and that the organisations worked hard to raise public spirits, provide outreach work and support communities.

Councillor David King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, likewise praised the organisations and thanked them for all their work. He confirmed that the Council was in this partnership for the long term and offered to see if the County Council could be persuaded to resume their funding, as a cross-party effort.

Councillor Adam Fox, Portfolio Holder for Housing, hailed the strength of the partnership working between the organisations, the Council and Colchester Borough Homes [CBH]. CBH project management had helped ensure that the 'Mercury Rising' project stayed on track. With County Council elections in the near future, it was stressed that it was important for Colchester's members of Essex County Council to stand up for local arts organisations.

The importance of sourcing local contractors, where possible, was stressed, with an example being the work planned for the building of new Council housing.

RESOLVED that the PANEL regretted the arts organisations' loss of funding from Essex County Council and was disappointed that the County Council had not responded to calls from the Mercury Theatre for a continuation of funding for the 'Mercury Rising' project.

RECOMMENDED to CABINET that: -

- (a) Cabinet formally recognises the importance of the three art organisations, built on trust and partnership working;
- (b) Cabinet explore whether the procurement model used for the 'Mercury Rising' project can be used more widely by the Council to boost the local economy;
- (c) All councillors be kept informed of all outreach work and events by the arts organisations, to ensure that they can share the great work undertaken within the cultural sector and ensure that those who could benefit from them have the opportunity so to do.

Report of	Assistant Director Corporate & Improvement Services	Author	Hayley McGrath
Title	Request for Delegated Authority to Agree New Insurance Contract		
Wards affected	Not applicable		

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Council operates a wide-ranging insurance portfolio, covering all of its operations and assets. It also procures and manages the insurance arrangements for Colchester Borough Homes, Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd and Colchester Community Stadium Ltd. The majority of the policies are procured on a long-term contract basis (a minimum of three years with an option of a two-year extension) and the current arrangements, which have been extended by the further two years, are due to expire at the end of July.

2. Recommended Decision

- 2.1 To delegate the responsibility for agreeing the new-long term insurance contract(s) to the Portfolio Holder for Resources.

3. Reason for Recommended Decision

- 3.1 The current contracts for insurance expire on 31 July 2021. A tender exercise is therefore currently being carried out by the Council's insurance brokers to obtain quotes for a new package. The results of this exercise are not scheduled to be available from the brokers until late June 2021, which will not allow sufficient time to be able to seek Cabinet approval for the new arrangements, and allow for any potential handover to a new supplier, prior to the expiry of the current contract.

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 The alternative is to request approval of the new contract at the Cabinet meeting on 07 July 2021. Whilst this would be before the expiry of the current contract it would not allow for any handover arrangements to be put in place, if the supplier changes. This could result in the need for the current suppliers to extend cover for a period of time whilst new working processes are implemented, which they are under no obligation to do.

5. Background Information

- 5.1 The current total annual insurance premium is in the region of £950,000.
- 5.2 The Council's insurances are presently split over a number of providers, with one insurer providing the majority of covers and then various other companies providing more specialist insurances. The tender has been split into separate 'lots' for each cover type, which will enable interested providers to quote for either individual policies or the whole contract, depending on the nature of their business. This allows the Council to mix and match policies to put together the most advantageous package in terms of premium and cover levels.
- 5.3 It is anticipated that the Council will enter into three-year contracts (with annual reviews), with the possible option to extend for a further two years.
- 5.4 Historically the only option to purchase insurance cover has been to use the tender process. However, in the last year there has been a suggestion of the creation of a local government insurance mutual, whereby a group of authorities come together and purchase cover collectively from the 'wholesale' insurance market. Effectively creating a new insurer that is owned and run by local authorities.
- 5.5 The Council has expressed an interest in the potential mutual, but it would not be operative in time for the expiry of the current arrangements. Therefore, it is proposed that the Council continues to monitor the development of a mutual, and review the viability of joining it before agreeing any optional extensions in the future.

6. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights implications

- 6.1 There are no equality, diversity and human rights implications. All insurers will be requested to submit details of their equality and diversity policies as part of the tender.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 There are no financial implications from running the tender process however there may be increased costs for the new contracts, and any delay in agreeing new contracts may result in increased costs from the current insurer.

8. Risk Management Implications

- 8.1 If the request to delegate the authority to a Portfolio Holder is not agreed there is the possibility that the Council will subject to increased operating costs whilst new processes are implemented.

9. Health & Safety Implications

- 9.1 Whilst the recommended decision has no direct health and safety implications, there is a requirement for certain insurances to be in place under Health & Safety legislation. A failure to agree an appropriate insurance programme prior to the expiry of the existing contract may lead to a breach of that legislation.

10. Environmental and Sustainability Implications

- 10.1 There are no Environmental and Sustainability implications. All insurers will be requested to submit details of their Environmental and Sustainability policies and assessments as part of the tender.

11. Other Standard References

- 11.1 There are no particular references to the Strategic Plan; publicity or consultation considerations; or Health, Wellbeing and Community Safety implications, but the maintenance of adequate insurance cover is an important aspect of discharging council services.

9 June 2021

Report of	Assistant Director of Corporate and Improvement Services	Author	Richard Clifford/Matthew Evans ☎ 507832/03300 538006
Title	Local Authority Remote Meetings Call for Evidence		
Wards affected	Not Applicable		

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The government has launched a call for evidence on the use of the arrangements which provided express provision for local authorities to hold meetings remotely. This report sets out a proposed response to the call for evidence. This is based on reviews to the Governance and Audit Committee in October 2020 and March 2021.

2. Recommended Decision

- 2.1 To approve the response to the call for evidence at Appendix 1 of this report.

3. Reason for Recommended Decision

- 3.1 The government call for evidence closes on 17 June 2021.
- 3.2 The proposed response highlights the advantages and disadvantages of remote meetings, but based on the evidence of the experience at Colchester Borough Council of remote meetings is supportive of arrangements that would allow all decision making meetings to be held remotely and to allow local authorities to have the flexibility to decide for themselves the circumstances in which they should have the option to meet remotely.

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 No alternative options are recommended.

5. Background Information

- 5.1 The Government has launched a call for evidence about the use of provisions that were put in place for local authorities to meet remotely during the course of the Covid 19 pandemic. These provisions were set out in the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus)(Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings)((England and Wales) Regulations 2020. These regulations enabled local authorities to:
- have flexibility to hold meetings at any time of day and on any day, to alter how frequently meetings can be held and to move or cancel meetings without requiring further notice.
 - to hold meetings remotely. For the purposes of any statutory requirement, members of the local authority are considered as attending a meeting if they can hear, and where practicable see, and be heard and, where practicable, be seen by other members and the public. This allowed for meetings to be held by remote means including via telephone conferencing, video conferencing, live webchat and live streaming. The “where practicable” wording is important because it means that it is not an absolute requirement that every participant can be seen all the time, even when they are speaking.
 - to make standing orders about remote attendance at meetings in relation to voting, access to documents and facilities that can be employed to allow the meeting to be held remotely to suit their own circumstances. (Remote Meetings Procedure Rules and Remote Meetings Protocol were agreed).
 - the “place” at which a local authority meeting is held is not confined to the council building. The “place” may be where the instigator or arranger of the meeting is, or electronic, digital or virtual locations such as internet locations, web addresses or conference call telephone numbers. It could be an officer’s or member’s home.
 - requirements for a meeting being “open to the public” are satisfied by a local authority holding the meeting remotely. This enabled local authorities to facilitate and hold remote meetings outside of the council offices and/or remotely and allows for members of the public to attend remotely.
 - where documents must be “open to inspection”, this is satisfied by the documents being published on the council’s website. Documents include notices, agendas, reports, background papers, minutes etc. The publication, posting or making available of documents at council offices includes publication on the Council’s website. The normal five clear working day notice of publication of agendas continue to apply.

The regulations expired on 7 May 2021.

- 5.2 The Government has received representations from a number of local authorities and local government sector bodies making the case for permanent express provision for remote meetings. Colchester Borough Council made representations supported by all the political groups, for the government to legislate to allow remote meetings to continue. The Government has indicated that it would like to hear from interested parties about the advantages and disadvantages of making such arrangements for remote meetings permanent and the use of the arrangements to date. The call for evidence closes on 17 June 2021 and the government has asked that where possible quantitative data be used to support any responses.

- 5.3 The call for evidence takes the form of list of questions and these questions together with proposed responses, are set out at Appendix 1. The proposed answers are shown in bold.
- 5.4 The Governance and Audit Committee has kept the use of remote meetings under review and received a detailed report to its meeting on 20 October 2020 and an update report on 23 March 2021 covering the issues. The 20 October 2020 report was informed by a survey views from members and those officers in senior management positions or who regularly attended Committee meetings . Members of the public were also invited to comment but no public responses were received. The information gathered for these reports and the conclusions in the debate have been used to inform the response to the call for evidence. From our own experience of remote meeting these have worked well for members, have environmental benefits and have increased democratic engagement with the Council's decision-making process.
- 5.5 The overall tenor of the response is supportive of the government introducing legislation which would permit local authorities to have the ability to hold formal decision-making meetings remotely or with hybrid arrangements, although some disadvantages are acknowledged. It also endorses the suggestion that local authorities should have the flexibility to decide for themselves the circumstances in which they should have the option to meet remotely.

