



EAST  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a remote meeting of the Finance & Assets Committee held at 4:30pm on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2021, facilitated by the Zoom video conferencing system.

#### **PRESENT**

Cllr David Brown (Chairman)  
Cllr David Ambrose Smith  
Cllr Anna Bailey (substitute for Cllr Bill Hunt)  
Cllr Ian Bovingdon (Vice Chairman)  
Cllr Charlotte Cane  
Cllr Simon Harries  
Cllr Alan Sharp  
Cllr John Trapp  
Cllr Alison Whelan

#### **OFFICERS**

Emma Grima – Director Commercial  
Ian Smith – Finance Manager  
Sally Bonnett – Infrastructure & Strategy Manager  
Maggie Camp – Legal Services Manager  
Spencer Clark – Open Spaces & Facilities Manager  
Tracy Couper – Democratic Services Manager  
Caroline Evans – Democratic Services Officer  
Victor Le Grand – Senior Leisure Services Officer

#### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Suresh Patel – Associate Partner, External Audit, Ernst & Young  
Jacob McHugh – Account Manager, External Audit, Ernst & Young  
Rosanna Driver – Team Leader, External Audit, Ernst & Young  
Rachel Ashley-Caunt – Head of Internal Audit

#### **134. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No questions had been submitted by members of the public.

#### **135. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies for absence had been submitted by Cllr Bill Hunt; Cllr Anna Bailey was attending as a substitute.

#### **136. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ambrose Smith declared a pecuniary interest in Item 10 (Service Level Agreement Funds – Leisure 2020/21) and stated that he would leave the room for that item only.

Cllr Sharp declared a personal interest in Item 10 as a Governor of Bottisham Village College and a Trustee of the Ellesmere Centre in Stetchworth, and stated that he would remain for the item since there would be no discussion of figures.

## **137. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- He welcomed Caroline Evans, Democratic Services Officer, who was clerking her first meeting.
- The Minutes of the meeting held on 4th March were not yet available for confirmation and would go to the meeting on 7th June, together with the minutes of this meeting.
- He recorded his thanks to Ian Smith for challenging the basis on which Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) had been planning to set our fees. This had resulted in a reduction of the fees to be charged.
- Members could raise items for future meetings at Item 14 – Forward Agenda Plan.
- This would be the final meeting of the Finance and Assets Committee in its current format. He recorded his thanks to all members of the Committee, to all officers and to the external auditors for their help, guidance and contributions made over the last year

A Member questioned the lack of Minutes from the last meeting and why two items were not included in this Agenda that had been on the Forward Plan for this meeting. The Chairman responded that the short time frame between the two meetings had prevented preparation of the previous Minutes in time for the report deadline for this meeting, and clarified that ECTC Management Accounts had been presented to the 4<sup>th</sup> March meeting and the Palace Green Homes item would be presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> June meeting.

## **138. EXTERNAL AUDIT – AUDIT PLAN 2020/21**

The Committee received the External Audit Outline Audit Planning Report, previously circulated. The Chairman invited Suresh Patel (Associate Partner, Ernst & Young) and Jacob McHugh (Account Manager, Ernst & Young) to present the report.

Suresh Patel introduced Rosanna Driver (Team Leader, Ernst & Young) to Members and informed them that she was attending the meeting as an observer. By way of background to the report, Suresh Patel highlighted that 2020/21 would see a greater impact of COVID-19 on the financial figures and therefore the likelihood was that more judgements would be made in the accounts than in previous years, and consequently additional risks were included in the Audit Plan. This year would also be the first year working under the National Audit Office's new 2020 Code of Audit Practice. He highlighted that approximately 30% of councils were yet to publish their audited 2019/20 accounts, which reflected current pressures and continued to impact on the work of auditors. He informed Members that MHCLG target dates of 1<sup>st</sup> August for publication of draft accounts and end of September for publication of audited accounts were considered by auditors to be unrealistic and MHCLG had been informed of that. The current plan for this Council was for the audit to take place mid-September for completion by the end of October with the Council aiming to complete their accounts by late June/mid-July.

Jacob McHugh drew Members' attention to the following points:

- There were five new risks related to COVID-19 (report pages 5 and 6), none of which were unique to East Cambs but instead were seen across Local Government.
- There was a revised auditing standard for 2020/21 (report page 7).
- Planning materiality remained at 2% and performance materiality had increased to 75% reflecting the good work of 2019/20 which had given the auditors confidence that few errors would be expected (report page 7).