6. Standard References

- 6.1 There are no particular references to the Strategic Plan; consultation or publicity considerations or financial; community safety; health and safety or risk management implications from the response to the consultation. There would be clear financial, health and safety and environmental and sustainability implications from any decision to allow remote meetings to recommence and some of these issues are addressed in the response to the Call for Evidence.

Appendices

Response to Call for Evidence – Appendix 1

Background Papers

Reports to Governance and Audit Committee on Remote Meetings 20 October 2020 and 23 March 2021

Open Consultation

Local Authority remote meetings: call for evidence

The answers given to these questions are supported by reports and their appendices that were submitted to Governance and Audit Committee on 28 July 2020, 20 October 2020, and 23 March 2021.

Answers selected have been highlighted by **bold** text.

Q1. Generally speaking, how well do you feel the current remote meetings arrangements work?

- Very Well
- **Well**
- Neither well nor poorly
- Poorly
- Very Poorly
- Unsure

Please explain your answer in more detail, though note you will be asked about specific advantages and disadvantages of remote meetings in further questions.

The feedback from members, officers and the public has generally been very good. Whilst there is a natural desire to have face to face meetings all participants are getting used to the new skills of digital meetings. Democratic Services have not received any specific complaints or concerns about the meetings. Additionally, of 32 Councillors who responded to a survey:

29 felt that they had the right equipment to fully participate in remote meetings;
28 felt that they had received sufficient training to enable them to participate in remote meetings;
23 felt that the Council's Remote Meeting Protocol was helpful

Q2. Generally speaking, do you think local authorities in England should have the express ability to hold at least some meetings remotely on a permanent basis?

- **Yes**
- No
- Unsure

Please explain your answer in more detail.

Members and those officers in senior management positions or who frequently supported or presented at Committee meetings were surveyed in relation to a number of aspects of remote meetings. Overall the surveys demonstrated a positive response to remote meetings, with very positive feedback to the Democratic and IT teams that have facilitated them. The key question of whether meetings should be remote, hybrid or face to face in the future prompted the following response:

How should future meetings be conducted?	Councillors	Officers	Total
Remote	13	8	21
Face to face	8	1	9
Hybrid of remote and face to face	7	3	10
No view	4	1	5

Some of the comments that were received from Members:

“We should meet in person for crucial, important meetings but others could continue remotely.”

“I believe that the Council ought to now return to the Town Hall and Rowan House. When Members and Officers can meet together, democracy will be better served. Virtual meetings ought to now be restricted to occasional training sessions, if essential.”

“In person, with the option to dial in, especially if visiting and especially for briefings.”

“Would like to see an element of remote meetings kept long term – maybe hybrid enabling people who cannot attend physically to still participate (attendance by Councillors has gone up and substitutions down) and briefings etc could be kept online.”

Some of the comments that were received from Officers:

“All online. It’s the future.”

“Online/virtual is definitely the best choice.”

“A mixture of online and Town Hall.”

“Evening meetings are definitely better for Officers online as they have often had a full day of meetings anyway. I think a combination would be ideal.”

**Q3. What do you think are some of the benefits of the remote meetings arrangements?
Please select all that apply.**

- **More accessible for local authority members**
- **Reduction in travel time for councillors**
- **Meetings more easily accessed by local residents**
- **Greater transparency for local authority meetings**
- Documents (e.g. minutes, agendas, supporting papers) are more accessible to local residents and others online.

- Easier to chair meetings in an orderly fashion
- A virtual format promotes greater equality in speaking time during meetings
- I do not think there are any benefits to remote meetings
- Other (please specify)

For each benefit you have selected, please explain each of your answers in more detail.

Attendance at meetings has risen, with fewer members attending Committees as substitutes. Members have been able to log in and participate in meetings from across the country, when they would not have been able to attend a physical meeting.

There are direct environmental benefits from holding meetings remotely, mainly from the reduction in car journeys and CO2 emissions from the Town Hall for meetings and are set out in a table below. A return to physical meetings would mean that these environmental benefits would be lost and there would be a merit in exploring hybrid meetings as far as possible in order to retain as many environmental benefits as possible.

Length of round journey (miles)	Avoided miles travelled	Saving of CO2 (tonnes)	CO2 avoided from vehicle emissions (kg)
4	1256	0.37	370
6	1884	0.55	550
10	2140	0.91	910

There are accessibility benefits from holding meetings remotely in that they allow people to view or join meetings from the environment of their choice, rather than from travelling to and accessing the meeting at the Town Hall. Members of the public have been able to join remote meetings from other countries, and have been able to join to speak online while keeping their identity protected, where they have reason to need to do so. Public engagement has increased significantly, the number of online views for each committee is considerably more than the previous audio streaming.

There is evidence that remote meetings have helped increase public engagement with meetings and have improved the transparency of decision making. An analysis was conducted of the number of views of each meeting held remotely June 2020 – October 2020. The figures show that more people were viewing through the YouTube live stream than listened through the audio stream for the similar period the previous year. There were 5780 views of meetings on You Tube from June – September 2020. The comparative figure for listens on the previous audio streaming system over the same period last year was 3,517. This indicates that more members of the public were engaging with remote public meetings.

Q4. (For local authorities only) Have you seen a reduction in costs since implementing remote meetings in your authority?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please explain your answer in more detail.

Agendas have become entirely digital, saving on printing costs. Additionally, not using Council buildings to host meetings has resulted in savings of CO2 emissions and the associated costs of lighting and heating meeting venues.

Q5. What do you think are some of the disadvantages of the remote meetings arrangements, and do you have any suggestions for how they could be mitigated/overcome? Please select all that apply.

- **It is harder for members to talk to one another informally**
- **Meetings are less accessible for local authority members or local residents who have a poor-quality internet connection**
- **Meetings are less accessible for local authority members or local residents who are unfamiliar with video conferencing/technology**
- There is less opportunity for local residents to speak or ask questions
- **Some find it more difficult to read documents online than in a physical format**
- Debate is restricted by the remote format
- It is more difficult to provide effective opposition or scrutiny in a remote format
- It is more difficult to chair meetings in an orderly fashion
- Virtual meetings can be more easily dominated by individual speakers
- It might enable democratically elected members to live and perform their duties outside their local area on a permanent basis, therefore detaching them from the communities they serve
- It may create too substantial a division between the way national democracy (e.g. in the House of Commons) and local democracy is conducted
- I do not think there are any disadvantages to remote meetings
- Other (please specify)

For each disadvantage you have selected, please explain each of your answers in more detail.

Some feedback received is that Members miss the opportunity to chat informally with their colleagues around the meeting setting, and they find that the remote meeting format does not allow Members to fully interact with each other.

A small number of Members have struggled with accessing and participating in remote meetings, and have required additional support during this process. Some Members do find it more difficult to reference agenda papers electronically while also participating in a remote meeting.

For each disadvantage you have selected, please explain any suggestions you have to mitigate/overcome them.

Work has already been undertaken to provide dedicated equipment to Members to allow them to join and participate in remote meetings. This includes distribution of new equipment and individual bespoke training. Members with weaker internet connections have been offered assistance to provide greater connectivity.

Q6. What do you think are some of the main advantages of holding face-to-face meetings, as opposed to remote meetings?

Some Members believe that remote meetings take longer, and it is harder to concentrate on the discussion. Face to face meetings would also allow Members and Officers to fully interact with each other both before and during the meeting.

There is also a potential for fewer staff to be required to administer entirely face to face meetings, although hybrid meetings may still require additional support.

Q7. If permanent arrangements were to be made for local authorities in England, for which meetings do you think they should have the option to hold remote meetings?

- **For all meetings**
- For most meetings with a few exceptions (please specify)
- Only for some meetings (please specify)
- I think local should be able to decide for themselves which meetings they should have the option to meet remotely
- I do not think local authorities should have the option to hold remote meetings for any meetings
- Unsure

It is considered that due to the support that has been expressed for element of remotes meetings, that there should be an option to make joining any face to face meeting remotely. Each Council should therefore be given the opportunity to allow remote, hybrid or face to face meetings at their discretion to better serve the diverse needs of Officers, Members and members of the public.

Q8. If permanent arrangements were to be made for local authorities in England, in which circumstances do you think local authorities should have the option to hold remote meetings?

- In any circumstances
- Only in extenuating circumstances where a meeting cannot be held face-to-face or some members would be unable to attend (e.g. severe weather events, coronavirus restrictions)
- **I think local authorities should be able to decide for themselves which circumstances they should have the option to meet remotely**
- I do not think local authorities should have the option to hold remote meetings under any circumstances
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure

Each Authority will be aware of the specific needs and circumstances of its Officers, Members and members of the public, and should be afforded the opportunity to operate in the most effective way, with any decision taken in respect of remote meeting attendance subject to the usual process, challenge and scrutiny.

Q9. Would you have any concerns if local authorities in England were given the power to decide for themselves which meetings, and in what circumstances, they have the option to hold remote meetings?

- Yes
- **No**
- Unsure

No, provided any such decision was taken as the result of a clear and public decision making process, in accordance with correct governance, and subject to debate, challenge and scrutiny.

Q10. If yes, do you have any suggestions for how your concerns could be mitigated/overcome.

N/A

Q11. In your view, would making express provision for English local authorities to meet remotely particularly benefit or disadvantage any individuals with protected characteristics e.g. those with disabilities or caring responsibilities?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Allowing Authorities greater flexibility in determining how meetings are run can only assist those with protected characteristics. In providing a greater range of options to access the democratic process, people with very different circumstances are still able to participate in meetings in a manner of their own choosing. Those who find it difficult to attend physical meetings may log on and participate over the internet, while retaining the option for physical public attendance at meetings if this is the preferred method of interaction.

Extract from the draft minutes of the Policy Panel meeting of 3 March 2021

15. Work Programme 2020-21

The Panel considered a report on its work programme for 2020-21.

The Panel discussed the possibility of a Borough memorial for victims of Covid-19, those affected and potentially the keyworkers who engaged in vital duties over the pandemic. Support was expressed for such a project, especially if it could be designed as a place for reflection and remembrance. Councillor Davidson, as the current Mayor of Colchester, explained that he was working with the High Steward and the Council's Cabinet to organise a memorial and an occasion of remembrance, potentially to take place before the Autumn.

RESOLVED that the work programme for the Policy Panel be noted.

RECOMMENDED to CABINET that Cabinet provide an update for the Policy Panel to consider regarding any potential plans, once laid down, for a Colchester memorial to those who have lost their lives to, or been affected by, Covid-19, and/or to those key workers who have carried out vital work during the pandemic.

Extract from the draft minutes of the Scrutiny Panel meeting of 19 March 2021

294. Review of Bus Service Provision

A statement was read out on behalf of a member of the public, Mr Chris Piggott, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5(1) of the Council's Remote Meetings Procedure Rules. Mr Piggott wrote to raise issues with a perceived lack of public transport infrastructure, especially in South Colchester, where bus use could involve lengthy journeys and a need to change buses. An assurance that this would be considered in the future was sought.

A statement was read out on behalf of a member of the public, Mr Thomas Rowe, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5(1) of the Council's Remote Meetings Procedure Rules.

Mr Rowe wrote to raise the following questions:

1. Whether a circular route from Ipswich Road to the hospital could be investigated.
2. Whether the possibility of the Number 2 bus to stop on Queens Street could be evaluated.
3. Whether rest breaks for drivers could be organised not to coincide with commuting and rush hours.
4. Whether the Council could liaise with Greater Anglia to better coordinate arrival and departure times for improved connections and journey times.
- 4a) How often waiting times are reviewed and what is considered to be an acceptable wait time is for passengers getting off trains.
5. Whether pricing could be more competitive during off-peak hours to encourage more users.
6. Whether buses could run for longer hours to help facilitate the night time economy.
7. How often routes were reviewed, and how demand was measured or predicted to determine new routes and times.

Jane Thompson, Transport and Sustainability Joint Lead, introduced the review and invited Helen Morris, Head of Essex County Council's Integrated Passenger Transport Unit [IPTU] to address the Panel.

The Head of the IPTU asked for any questions about specific issues to be sent to County Council cabinet members, rather than raised at this meeting, as the pre-election period had almost been reached. She then detailed structural issues faced by bus provision under the deregulated model used in Essex. This model entailed the great majority of services being commercially run, with 15% of services supported by the County Council for the good of the public.

A continued decline in passenger numbers had been recorded since 1985, leading to reductions in investment over time. Passenger numbers remain crucial to support service provision. Essex covered many rural areas in which it was a challenge to deliver bus services, with some areas not being served by any routes. Passenger confidence was now an even greater issue, due to Covid-19 fears, and there was a need to shape the bus network to reflect changed travel patterns.

The bus transport sector was currently experiencing market failure, due to Covid-19, so significant public funding had been needed to subsidise the service whilst restrictions had drastically cut passenger numbers. Tribute was paid to those who had kept the network functioning during the pandemic, and partnership working was praised. The County Council's bus strategy had been badly hit and will be adjusted to reflect any Department for Transport guidance issued.

The 'Safer, Greener, Healthier' Strategy was outlined, to reduce car use and improve the environment and public health. £2.5m had been granted by the Department for Transport and the Head of the IPTU explained how the Borough Council and its members could help the Strategy to succeed. This included promotion of bus use, promotion by the Council and members, forming a pro-bus vision and complimentary parking strategy for the Borough and looking to use S106 money from planning applications to help the Borough and County Councils work to provide new routes and stops for new developments.

Richard Gravitt, Essex County Council Strategy, Growth, Infrastructure & Integration Manager, explained that the County Council spent £8-£9m on bus service provision within the year, £20m on school bus transport and £17m on concessionary bus fares. Tracey Vickers, County Council Head of Sustainable Transport, explained that the draft County Travel Strategy was going to be presented, but that the County's Cabinet had agreed to send it for further consultation, following requests for this. The County Council's current strategy was to persuade the public to only travel when necessary, to push modal shift to safer/healthier/sustainable options for travel. Prioritisation had been given to promoting active travel, rebuilding passenger transport and exploring new approaches and driving behaviour change to affordable alternatives to private motor transport.

The Transport and Sustainability Joint Lead gave an overview of views expressed by bus operators in the past, including complaints that congestion was a problem and that parking charges were too low and acted as a disincentive to bus use. Work had been promised to improve punctuality and access, engagement with stakeholders and improving environmental standards.

Piers Marlow, FirstGroup Managing Director, gave more information on how Covid-19 had forced changes to service provision since the previous March. Some routes

had experienced drops in usage of up to 90%, with the best performing down by 50%. Social distancing had drastically reduced capacity and forced reductions in vehicle use. Plans were in place for 12 April to meet an increase in traveller numbers. Since schools had reopened, service usage had risen to around 35/40%.

Julian Elliott, FirstGroup, noted that punctuality had improved, thanks to a drop in traffic density and a lowering of the variation in journey times because of this. This shows what was possible, if congestion were to be addressed once Covid-19 restrictions were eased. Travel patterns were expected to change. Hybrid working was expected to remain commonplace, so work was underway to look at a range of tickets for semi-regular passengers.

Two-thirds of passengers were now paying via cashless options. Digital options would continue to be promoted, but cash was still a valid way to pay. Online booking options included tools to check seat availabilities.

FirstGroup's Managing Director regretted that the pandemic had hit their plans for improving environmental performance but gave assurance that efforts were still underway to increase the use of vehicles meeting the Euro 6 standard. A 'Green Road' Strategy was being used to change driving styles, to increase safety and reduce emissions. No new diesel buses would be brought into use after December 2022. Existing diesel vehicles would be phased out and replaced with zero-emission alternatives. FirstGroup operated electric vehicles across the UK and this might be possible to do within the Borough.

The bus operators worked in partnership with the County Council, under the National Bus Strategy, to improve coverage and uptake. All Essex operators met regularly with the County Council to raise and address any issues.

Glenn Shuttleworth, Go East Anglia's District Manager, informed the Panel that Go Ahead [operators of Heddingham and Chambers buses] was investing in new technology, now operating the largest electric fleet within London. Go Ahead had experienced similar effect from the pandemic as FirstGroup, with passenger numbers now returning to levels closer to normal.

The new national Bus Strategy was argued to be a good opportunity for operators and councils to work together to expand bus usage.

The District Manager echoed the view that parking in the Borough was too cheap and added that the bus operators suffered from the lack of a dedicated bus station. It was posited that the use of buses would be improved if the Colchester Business Improvement District could look at efforts to incentivise bus use, such as offers and deals for bus passengers from local outlets.

Michael Jennings, Arriva's Area Head of Commercial, emphasised the challenges in the sector. Focus had been given to maintaining a core network that was safe for use. Like other operators, some routes had lost around 90% of their passenger usage during lockdown.

Partnership working was described as essential to create a strategic approach, increase passenger numbers and to gain access to funding streams. With travel patterns changing, now would be a good opportunity to help shape new travel habits and persuade people to use buses.

Tracey Rudling, Chief Executive of Community 360, described her charity's role in supplying minibuses designed for accessibility. Community 360 had experienced a challenging year, due to Covid-19. Around 50,000 trips were carried out, in a normal year, for vulnerable service users and those who could not access general public transport services. Most clients were classified as being at increased risk of Covid-19, and a significant percentage of the volunteer drivers had been unable to work during the pandemic. Community 360 had experienced an approximate loss of £10k from its community transport operations each month during the pandemic.

The Head of ECC's IPTU praised the successes of community transport schemes and explained the County Council's approach of shaping their operations around community schemes. The Chief Executive of Community 360 detailed their operations and ventured the possibility of partnership working between community schemes and commercial operators.

An investment had been made in five leased buses, contactless payment options had been put in place and measures engaged to minimise any risk of Covid-19 infection. Around 18,000 journeys had been undertaken during 2020, with total mileage of around 1,200 miles and regular checks were carried out to ensure driver and passenger safety. Options had been introduced to allow social activities to move online, to reduce the need for travel to in-person meetings.

The Panel commenced their discussion, raising a range of factors impacting on passenger transport, such as the Ipswich Road roundabout roadworks and the increased number of properties from new developments. A member [Councillor Hogg] requested a comparison be provided to show the route network which will be in place after the ending of Covid-19 restrictions, compared to the network which was operated prior to the pandemic. It was agreed that this request would be added to the questions asked in the 'Have Your Say' contributions from the public and sent to the Head of ECC IPTU so that they could be discussed with operators and responses provided. Owen Howell, Democratic Services Officer, would ensure these were sent to Helen Morris at Essex County Council for this purpose. It was noted that operators were in a difficult position as it had not been possible to conduct a long-term review to envisage future networks. Recent announcements regarding a national bus strategy were noted as potentially heralding a better opportunity for operators and councils to come together to plan for the future. Achieving increased bus usage would 'tick many boxes' involving environmental goals, desirable modal shift, reducing congestion and improving public health.