A Member raised concerns regarding debts to the Council, particularly the loan to the East Cambs Trading Company (ECTC), and also the uncertain situation regarding the Central Government/Combined Authority grant funding for housing. The Member sought confirmation that the auditors would be examining both of those and that they would be able to see documentation and letters regarding them in order to be able to advise on the potential risks to the Trading Companies and subsequently to the Council regarding delivery of affordable housing. With reference to the valuation of assets, the Member questioned whether general care and maintenance of the assets would be assessed.

In response, Suresh Patel explained that the recoverability of loans would be covered in the work on debtors and that any weaknesses in asset management should be picked up in the value for money work.

Another Member requested clarification on the following five points:

1. Whether a deficiency in any group, or company within a group, would flow through in the consolidation to be reflected as a deficit in the group accounts.
2. Whether 12 month detailed cashflow information would be required as is the case for corporate entities.
3. Why the leisure centre operator was highlighted on pages 16 and 22 of the report, since not actually related to East Cambs District Council.
4. How the audit differences figure of £39k had been reached (page 24 of the report).
5. The risk of slippage within the proposed timetable, since it appeared to use all of the available time.

Addressing points 2, 3, and 5, Suresh Patel responded that cashflow forecast figures would be needed but in less detail than for profit-based corporate entities, as per Practice Note 10 for the Public Sector; the leisure centre operator was considered a key partner and therefore had an impact on the Council's financial resilience (addressed under "value for money") as well as recoverability of debt regarding the management fee they were due to pay; the timetable was felt to be reasonable and a 6 week period had now been agreed with the S151 Officer and Finance Manager to fit with other commitments of the team.

Taking points 1 and 4, Jacob McHugh informed Members that group account preparation involved adding Council figures and subsidiary company figures and then removing activity between them, therefore company activity would be reflected in consolidated figures; the £39k audit differences figure was effectively 5% of the planning materiality. Having received confirmation on point 1, the Member expressed concern that this was at odds with the Leader of Council's assertion at the Finance & Assets Committee meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021 that losses in subsidiary companies would not flow through to affect the Council.

A Member commented with concern that the proposed timetable would miss the published deadline and could therefore cause reputational damage. However, the Member noted Suresh Patel's earlier comments regarding discussions with MHCLG and the knock-on effects of a significant proportion of councils being yet to publish their audited 2019/20 accounts.

A Member made various points regarding both ECTC and asset management, the stating of which was challenged by another Member as not being of relevance to the debate on the External Audit. The Chairman reminded Members to focus on the External Audit Plan.

Cllr Brown proposed that the report be noted, this was seconded by Cllr Bovingdon.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the External Audit Plan 2020/21 be noted.

### **139. INTERNAL AUDIT CHARTER AND WORK PLAN 2021/22**

The Committee considered a report (V157, previously circulated) presenting the draft Internal Audit Plan for 2021/22 and the Internal Audit Charter.

On the invitation of the Chairman, Rachel Ashley-Caunt (Head of Internal Audit) introduced the report and explained to Members that the Internal Audit Plan had been drafted on the risks, priorities and horizon scanning based on the process agreed with the Committee before Christmas. Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix 1 of the report summarised the changes compared to the original draft plan. She emphasised the importance of the plan remaining flexible and therefore requested delegated authority for the S151 Officer to make in year amendments between meetings in consultation with the Chair of this Committee.

The Chairman clarified that responsibility for the Internal Audit would be moving to the new Audit Committee and that therefore in future any such consultation would be with the Chairman of the Audit Committee, although until that point it would be with the Chairman of the Finance & Assets Committee.

A Member asked the Head of Internal Audit why "safeguarding" and "ICT systems – general" had been removed from the plan. Regarding safeguarding, the Member expressed surprise given the impact of the pandemic on things like younger people's mental health and also on domestic violence, and that the Council was now more closely involved in safeguarding through its advisory services than it had been in the past. Regarding ICT, the Member questioned the decision to focus on IT asset management instead of ICT systems given the recent serious ICT problem and the increased pressure on data storage and distribution resulting from remote working.