It was asked whether Essex was too large and heterogenous an area to allow a single transport network to be successful and whether there was scope for services to be provided by mutual organisations and community providers. The Head of ECC's IPTU confirmed that it was the diversity of Essex which presented the greatest challenge, rather than the size. Different network types were required for different types of areas. Department for Transport modelling had only been on areas

such as Oxford or Brighton. Granular modelling and planning were required for each different type of area. Issues were greater for rural areas, an example being that there were no 'town deal' funds and fewer funding options for rural areas.

Government funding covered 75% of the cost difference between diesel and electric buses, which did not make it financially viable to fully replace all diesel vehicles. The County Council has raised this concern with Government and has pushed the need for 'branch' schemes which extend beyond the main routes.

The Panel were informed that the new national bus strategy was highly detailed and had a focus on partnership working between transport authorities, bus companies, community transport operators and statutory partners. The Borough Council could support this via its approach to its administration of the planning system, via the local plan, by influencing town development and its parking strategy, and by working with partners such as the Business Improvement District and hospital to design a granular approach for the Borough.

FirstGroup gave assurance that opportunities for improvement would be significant, but that the Council should be patient whilst operators conducted recovery work after the pandemic and worked to bring capacity up to full strength.

A Panel member stressed the importance of reducing congestion and expanding bus use. The guests were asked how long it would be before zero emission vehicles could be brought into use in the Borough. Piers Marlow informed the Panel that FirstGroup's early plans were examining use of electric vehicles, rather than hydrogen-powered. This was unlikely to happen within the coming two years but was possible within three to five years. Infrastructure set-up was the key issue.

Members asked why the £2.5m funding from Government for electric buses had only been used for vehicles in central Essex. The Head of ECC's IPTU explained that the bidding criteria for this funding had been very specific, especially with regard to rurality. Two pilot schemes in rural parts of central Essex had therefore been proposed where no services had previously been possible. These would include trialling of electric minibuses, app functions and methods to push modal shift and give digital support to service users. More details would be provided to members following the meeting.

The guests were asked whether a 'one-stop shop' application could be possible. Non-digital payment tended to slow journey times, and touch-payment was suggested as a way to improve the situation. It was confirmed that the technology existed for this and needed to be examined. The Bus service open data service already provided information on all operators' services and timings and would in the future provide fare data also. This was in line with the statutory requirements laid out in the Bus Services Act 2017. It was noted that research carried out with non-bus users living near stops had found that a lack of knowledge and fear of being caught out was a key disincentive to use of the bus services.

It was queried what councillors could do to help via setting conditions for Section 106 contributions and conditions on new developments to ensure bus stops and infrastructure are provided. The officers of ECC explained that Tier-Two authorities

such as borough councils should work with the County Council to include sustainable transport measures and ensure flexible agreements which included the provision of new infrastructure, with new services and infrastructure working together. Part of the planning process was to consider ways to drive modal shift and some past 106 agreements had included enhanced bus provisions. The new national strategy indicated a move towards allowing councils a greater ability to work together, including on the use of online apps to cover multiple council areas. The simpler the online ticketing app was, the easier and quicker it would be for payment and the more likely it would be to increase uptake.

The Panel discussed what possible benefits would be likely were the current High Street restrictions on private vehicle use to be kept in place. Jonathan Ellis, FirstGroup, stressed the importance of enabling buses to quickly enter and leave the town centre. Essex County Council's Strategy, Growth, Infrastructure & Integration Manager noted that bus stop capacity in the Town centre was limited, with many concentrated on the High Street.

Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources, explained that Cabinet had held discussions with the Business Improvement District regarding potential ways to use a strategy and offers to increase passenger numbers coming in to Colchester. There was strong support for active and sustainable travel, such as via the County's 'Safer, Greener, Healthier' approach, aiming to move people away from car use.

The Panel discussed pricing difficulties, observing that increased passenger numbers were needed to allow fare prices to be reduced, whilst fare reductions could increase passenger numbers. It was asked what could be done to reduce fare prices and what level of reductions in fare prices would be needed to increase passenger numbers by the required amount [i.e., price elasticity of demand]. The Managing Director of FirstGroup elaborated on his expectation that, post-pandemic, travel patterns would be very different, and that ticket offers would need to match the new patterns and seek to attract new users. There were many options, but all depended on partnership working. Essex County Council's Strategy, Growth, Infrastructure & Integration Manager explained that demand for bus use was price inelastic in the short term, but more elastic over time as alternatives were sought by service users.

It was expected that the majority of expected government funding would commence from 2022 onwards. The Panel were informed that a key challenge was how to accommodate bus routes within the historic streetscape of Colchester. There were design and funding challenges, which required investment to overcome. It was suggested that bus users tended to browse, buy and use services more whilst shopping, and that this should be used to make the case to the town centre retail and service community that increased bus use helps their businesses.

Glenn Shuttleworth, Go East Anglia's District Manager, told the Panel that his firm had been urging local authorities to make different decisions regarding passenger travel contracts. The current system was built around accepting the lowest-cost bids, which makes it harder to improve environmental and service standards. The Head of ECC's IPTU confirmed that the current system was based primarily on cost, to maximise the network coverage that could be afforded. This would need to be

addressed when the national bus strategy was considered. With school transport services costing around £30m per annum, this system required modernisation; the current system was still based on rules laid down in 1948.

The Panel discussed whether to make a recommendation that Cabinet work with the Colchester Business Improvement District and bus operators to attempt to find ways to provide offers to bus users in order to drive a modal shift from car use to bus use, in addition to promoting sustainable and active travel options.

The Panel then considered whether to make recommendations to encourage councillors to promote local bus services and for the Council to work with the national Bus Strategy to help improve investment in local buses, to potentially boost the local economy and create jobs. There was also a further recommendation proposed that the Council uses its powers as a tier two authority to incentivise and support bus use and seek lower ticket prices. The Portfolio Holder for Business and Resources advised that recommendations would be most effective if specific and based on the partnership working between the Council and Essex County Council.

A number of recommendations were then proposed formally and agreed as follow below. The Chairman then thanked the Panel's guests for participating in this review.

RECOMMENDATION to CABINET that: -

- (a) Cabinet encourages councillors to take up the '#UseTheBus challenge', to invest in local communities, jobs and the environment by championing bus travel.
- (b) Cabinet uses the powers available to a Tier Two authority to enhance and highlight modal shift from car use. Powers of Planning, redevelopment of Town Centre and a boroughwide Parking Strategy being examples (but not an exhaustive list) of these powers.
- (c) Cabinet investigates incentives and offers, through the Business Improvement District [BID] and business partners, in developing a level playing field for bus passengers, when compared to parking deals, thus promoting sustainable transport options.
- (d) Guidance be issued to all elected members as to the options available regarding use of Section 106 funds from new developments, potentially to support bus infrastructure and routes.
- (e) Cabinet directs officers to investigate the possibility of working with partners to create a Borough-wide travel app, to support and encourage use of sustainable and active travel options.

Report of	Assistant Director – Corporate and Improvement Services	Author	Jan Mooney/Richard Clifford
			☎ 282294/507832
Title	Appointments to External Organisations and Council Groups and Abolition of the Revolving Investment Fund Committee		
Wards affected	All		

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report proposes appointments to a number of external organisations and Council groups and also provides a number of reports about the work undertaken by appointees to external organisations and Council groups in 2020-21. It also proposes that the Revolving Investment Fund Committee be abolished.

2. Recommended Decision

- 2.1 The representatives to the various external organisations and Council groups listed in Appendix A be appointed for the 2021-22 municipal year, with such appointments to cease if representatives cease to be members of the Council during the municipal year. Please note that an updated Appendix A containing details of the appointments will be circulated at or before the Cabinet meeting.
- 2.2 To authorise the Leader of the Council to make a determination, where a nomination is deemed to be in dispute, if a vacancy occurs or if an appointment needs to be made to a new organisation during the course of the municipal year.
- 2.3 To agree that the Revolving Investment Fund Committee be abolished, and its functions revert back to Cabinet.
- 2.4 To note the reports about the work undertaken by appointees to external organisations in 2020-21, as set out in Appendix B.

3. Reason for Recommended Decisions

- 3.1 It is important for the Council to continue to make formal appointments to certain organisations and council groups such as those with statutory functions, our key strategic and community partners and groups with joint working arrangements. These groups have been identified in Appendix A.
- 3.2 The Revolving Investment Fund Committee is no longer required as the functions previously performed by the Committee can be more effectively dealt with by Cabinet.

4. Alternative Options

- 4.1 No alternative options are proposed other than to authorise the Leader of the Council to make a determination where a nomination is deemed to be in dispute.

5. Background Information

- 5.1 In accordance with the agreed procedure for making appointments to external organisations and council groups, if any seat or vote allocation remains in dispute by the after the appointments have been made by Cabinet, the Leader of the Council can determine the matter.
- 5.2 In previous years, this report has confirmed the appointments to the Revolving Investment Fund (RIF) Committee. The RIF Committee is a sub-Committee of Cabinet operating under powers delegated by Cabinet. It is proposed that that the RIF Committee be abolished, and the functions previously undertaken by the Committee revert back to Cabinet and consequently no appointments be made to the RIF Committee.
- 5.3 A review of the Council's governance arrangements highlighted the need for the work undertaken by the Council's representative on outside bodies and Council groups to be formally reviewed. Therefore, information about the work of the Council's representatives on a number of the external organisations and Council groups in the 2020-21 municipal year is attached at Appendix B.
- 5.4 The work of some of the organisations to which appointments are made are also reviewed and scrutinised through the work of the Council's Committees and Panels. The work of the Council's commercial companies is reported to the Governance and Audit Committee as the Shareholder Committee of the Council. A link to the report considered in January 2021 is below.

[Governance and Audit \(cmis.uk.com\)](https://cmis.uk.com)

The Member Development Group also reports annually to Cabinet and a report on their work will be submitted to a future Cabinet meeting.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 Members are entitled to claim travel allowance in respect of attendance at meetings of the external organisations and Council groups to which they have been appointed.

7. Strategic Plan References

- 7.1 The particular contribution that each of the external organisations and Council groups makes towards the aims of the Strategic Plan is indicated in in Appendix A.

8. Publicity Considerations

- 8.1 Members appointed as representatives will be notified accordingly. Confirmation of appointments will be sent to the relevant external organisation and to officer contacts for the various Council groups.

9. Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications

- 9.1 There are no direct implications for Equality and Diversity from these appointments and as such a full EQIA has not been deemed necessary. However, the council and all representatives, both officers and members, will encourage and in some cases insist that our partners have the same approach to equality and diversity as we do and ensure that this is implicit within their policies and procedures.

10. Risk Management Implications

- 10.1 Councillors fulfilling external and partnership appointments need to have regard to the information and advice contained within the 'Guidance for Members on Outside Bodies'.
- 11. Health, Well-being and Community Safety, Environmental and Sustainability and Health and Safety Implications**
- 11.1 No direct implications, however the appointments to outside bodies listed within this report enable the Council to better address issues within these areas.

Appendices

Appendix A – Appointments to External Organisations and Council Groups 2021-22

Appendix B – Reports on Appointments to External Organisations and Council Groups 2020-21

Organisations / Groups requiring formal appointment				
Organisation	Representatives for 2021/22	Role of the Representative and Voting Capacity	Contact Name and Address	Compliance with the Strategic Plan
Local Government Organisations				
Local Government Association, General Assembly [Local Government Association dealing with all aspects of local government] [Meetings are held in June/July and December at 2pm. The meeting in June/July is held at the annual conference venue and the December meeting in London]	Leader of the Council, Cllr Dundas Substitute member: Cllr Lissimore Observers: Cllr Cory, Cllr Fox, Cllr B. Oxford	Representative is a member of the general assembly and has a voting right (if more than one member is appointed there remains only one voting right)	Fatima A S de Abreu Member Services Assistant Local Government Association 18 Smith Square Westminster London SW1P 3HZ Direct line: 0207 664 3136 fatima.deabreu@local.gov.uk	Relevant to all strategic priorities

East of England Local Government Association	<p>Leader of the Council, Cllr Dundas</p> <p>Substitute member: Cllr Lissimore</p>		<p>Policy and Secretariat Manager East of England Local Government Association West Suffolk House West Way Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 3YU</p> <p>01284 758321 07920 257935</p> <p>info@eelga.gov.uk</p>	<p>Relevant to most strategic priorities</p>
Local Government Information Unit The LGIU is an independent research and information organisation.	<p>Leader of the Council, Cllr Dundas</p>		<p>Head of Partnerships Third Floor 251 Pentonville Road London N1 9NG</p> <p>020 7554 2800</p> <p>partnerships@lgiu.org.uk</p>	<p>Relevant to most strategic priorities</p>

<p>Haven Gateway Partnership</p> <p>[A sub-regional economic partnership]</p> <p>The purpose of the Partnership is to be a framework through which partner organisations can work together to promote the economic opportunities and secure the future prosperity of this major gateway to the East of England</p> <p>[The Management Board meets bi-monthly around the sub-region alternating between Suffolk and Essex]</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Resources - Cllr Lissimore</p> <p>Substitute member: Cllr Dundas</p>		<p>Anita Thornberry Director Unit 1, The Green House Parkside Office Village Knowledge Gateway Nesfield Road Wivenhoe Park Colchester CO4 3ZL</p> <p>Tel: 01206 713611 Mobile: 07595 415660 Main Number: 01206 764778 Email: anita.thornberry@haven-gateway.org</p> <p>Officer contact - Mandy Jones , tel 282501</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

<p>Essex Waste Partnership</p> <p>The Essex Waste Partnership includes Essex County Council, the 12 district and borough councils and the unitary authority of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. The Essex Waste Partnership was set up to ensure cost-efficient and sustainable waste management is delivered across the county and Southend. The aim is to reduce and reuse as much waste as is physically possible.</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability - Cllr Crow</p> <p>Substitute member: Cllr Hagon</p>		<p>Andrew Seaman Democratic Services Officer Legal and Assurance Corporate and Customer Services</p> <p>Essex County Council County Hall, Chelmsford 03330 322 177 www.essex.gov.uk andrew.seaman@essex.gov.uk</p> <p><u>Officer Contact:</u> Rosa Tanfield Group Manager – Neighbourhood Services rosa.tanfield@colchester.gov.uk</p>	<p>Minimise levels of waste through encouraging sustainable methods of recycling. Develop our service to improve customer experience and employee health and wellbeing.</p>
<p>North Essex Parking Partnership Joint Committee</p> <p>To develop and implement a joint parking service for North Essex including Braintree, Colchester, Epping Forest, Harlow, Tendring and Uttlesford.</p> <p>Joint Parking Committee providing parking services across North Essex, parking management and the power to make new parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability - Cllr Crow</p> <p>Substitute member; Portfolio Holder for Communities = Cllr B Oxford</p>	<p>To receive reports, participate in discussions and to raise issues of concern to this Council, one executive member able to vote.</p>	<p>Rory Doyle. Assistant Director Environment</p> <p>Partnership Officer contact:- Richard Walker Parking Partnership Group Manager, Delivery Point 12 01206 282708 www.parkingpartnership.org parking@colchester.gov.uk</p>	<p>Meet Climate Emergency commitments including carbon reduction, air quality and biodiversity.</p>

<p>Essex County Travellers Unit (ECTU) - a partnership with Essex County Council, Police, Fire Brigade and other local authorities</p> <p>The aim of the ECTU is to deliver an efficient, effective and consistent approach to service provision across the county.</p> <p>The unit fulfils the council's responsibilities for gypsies/ travellers.</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Communities - Cllr B. Oxford</p>	<p>To sit on the ECTU partnership board. If action requires a vote then this would be to determine a recommendation to the authorities. The representative will then take the recommendation through the appropriate decision making process. There is one vote per member authority</p>	<p>Steve Andrews Essex Countywide Traveller Unit Manager</p> <p>telephone: 03330 137854 mobile: 07867 469246 email: stephen.andrews@essex.gov.uk</p> <p>CBC – Belinda Silkstone</p>	<p>Improve community facilities by building on existing assets (people and places) to enable communities to come together, play together & encourage improved health and wellbeing.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Campaign to Protect Rural Essex (Countryside and environment organisation) [Meetings held six times a year at 10.30am at the Essex Record Office, Wharf Road, Chelmsford]	Cllr Chillingworth Substitute member : Cllr Ellis	Representatives have no specific role but attend on behalf of the Council to facilitate two way communications. Representatives are not able to vote	Ms Angie Jamison, Chairman Ms Tricia Moxey, Vice Chairman Campaign to Protect Rural Essex RCCE House Threshelfords Park Inworth Road Feering, Colchester CO5 9SE office@cpressex.org.uk Tel/Fax: 01376 572023	Meet Climate Emergency commitments including carbon reduction, air quality and biodiversity. Plant 200,000 trees over 5 years and green the Colchester Orbital. Build a voluntary network to support our trees, change attitudes to the environment and build awareness of climate change and how impacts can be offset
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Colchester Borough Homes Board</p> <p>Wholly-owned subsidiary company of the Council. Colchester Borough Homes is the Council's Arms-Length Housing Management Organisation (ALMO).</p>	<p>Cllrs Bourne, Burrows and Chapman</p>	<p>Representative is a Director of the Board of CBH, along with tenants/leaseholders (3) and independent Board members (3). Board members have voting rights</p>	<p>Jo Paget Board Assurance Officer HR & Governance Team Colchester Borough Homes Tel: (01206) 282752 jo.paget@cbhomes.org.uk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on community strengths and assets • Tackle the causes of inequality and support our most vulnerable people • Provide opportunities for young people • Increase the number, quality and types of homes • Improve existing homes to keep them in good repair and improve energy efficiency • Continue to improve and modernise housing for older people • Prevent households from experiencing homelessness
---	--	--	---	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intervene early to prevent homelessness and work in partnership with other organisations to sustain peoples tenancies• Tackle rough sleeping in the Borough• Enable Economic Recovery from Covid-19 ensuring all residents benefit from growth <p>Create an environment that attracts inward investment to Colchester and help businesses flourish</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>North Essex Children's Partnership</p> <p>[To secure the improvement in the well being of children and young people in North East Essex as defined by section 10 of the Children Act 2004.]</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Communities - Cllr B. Oxford</p> <p>Plus Officer member – Lucie Breadman, Assistant Director for Communities</p>		<p>Lee Bailey Lead for Partnership Delivery Family Operations Head of Locality Commissioning – North East North East Commissioning Hub, Essex House, 200 The Crescent, Colchester Business Park, Colchester, Essex CO4 9YQ Essex County Council Telephone: 03330139085 Mobile: 07824867641 email: lee.bailey@essex.gov.uk www.essex.gov.uk</p> <p>Officer contact – Lucie Breadman Tel: 282726 Delivery Point 4</p>	<p>Work with partners to improve facilities, activities and youth engagement aiming for positive impacts on volunteering, improved health & wellbeing, reducing ASB and developing a greater sense of community.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd</p> <p>[Wholly owned company of the Council]</p>	<p>Cllrs Goss, Leatherdale, Warnes, Wood</p>	<p>Representative is a Director of the Board of CCHL alongside Paul Smith.</p>	<p>Adrian Pritchard Managing Director Colchester Commercial Holdings Ltd Rowan House 33 Sheepen Road Colchester CO3 3WG</p>	<p>Relevant to most strategic priorities</p> <p>Northern Gateway: Create a new gateway to Colchester, providing jobs and healthcare, housing and an innovative energy source as well as leisure, sports and entertainment facilities, that contribute to the council's revenue.</p> <p>Regenerate the Rowan House site and existing accommodation to provide top quality office space and stimulate inward investment, providing a better working environment and additional revenue</p> <p>Create a vision for Colchester Town</p>
---	--	--	---	---