The Head of Internal Audit responded that difficult decisions had needed to be made. Safeguarding had last been audited in 2017, there had been no concerns then and the policies had been maintained. Regarding ICT, cybersecurity work had been on last year's plan and was now underway. Information regarding disaster-recovery, network mapping, and penetration tests on the robustness and security of data would therefore be presented to the new Audit Committee in the Annual Report. The Member agreed that the issues were complex and suggested that Internal Audit may not be the best vehicle for considering safeguarding, instead proposing that the topic

be debated at the next Committee meeting in order to consider it in depth as the Council's services to the public continued to evolve.

Another Member noted that there were no dates for the completion of the work and suggested that a schedule should be included based on the dates of the Audit Committee meetings in order to be clear when each element would be reported and to prevent slippage. This was agreed by the Head of Internal Audit.

A Member drew attention to the multiple references within the documents to Finance & Assets Committee and questioned whether they should be replaced with Audit Committee since the responsibility would lie with that Committee for the year the documents covered. Related to that, the Member suggested it would be more appropriate to approve the recommendations on an interim basis, subject to the Audit Committee reviewing them at their first meeting. The Head of Internal Audit agreed with the importance of the Audit Committee reviewing the documents at their first meeting in order to have ownership of the process, but reminded Members that the Internal Audit Charter needed approving annually and was last done in March 2020, and the work in the plan was due to start in early April so should ideally be approved at this meeting.

A motion to approve the recommendations in the report, amended to include a requirement for the report to be presented to the first meeting of the new Audit Committee, was proposed by Cllr Whelan and seconded by Cllr Brown.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) That the Internal Audit Plan for 2021/22 and the Internal Audit Charter set out in Appendix 1 and 2 of the report be approved.
- 2) That the delegation of authority to the Council's S151 Officer to approve in year amendments to the Audit Plan between Committee meetings, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, be approved.
- 3) That the Internal Audit Plan for 2020/21 and the Internal Audit Charter be presented to the first meeting of the new Audit Committee for review.

#### **140. INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received a report (V158, previously circulated) advising Members of the work of the Internal Audit completed during the period November 2020 to March 2021, and the progress against the Internal Audit Plan.

The Chairman invited the Head of Internal Audit to present the report. She explained that since the writing of the report further progress had been made and that 100% of the plan was now either in progress or complete. She referred Members to her earlier comments regarding the work on cybersecurity that would be delivered in April and completed in time for the Annual Audit Report. She drew Members' attention to the four audit reports that had been finalised since the previous Committee meeting and were referenced in Section 2.3 of Appendix 1 of the report – Treasury Management, Bank Reconciliations, Data Protection, and Local Authority Trading Companies. One 2019/20 audit recommendation remained overdue from the Disabled Facilities Grants audit and was detailed in Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix 1 of the report. She explained that there had been some delays overall due to trying not to pressure service areas

already burdened with COVID-19 issues so ~18% of the work would overflow into the first quarter of the next financial year, but reiterated that all remaining items would be completed and included in the Annual Audit Report which would be presented to the new Audit Committee at its first meeting.

Some Members expressed concerns with the report and highlighted particular issues as follows:

- Bank Reconciliations – a balancing item of £223.16 being deemed “not a material item” and remaining unreconciled for the remainder of the financial year. The Member recognised that the document quoted the Senior Accountant, but stressed that this view should not have been accepted by Internal Audit and that the item should be resolved.
- Overdue action on Disabled Facilities Grants – noting that this Committee had recently approved the Council’s Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Policy and that the reported delay could cause a potential risk to a protected group, questioned whether an Equalities Impact statement should have been provided.
- Local Authority Trading Companies – recent debate at this Committee regarding ECTC had suggested to the Member that where Officers and Members had roles in both ECTC and the Council the separation between those roles was not always clear, and that a Member acting as an ECTC Board observer had contributed inappropriately to Board Meeting discussions, consequently the governance did not appear to be working as it should. Given that the audit report included mention of six recommendations to further strengthen governance arrangements (and which the Head of Internal Audit was asked to detail) it was surprising that the audit’s conclusion was positive.