				Centre that strengthens Colchester position as leading centre for heritage and culture and a place in which to work, visit, relocate and invest in. Work with partners to harness significant regeneration opportunities.
--	--	--	--	---

<p>One Colchester Partnership Systems Leadership Strategic Group</p> <p>Aimed at joining up systems leaders across Health & Wellbeing, Safety and Economy to support improvement and systems approach to problem solving.</p>	<p>Leader of the Council, Cllr Dundas</p>		<p>Justine Wisdom, PA to Pam Donnelly Justine.Wisdom@Colchester.gov.uk</p> <p>Executive Director – Pam Donnelly</p> <p>AD for Communities – Lucie Breadman</p> <p>AD for Customer Leonie Rathbone</p>	<p>Relevant to elements of many Strategic Plan priorities.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

Safer Colchester Delivery Board	Cllr B. Oxford	Full voting rights	<p>Sonia Carr, Community Safety and Safeguarding Coordinator (Communities)</p> <p>Sonia.carr@colchester.gov.uk 01206 282978</p> <p>AD for Communities – Lucie Breadman</p> <p>Safety & Wellbeing Manager – Mel Rundle</p>	<p>Create a vision for Colchester Town Centre that strengthens Colchester position as leading centre for heritage and culture and a place in which to work, visit, relocate and invest in. Work with partners to harness significant regeneration opportunities.</p> <p>Work with partners to improve facilities, activities and youth engagement aiming for positive impacts on volunteering, improved health & wellbeing, reducing ASB and developing a greater sense of community.</p>
---------------------------------	----------------	--------------------	---	---

Colchester Hospital University NHS Foundation Trust	Cllr Hayter		<p>Tammy Diles Deputy Company Secretary</p> <p>Email: tammy.diles@Colchesterhospital.nhs.uk Colchester General Hospital Trust Offices Turner Road Colchester Essex CO4 5JL 01206 745338</p>	
Colchester and Ipswich Joint Museums Committee To develop and implement a joint museum service for Colchester and Ipswich	Portfolio Holder for Communities - Cllr B. Oxford and Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage -Cllr Laws		<p>Lucie Breadman Assistant Director, Community 01206 282726 Lucie.breadman@colchester.gov.uk</p> <p>Frank Hargrave, CIMS Manager frank.hargrave@colchester.gov.uk</p>	Bring our history to life, from the Temple & Castle to the Roman Circus, through display of physical objects, events, interpretation and commemoration to physical and digital trails and displays. Building pride in Britain's 1st City, drawing in residents and visitors.

<p>Dedham Vale (AONB) and Stour Valley Joint Advisory Committee</p> <p>[Partnership project funded by local authorities and DEFRA</p> <p>[Meetings held 2 or 3 times a year at various times and venues throughout the Stour Valley area. Additional meetings and workshops as necessary.]</p>	<p>Cllr Laws and Cllr Chapman</p>	<p>Representatives are involved in steering the work of the project and in particular matters affecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Representatives are able to vote.</p>	<p>AONB Manager, Simon Amstutz Address: AONB Office, Dock Lane, Melton, Suffolk IP12 1PE Dedham Vale (AONB) and Stour Valley Project c/o Suffolk County Council Endeavour House 8 Russell Road Ipswich IP1 2BX Telephone: 01394 445225</p> <p>E:mail Dedhamvale.project@suffolk.gov.uk</p> <p>Officer contact – Adam John, Tel: 282472 Delivery Point 8</p>	<p>Meet Climate Emergency commitments including carbon reduction, air quality and biodiversity.</p>
---	---------------------------------------	---	---	---

<p>Essex Partnership for Flood Management</p> <p>The aim of the Partnership is to meet Essex County Council's responsibilities under the Flood Management Act. Essex County Council recognise the need to work with borough and district councils on flood management issues. They have established the Essex Partnership for Flood Management which is a member group that will receive reports on these issues across Essex and agree actions to alleviate problems.</p> <p>The Partnership is supported by an officer steering group.</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability - Cllr Crow</p>		<p>CBC Officer Contact: Bethany Jones Planning Policy Officer Bethany.jones@colchester.gov.uk</p> <p>Essex County Council:</p> <p>Lucy Shepherd Flood Partnerships Manager Environment, Sustainability & Highways Essex County Council 01245 433181 Ex 52181 lucy.shepherd@essex.gov.uk</p> <p>Lisa Siggins Democratic Services Officer Democratic Services Corporate and Customer Services</p> <p>Essex County Council Telephone: 033301 34594 Ext: 34594 Email: lisa.siggins@essex.gov.uk www.essex.gov.uk</p>	<p>Meet Climate Emergency commitments including carbon reduction, air quality and biodiversity.</p> <p>Work with partners to develop a vision for the upper, middle and lower River Colne that prioritises its value as a unique natural asset to be carefully utilised, protected and enhanced.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

Colchester Arts Centre	Cllr Laws		<p>Anthony Roberts Director Colchester Arts Centre Church Street Colchester Essex CO1 1NF</p> <p>anthony@colchesterartscentre.com</p> <p>Officer contact – Claire Taylor, Visitor and Cultural Services Team Leader - T 01206 282920 Claire.taylor@colchester.gov.uk</p>	Build on the work of Creative Colchester by working with them, Arts Council funded and other partners to develop a collaborative Cultural Vision and Ambitions for the Borough.
Firstsite	Cllr Leatherdale		<p>Sally Shaw Director Lewis Gardens High Street Colchester CO1 1JH</p> <p>sally@firstsite.uk</p> <p>Copy in Sandra MacDonald</p> <p>sandra@firstsite.uk</p> <p>Officer contact – Claire Taylor, Visitor and Cultural Services Team Leader - T 01206 282920 Claire.taylor@colchester.gov.uk</p>	Build on the work of Creative Colchester by working with them, Arts Council funded and other partners to develop a collaborative Cultural Vision and Ambitions for the Borough.

<p>Mercury Theatre Limited</p> <p>[Limited Company and Charity running an arts repertory company]</p> <p>[Meetings held every 4-6 weeks at 6pm at the Mercury Theatre]</p>	<p>Cllr Barton</p>	<p>Representatives act as Directors who are able to participate fully in the meetings and vote</p>	<p>Steve Mannix Interim Executive Director Mercury Theatre Balkerne Gate Colchester CO1 1PT</p> <p>Steve.Mannix@mercurytheatre.co.uk</p> <p>Officer contact – Claire Taylor, Visitor and Cultural Services Team Leader - T 01206 282920 Claire.taylor@colchester.gov.uk</p>	<p>Build on the work of Creative Colchester by working with them, Arts Council funded and other partners to develop a collaborative Cultural Vision and Ambitions for the Borough..</p>
<p>‘Our Colchester’ Business Improvement District (BID) Board</p> <p>The Board provides strategic direction over the Limited company that operates Colchester Town Centre BID. The BID works to advance the interests and prospects of the Town Centre for the benefit of the residents and Businesses of the Borough and Town.</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage - Cllr Laws</p> <p>Substitute member: Cllr Dundas</p>	<p>The Councillor is an observer on the Board</p>	<p>Chair of the Board, Our Colchester BID, C/O Management Suite, Culver Square Shopping Centre, Culver Square, 9A Culver Street, CO11 1JQ.</p> <p>Officer Contact Mandy Jones Assistant Director – Place and Client mandy.jones@colchester.gov.uk</p>	<p>Create a vision for Colchester Town Centre that strengthens Colchester position as leading centre for heritage and culture and a place in which to work, visit, relocate and invest in. Work with partners to harness significant regeneration opportunities.</p>

Member Development Group Council Group constituted to assist in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of member development strategies.	Cllrs Dundas, Goacher, Harris, King, Lissimore, B. Oxford		Richard Clifford, Lead Democratic Services Officer. richard.clifford@colchester.gov.uk 01206 507832	Supports members to meet all strategic priorities
Police and Crime Panel The Panel will be responsible for scrutinising and supporting the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner, who in turn is responsible for holding the Chief Constable to account.	Cllr Mannion Substitute member: Cllr Barber		Colin Ismay Corporate Law and Assurance Essex County Council County Hall Market Road Chelmsford CM1 1QH colin.ismay@essex.gov.uk Telephone ddi 01245 430396 Extn 20396 Email: colin.ismay@essex.gov.uk www.essex.gov.uk	Work with partners to improve facilities, activities and youth engagement aiming for positive impacts on volunteering, improved health & wellbeing, reducing ASB and developing a greater sense of community.
Bradwell Local Communities Liaison Council Independent, local community body acting as a liaison between with local organisations on matters arising from the operation/management of the Bradwell Power Station site.	Cllr Davidson	Full voting rights Meets twice a year June 5 2019 Steeple Village Hall, Garden Fields, Steeple, Southminster, Essex CM0 7JY, 9.30 for 10am	Tracey Finn Bradwell LCLC Secretariat mailto:tracey.finn@magnoxsites.com Tel: 01797 343510 https://magnoxsites.com/site/bradwell#community	Meet Climate Emergency commitments including carbon reduction, air quality and biodiversity.