The Head of Internal Audit explained that the outstanding action regarding Disabled Facilities Grants was not holding up delivery of the work, rather it was related to the awarding of contracts and checking that formal framework contracts were in place. It was therefore not considered to be presenting a risk to those who would be in receipt of the work. A Member requested that Committee Members be reassured by Officers outside the meeting that the work was proceeding and also that the correct procurement procedures were in place in order that the Council was not at risk.

Regarding the trading companies, the Head of Internal Audit stated that the recommendations were designed to further strengthen the governance and had all been agreed with Officers. In summary the recommendations were:

- A Conflict Protocol to be prepared.
- Board Minutes to be provided as exempt items to Shareholder Committees.
- The Member Seminar which had been due to take place in 2020 to be rescheduled.
- The East Cambs Street Scene (ECSS) Memorandum of Agreement to be updated.
- The repayment schedules for the loans to be documented in line with the agreements.
- Biannual reports to be provided to the Shareholder Committees including strategic risk assessments.

She stated that the changes to the ECSS Memorandum of Agreement were all deemed to be generally administrative and therefore not considered significant in terms of the audit position. A question regarding the increased funding provided to ECSS was deferred for clarification outside of the meeting.

A Member clarified that Full Council had agreed in October 2019 that observers would have the right to contribute to discussions at the Board Meetings of both ECTC and ECSS.

The recommendation in the report was proposed by Cllr Brown and seconded by Cllr Bovingdon.

It was resolved:

That the progress made by Internal Audit in the delivery of the Audit Plan and key findings detailed in Appendix 1 of the report be noted.

#### **141. RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee received a report (V159, previously circulated) detailing the latest Corporate Risk Register and framework.

The Head of Internal Audit introduced the report and explained to Members that the contents were owned by the Council; Internal Audit did not score or endorse it so it did not represent their assessment, their role was purely to collate and present it on behalf of Officers.

Several Members raised concerns with the Risk Register. They suggested that it was insufficiently rigorous, did not follow corporate best practice for risk registers, and that the key controls were not material enough to have sufficient impact. They expressed concern that the Council was exposed in some areas that it was not recognising and therefore questioned if Members and Officers were fully understanding the nature of risk. They stated that the Risk Register should be a very important Council document to highlight to Officers, Members and Auditors where their attention should be focussed and, by not being rigorous, a key way to manage the Council's risks was lost.

Attention was drawn to risks A2 and A3 relating to the risk that the trading companies may not deliver upon their business plans and the Council may not deliver the housing policy. Another Member agreed with the need to highlight this and commented that the potential impact on residents would be significant, since the Council was not meeting its housing strategy targets for affordable housing. Furthermore, speaking on risk A4 regarding homelessness, the good work of the housing department in tackling street homelessness was recognised, but the Risk Register did not reflect the many families who were inappropriately housed. Similarly, whilst not suggesting any fault in the Council's response to COVID-19, a Member suggested that risks regarding the impact of the pandemic should be categorised as red, since no key controls reduced the risk. The downgrading of risk C2 regarding ICT systems was criticised in light of a recent serious ICT problem.

A Member responded that the delay in East Cambs Trading Company's building works had been an inevitable consequence of lockdown and did not therefore represent a failure. They also emphasised that East Cambs Street Scene had not been underperforming. Regarding the delivery of affordable housing they explained that the Council's powers were limited, since individual Planning applications had to be considered on Planning grounds and, as an example, drew Members' attention to a recent application for 100% affordable housing in Mepal that had been refused by Planning Committee on the advice of Officers and the guidance of local Members.

Also, once applications were approved, there was no way to compel developers to start to build. They agreed with other Members that mitigating actions contained in the Risk Register could be reviewed, and emphasised that Members could submit individual points directly to Officers.

Several Members emphasised their total support for ECSS and the excellent work they did, explained that their concerns were purely regarding the Council's exposure to risk, and clarified that their comments regarding risk A2 related to ECTC and not ECSS. In particular, one Member asserted that the Risk Register did not accurately reflect that a failure of ECTC to service its debt would leave the Council insolvent due to its level of exposure. That assertion was challenged and the S151 Officer explained that he believed that there was enough equity in the Company to repay the Council loan. When further questioned regarding the protection, the S151 Officer stated that he would clarify and confirm outside of the meeting.

A Member commented that profit from a business delivering housing would inevitably take time and that financial profit was not the only way in which the trading companies delivered value and benefits to the Council and local residents. They stated that by the end of the financial year, ECTC would have delivered £2.1m of value to the Council. Another Member reiterated the previously-expressed view (Minute 138) that the above Member, in her capacity as Leader of Council, had misunderstood how finance flowed between the trading companies and the Council. The Member concerned responded via a Point of Explanation that the relevant table in the Trading Company's Business Plan was clear.

The recommendation in the report was proposed by Cllr Brown and seconded by Cllr Bovingdon.

It was resolved:

That the Corporate Risk Register as set out in Appendix 2 of the report be noted.

*6:25pm to 6:35pm the meeting was briefly adjourned for a comfort break.*

#### **142. FORMER MEPAL OUTDOOR CENTRE**

The Committee considered a report (V160, previously circulated) regarding the proposed demolition of the existing structures at the former Mepal Outdoor Centre site. The Director Commercial introduced the report and showed the Committee some photographs of the various structures referenced in Appendix 1.

During the course of the debate there was mention of potential future uses of the site. At the first such mention, Cllr Cane declared an interest related to one potential future use. The Chairman reminded Members to focus purely on the Agenda item.

Several Members expressed concern and disappointment at the current state of the site. Some criticised the way that the site had been managed since being taken over by the Council and the use of insurance claim money to fund security fencing rather than repairs. They were also disappointed regarding a lack of detail and transparency in the report, particularly relating to other documents that were referred to but not provided. Mention was made of the importance of outdoor activities for young people and consequently that more should have been done to secure the site's future use for that purpose. One Member commented that while recognising that



authorising the demolition was only a first step, and that approval of a planning application would be needed before it could go ahead, each seemingly harmless small step cemented the assumption that the site would no longer be used for leisure purposes.

Other Members emphasised that the Council had worked hard for several years to find a third party willing to take over the site as an outdoor activity centre but had not been successful. They reiterated that the structures were clearly dangerous following the arson and vandalism and that the report's recommendation was for the safety of the public. The site was becoming hard to insure in its current state and there was an ongoing cost and liability to the Council in trying to maintain the site.

A Member reminded Members that over recent years nature had taken over the site and, due to the ecology and biodiversity now present there, the Wildlife Trust had indicated that only low impact recreational use such as bird watching and fishing would now be appropriate there. The Member also explained that the planning application for demolition would need to address the impact on biodiversity and environment.

A Member questioned why temporary uses had not been explored for the site, since keeping it well-maintained would have provided security and deterred vandals. Given the diverse nature now present on the site, a potential use as an environmental education centre also was suggested.

The recommendations in the report were proposed by Cllr Ambrose Smith and seconded by Cllr Bovingdon.

It was resolved:

- 1) That the demolition of the existing structures at the former Mepal Outdoor Centre site be authorised.
- 2) That the Open Spaces & Facilities Manager be instructed to submit a planning application to implement the demolition of existing structures.

#### **143. SLA GRANTS FUNDING LEISURE 2020/21**

*7:11pm Cllr Ambrose Smith left the meeting.*

The Committee considered a report (V161, previously circulated) detailing a review of the current position of the leisure facility trusts operating in East Cambridgeshire. The Senior Leisure Services Officer outlined the contents of the report and emphasised that with no certainty regarding the route out of lockdown, including how soon users would be confident to return once facilities were allowed to reopen, it would be important to remain flexible to respond to emerging needs.

Several Members expressed their strong support for the recommendations in the report. They stressed the importance of being able to respond flexibly to provide support and encouraged Officers in their aim to support local leisure facilities. A Member thanked the Officer for a clearly written and understandable report and presentation and asked that the impact on people with protected characteristics should be borne in mind going forward.

The recommendations in the report were proposed by Cllr Brown and seconded by Cllr Bailey.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) That the full carry forward of the 2020/21 Service Level Agreement (SLA) grants budget into 2021/22 be approved.
- 2) That the use of the Service Level Agreement grants budget for 2020/21 and 2021/22 to directly support operations, where necessary, in order to address the financial pressures created by the pandemic be approved.
- 3) That agreement to provide hardship relief to all community-owned leisure centres for 2021-22 following the end of the government-mandated full relief be approved.