<p>Town Deal Board (We Are Colchester)</p> <p>We Are Colchester is a partnership of councils, businesses and voluntary groups which has been established to put together a bid for Government Towns Fund cash.</p>	<p>Leader of the Council - Cllr Dundas</p>	<p>Voting representative</p>	<p>Simon Thorp Town Deal Project Manager</p> <p>Simon.Thorp@colchester.gov.uk</p>	<p>Create a vision for Colchester Town Centre that strengthens Colchester position as leading centre for heritage and culture and a place in which to work, visit, relocate and invest in. Work with partners to harness significant regeneration opportunities</p>
<p>North Essex Economic Board NEEB</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Resources - Cllr Lissimore</p>	<p>As Portfolio Holder incorporating Economic development to represent the Council on this North Essex group of authorities seeking to advance the economic potential of the locality. Has one vote on a Board of six District Authorities and also including Essex County Council</p> <p>Board meets quarterly.</p>	<p>Lindsay Barker, Strategic Director lindsay.barker@colchester.gov.uk Tel: 01206 282717</p> <p>Mandy Jones, Assistant Director, Place & Client Services Mandy.jones@colchester.gov.uk Tel: 01206 282501</p>	<p>The NEEB Economic Strategy has been approved by the Councils Cabinet and its objectives match the Councils own economic aspirations incorporated in the Strategic Plan.</p>

<p>Local Highway Panel</p>	<p>Cllrs Hagon, Hogg, Willetts and J. Young</p>	<p>The Borough Council can nominate 4 members to the Local Highway Panel.</p> <p>All County Councillors with exception of the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and the Leader of the Council will be voting members of the respective Local Highway Panel.</p> <p>The LHP is accountable for:</p> <p>Recommending the annual LHP programme for submission to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure.</p> <p>Documenting highways issues raised by residents and the community in its area, so that the concerns can be investigated and the possibility of addressing these</p>	<p>Jon Simmons, Highway Liaison Officer – (Chelmsford and Colchester Local Highway Panel)</p> <p>jon.simmons@essexhighways.org</p> <p>www.essex.gov.uk/highways</p>	<p>Respond to the Climate Emergency</p> <p>Enable more opportunity for walking and cycling around Colchester</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	--

		through engineering solutions can be validated.		
--	--	---	--	--

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	Essex Waste Partnership	
Representative/s	Portfolio Holder for Waste, Sustainability and Transportation – Cllr Goss	Substitute member – Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy – Cllr Cory
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 All suspended in response to Covid-10 pandemic	Attended:
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group The Essex Waste Partnership includes Essex County Council, the 12 district and borough councils and the unitary authority of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council. The Essex Waste Partnership was set up to ensure cost-efficient and sustainable waste management is delivered across the county and Southend. The aim is to reduce and reuse as much waste as is physically possible.</p> <p>Work in 2020/21 Covid response</p> <p>Other members All Waste Collection Authorities within Essex and Essex County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority</p>	
Issues arising or Action required	Review of the Waste Management Strategy	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	North Essex Parking Partnership	
Representative/s	Councillor Lilley	
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 Four Committee Meetings (June, October, January, March)	Attended: All meetings
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group</p> <p>A Strategic Partnership governing on-street parking throughout North Essex on behalf of districts and the county council.</p> <p>Work in 2020/21</p> <p>Decide the budgetary, project, administrative, technical and regulatory work of the Committee.</p> <p>Decide the strategic direction for highway parking, including pricing for permits, and to approve any new parking regulations across the North of the County.</p> <p>Other members</p> <p>Braintree District Council Epping Forest District Council Essex County Council Harlow District Council Tendring District Council Uttlesford District Council</p>	
Issues arising or Action required	Focus on the budgetary implications of the pandemic.	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	Essex Countywide Travellers Unit – ECTU Joint Committee	
Representative/s	Cllr Michael Lilley	
No. of meetings	12 June 2020 13 November 2020	Attended: 12 June 2020 & 13 November 2020
Comments	Purpose of the Group <p>The aim of the ECTU is to deliver an efficient, effective and consistent approach in the management of unauthorised encampments and provide health & fire safety support to the gypsy/ traveller community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essex County Council • Braintree District Council • Chelmsford City Council • Uttlesford District Council • Maldon District Council • Thurrock Council • Tendring District Council • Castle Point District Council • Chelmsford City Council • Rochford District Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essex Fire & Rescue Service • Essex Police 	
Issues arising or Action required	Finance <p>Membership fees. These had been agreed previously for 2020/2021. Upon careful consideration of the committee of the Finance data produced for 21/22 it was agreed that that membership fees for 2021/22 would remain unchanged.</p> Membership status <p>Mr Andrews reported no change in the membership of the Joint Committee with all but three Essex authorities (Epping Forest, Harlow and Southend) signed up.</p>	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>Harlows injunction - It was advised that Harlow Council did not proceed with their extension application.</p> <p>Operations performance update - key issues</p> <p>Due to Covid and restrictions in face-to-face visits There has been minimal works carried out in terms of supporting health issues and supporting Children into education and Fire Safety. However, still supporting some known families/issues over the phone where possible, and taking some new cases on the same basis. In addition, sending out some general messages via WhatsApp.</p> <p>Health and Welfare: There had been continued welfare support with families to ensure they were getting the correct support and benefits and had access to health services. There had been more engagement with Gypsy / Traveller men who required support due to being unable to get to work during lockdown. Work was taking place with MARAC (Multi Agency Assessment Conference) to help support Gypsy Traveller victims of domestic violence. There had been continued support to other agencies working with the Gypsy Traveller community.</p> <p>Unauthorised Encampments. After the normally quiet winter period, the year started very slowly, with only a couple of encampments throughout March and April. Numbers began to pick up in May and t and by August/September last year's numbers had been exceeded, before declining in October</p> <p>For the first time since the ECTU was formed a repossession order was refused, with the magistrate deciding that Traveller should not be moved during lockdown.</p> <p>The Unit and the Police will respond to unauthorised encampments in accordance with central government guidance. CI Balding confirmed that COVID-19 did feature in the Police's decision-making process, but they would issue Section 61 orders where appropriate.</p> <p>ECC/ECTU Review</p> <p>The Committee received a verbal update from Adrian Coggins, Head of Wellbeing and Public Health. Friday, 13 November 2020</p> <p>The review had been undertaken over the past 12 months, with the aim of establishing what was Essex County Council's best role in the Gypsy and Traveller agenda, relative to other agencies.</p> <p>One of the recommendations of the review was that ECC would divest of the sites, passing responsibility to another provider subject</p>
--	---

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>to assurance around good management and accountability. COVID and the local government review had both had an impact on the review, and it had been decided that ECC would currently be retaining the sites but a different approach may be taken in future.</p> <p>The review had also considered the role of ECTU reference the management of unauthorised encampments. It was considered that ECTU worked very well as a partnership and had received good feedback in terms of how it had worked. The rationale that drove the establishment of ECTU remained just as strong as it did in 2012.</p>
--	--