*7:21pm Cllr Ambrose Smith returned to the meeting.*

#### **144. RECOMMENDATION FROM BUS, CYCLE, WALK WORKING PARTY**

The Committee considered a report (V162, previously circulated) outlining a recommendation from the Bus, Cycle, Work Walking Party regarding preliminary feasibility studies. The Infrastructure & Strategy Manager summarised the Working Party's recommendation and explained that the recommendation before the Committee asked that the work on the prioritisation of the routes should be completed, together with obtaining quotes for feasibility studies for a number of routes, prior to allocation of any funding.

The Chairman clarified for Members that since Working Parties are non-decision-making groups, the Constitution did not allow delegation of funds from Committees to them. He outlined two potential options: to delegate funds to the Infrastructure & Strategy Manager in consultation with the Chairman of Finance & Assets Committee, or to provide a report to the June meeting of this Committee with specific funding requests for approval and allocation. The Democratic Services Manager confirmed that both options would be permitted under the Constitution.

Several Working Party Members stated that the most recent meeting of the Working Party had been very positive and productive with a clear drive to move the project forward without delay. They also stressed the importance of being able to influence the LCWIP and that having the Sustrans data would provide more robust arguments to do that. The Chairman of the Working Party summarised that the next step, as identified at their latest meeting, was for Working Party members to consider maps of the routes that had been mentioned in the public consultation and that the intention was to do that in a meeting at the end of April, once the maps had been prepared from the consultation data. Parish Councils would also be consulted regarding the smaller routes identified, and a response to the County Council's consultation needed to be prepared.

A Member stressed the importance of ending up with a good quality strategic map of potential cycling and walking routes within the District which could be used to prioritise routes and then subsequently obtain Sustrans quotes in order to determine the best way forward. They emphasised that in prioritising routes it would be important to consider viability and the realistic possibility of delivering each route as

well as the route's popularity in the consultation responses. The Council did not have sufficient monies available itself to deliver a district-wide cycling and walking network, but would look to secure funding from elsewhere, including S106 monies and potentially CIL funding.

The Chairman and other Members recorded their thanks to the members of the Working Party for their hard work.

The recommendations in the report were proposed by Cllr Ambrose Smith and seconded by Cllr Harries.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) That the recommendation made by the East Cambridgeshire Bus, Cycle, Walk Working Party requesting a funding allocation of £30,000 to fund feasibility studies for new cycle routes, as set out in paragraph 3.2 of the report, be noted.
- 2) That this Committee awaits the result of the prioritisation work to ensure that the prioritised routes are capable of progression.
- 3) That quotes for a number of route feasibility studies be requested to ensure any funds utilised can be maximised and a report be presented to a future Finance & Assets Committee meeting.

#### **145. CIL FUNDING REQUEST**

The Committee considered a report (V163, previously circulated) requesting the allocation of £180k to the first phase of improvements to the Gardiner Memorial Hall, Burwell, and the in-principle agreement to support the opportunity for further funding of Phase 2.

The Chairman reported that he had received positive feedback from Burwell Parish Councillors regarding how well they had been working with Sally Bonnett, Infrastructure & Strategy Manager, and recorded his thanks to her.

Members commented positively on the proposals and stated that they felt projects like this were an excellent use of CIL money.

The recommendations in the report were proposed by Cllr Brown and seconded by Cllr Cane.

It was resolved unanimously:

- 1) That the allocation of £180,000 to Phase 1 of the Gardiner Memorial Hall, Burwell, Improvement Project be approved.
- 2) That in-principle agreement be given to provide future funding for Phase 2 of the Gardiner Memorial Hall Improvement Project as set out in paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7 of the report.

#### **146. ASSETS UPDATE**

The Committee received a report (V164, previously circulated) containing an update on Council-owned assets.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the update on Council-owned assets be noted.

**147. FORWARD AGENDA PLAN**

The Committee received the updated Forward Agenda Plan for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

A Member questioned the purpose of the Committee approving a Forward Agenda Plan, if it could not be guaranteed that future Agendas aligned with it. Specifically, attention was drawn to the ECTC Management Accounts and Palace Green Homes Accommodation items that had been timetabled for this meeting on a previous Forward Agenda Plan but had not been included today. The Chairman responded that Members had been informed of the reasons for these changes in Chairman's Announcements, as detailed above.

It was resolved unanimously:

That the Forward Agenda Plan be noted.

*The meeting concluded at 7:48pm.*