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	Colchester Borough Homes	
Representative/s	Cllr Nigel Chapman Cllr Lesley Scott Boutell Cllr Cyril Liddy (stepped down on 3/11/2020) Cllr Tina Bourne (From 4/11/2020)	
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 Board:6 Finance & Audit Committee: 5 Business Development Panel: 4	Attended: For the 6 Board Meetings, the following apologies were recorded: Cllr Nigel Chapman: 1 Cllr Lesley Scott Boutell: 0 Cllr Cyril Liddy: 1 Cllr Tina Bourne: 0
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group</p> <p>Colchester Borough Homes (CBH) is an Arm's Length Management Organisation set up by Colchester Borough Council. Part of the local business community since 2003, CBH is an award-winning organisation providing management and maintenance services to around 7,000 residential, commercial and public buildings in the local area, including the Council's housing stock, Colchester Castle, Leisure World Colchester and Colchester Town Hall.</p> <p>CBH offers a range of services to the private, public and non-profit sectors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings maintenance, renovations, refurbishments and repairs • Lettings, tenancy management and income collection • Housing options and advice • Asset management • Facilities management • Health & safety • Construction projects • Energy efficiency <p>The Board of Directors provides strategic direction for the Company, approves its policies, approves its expenditure and monitors its financial position and its performance in delivering services. It also ensures compliance with the Management Agreement between the Company and Colchester Borough Council and ensures the Company complies with its legal responsibilities. Board Members are also members of one or more Committees (Finance & Audit, Appointments & Remuneration (all NEDs), which allows for greater scrutiny of specific items and for delegated</p>	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>powers to be bestowed by the Board for certain decisions to be taken at Committee level. Board Members sit on the Business Development Panel, to which decision making powers regarding some commercial trading opportunities have been delegated</p> <p>Work in 2020/21</p> <p>Some of the key work done by the Board in 2020/21 was</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To appoint new independent and resident Board Members • To appoint Committee Chairs • Approve new Governance Structure • Approve adoption of the NHF Code of Governance • Approval of Scheme of Delegations • Review of Strategic Plans • Approval of Company Accounts • Approval of CBH Budget 2021/22 • Approval of Risk Appetite • Approval of Capital Investment Programme 2020-2025 • Review and Approval of Corporate/Strategic Policy Changes • Management Agreement Extension Consultation • Board Covid Briefings and Transformation Programme overview <p>As well as the official meetings recorded above, members attended a number of stand-alone meetings, briefings and training events throughout the year. These focussed on ensuring key skills and knowledge are held by Members.</p> <p>Other members</p> <p>The Board includes three resident Members and four independent Members alongside the three Members appointed by CBC and Gareth Mitchell (CEO and executive director).</p> <p>For more information on other members of the CBH Board, please visit https://cbhomes.org.uk/about-us/how-we-make-decisions/board-members/</p>
Issues arising or Action required	

Stakeholder Governor Report on East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust – Councillor Helen Chuah.

I took over from Annie Feltham as stakeholder Governor of the East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust (ESNEFT) some 3 years ago, and a lot of changes have taken place since then.

Colchester General Hospital (CGH) was put into special measures and there have been changes of Chief Executive and Chairman along the way. Colchester General Hospital merged with Ipswich Hospital to become known as the East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust.

I have made visits to the wards in CGH accompanied by members of the non executive team. Most merges fail, but ESNEFT has proved successful with the clinical teams from both sites working together, and seeing new developments taking place for the wider benefits of patients across Colchester and Ipswich.

Then came the unexpected – Covid 19 pandemic! All grades of staff from both sides – doctors, nurses, clinical, administrative personnel regardless of status or grades worked tremendously under increasing pressure, some wards either closed or adjust to provide care for the many patients admitted with Covid 19 in their different stages of the infection. The Intensive Care Unit as you can imagine was full beyond expectations. Staff from various wards were allocated and volunteered to work in ICU, as well as some retired staff returned to help.

The vaccination has taken place for ALL grades of staff, 80% has had their second dose, but there are 3% of staff who decline. ESNEFT is working with individuals to persuade them to accept the vaccinations. The Trust is also making contingency plans on managing the third surge should it happens.

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Visitors are now allowed into a booked slot system, and for End of Life Care, 4 people are allowed to visit.

As you may expect there is now a long waiting list for outpatients clinics, surgery, medical diagnostic and operations. The Trust continue to maintain emergency services, and wards are slowly adjusting to caring for patients with their individual needs.

Looking ahead, the Trust is waiting to face the outcome of the White Paper. No doubt we will hear more of as it gets debated in Parliament, and hopefully, a presentation on its working will be made to Colchester Borough Council members.

In conclusion, I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks and praise for the manner that ESNEFT organisation especially the medical and nursing professionals, all grades of staff who have worked tirelessly to care for the many patients with Covid 19 symptoms within ICU and wards. Also, the volunteers and retired staff who came forward when we needed them. It was a real compassionate caring attitude.

The Trust is undertaking a staff survey focusing on staff physical and mental well being with the aim to build on and share best practice.

We must All take Responsibility for Our Own Health – Life is Not Free!

From Councillor Helen Chuah

Stakeholder Governor (CBC)

25th April 2021.

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	Dedham Vale (AONB) and Stour Valley Joint Advisory Committee	
Representative/s	Councillor Arnold and Councillor Chapman	Officer - Adam John
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 - 2/3	Attended: all
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group</p> <p>Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) representatives are involved in steering the work of the Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project Management Team on matters affecting and impacting on the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Representatives are given voting rights.</p> <p>Meetings are held 2 or 3 times a year at various times and venues throughout the Stour Valley area, with additional meetings and workshops called as deemed necessary by the JAC.</p> <p>Work in 2020/21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring the 2016-21 Dedham Vale (AONB) & Stour Valley Management Plan and commencing preparation for the 2021-26 Management Plan (a statutory requirement on Colchester Borough Council under the CROW Act). • Commenting on planning applications within & impacting on the Dedham Vale AONB. • Administering the Stour Valley Environment Fund for the benefit of the Dedham Vale AONB. • Applying and securing beneficial project grant funding for the Dedham Vale AONB at all levels. • Dedham Vale AONB representation and lobbying at a national level, including in relation to the current Government commissioned review of Protected Landscapes and the ongoing Dedham Vale AONB boundary review. • Working with wider *Partnership Forum championing the AONB. <p>Other members</p> <p>The Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) comprises funding partners from all the local authorities within the Stour Valley and DEFRA.</p>	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>*The Dedham Vale Partnership Forum, in addition to the above JAC members, includes non-funding partner's representatives from the NFU, CLA, Environment Agency, Natural England and the Sub-regional Economic Partnership as well as other bodies with an interest.</p>
Issues arising or Action required	None

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	We Are Colchester (Town Deal) Board	
Representative/s	Cllr Mark Cory (CBC) Cllr David King (CBC)*	*Cllr King is chair of the Town Deal Advisory Group – a working group to the main board. As such Cllr King has attended several of the board meetings.
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 - 7. 10 March 2020 11 May 2020 6 July 2020 1 September 2020 12 October 2020 29 October 2020 10 March 2021	Attended: 7.
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group</p> <p>To deliver a successful Town Deal strategy, vision, and Town Investment Plan to central government, for Colchester.</p> <p>Work in 2020/21</p> <p>The Board is the governance body responsible for making decisions and monitoring progress of all Town Deal programme and project initiatives, in partnership with the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).</p> <p>The Board oversaw and directed the development and delivery of a Town Deal strategy, vision, and Town Investment Plan; developed and supported extensive community consultation; worked effectively with the Town Deal Programme Office, stakeholder groups, and local authority Officers from Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council.</p> <p>Other members</p> <p>Adrian Pritchard (CBC) Adam Bryan (SELEP) Ashleigh Seymour-Rutherford (COLBEA) Chris Rhodes (Hiscox) Cllr Tony Ball (ECC) Lucy Johnson (University of Essex) Mark Carroll (ECC) Mark Jarman-Howe (North East Essex Alliance, St Helena Hospice)</p>	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>Shona Johnstone (Homes England)</p> <p>Simon Blaxill (Kent Blaxill & Colchester Business Improvement District)</p> <p>Tracy Rudling (Community 360)</p> <p>Alison Jennings (Homes England)</p> <p>Will Quince MP (Conservative Party)</p>
Issues arising or Action required	<p>Having successfully secured an £18.2M Town Deal award from government, the Board will continue to bring constructive challenge to the development of the Detailed Project Business Case and Implementation phases, and support the development of plans to address any issues identified; seek to leverage further investment into Colchester to supplement the MHCLG award, contribute to the nomination and appointment of Board members, and Monitor and Evaluate outcomes-based delivery of Colchester's Town Investment Plan.</p>

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

Outside Body	North Essex Economic Board – NEEB	
Representative/s	Board Member: Cllr David King Director: Lindsay Barker Assistant Director: Mandy Jones	
No. of meetings	Held in 2020/21 11 May 2020 11 August 2020 11 November 2020 11 February 2021 15 April 2021	Attended: Cllr David King & Ian Vipond Cllr David King & Ian Vipond Cllr David King & Ian Vipond Cllr David King & Ian Vipond Cllr David King & Ian Vipond
Comments	<p>Purpose of the Group To advance the economic potential of North Essex which includes the Districts of Uttlesford, Braintree, Colchester, Tendring and Chelmsford (Maldon is also an observer).</p> <p>Work in 2020/21 This has concentrated on designing and funding a strategy to deal with the impact on local businesses of the covid epidemic. A programme of business support and skills development of a value of £1.85m is due to be rolled out over this year.</p> <p>Other members Cllr Tony Ball: Essex County Council Cllr Tom Cunningham: Braintree District Council Cllr Mark Durham: Essex County Council Cllr David King: Colchester Borough Council Cllr Neil Reeve: Uttlesford District Council Cllr Mary Newton: Tendring District Council Cllr Maria Goldman: Chelmsford City Council Dominic Collins: Braintree District Council Mark Carroll: Essex County Council Steve Evison: Essex County Council Paul Price: Tendring District Council Ian Vipond: Colchester Borough Council</p>	

APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES - APPENDIX B

	<p>Roger Harborough: Uttlesford District Council</p> <p>Tristan Smith: Essex County Council</p> <p>Stuart Graham: Chelmsford City Council</p>
Issues arising or Action required	

