

**MINUTES OF THE GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 7PM ON
WEDNESDAY, 13 MARCH 2019
BOURGES / VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors C. Harper (Chairman), R. Brown, G. Casey (Vice-Chairman), M. Farooq, Judy Fox, A Joseph, D King, S. Martin, N. Sandford.
Co-opted Members: Parish Councillors Keith Lievesley and Richard Clarke.

Officers Present: Dave Anderson – Interim Development Director
Amanda Askham – Director of Business Improvement and Development
Mark Sandhu – Head of Customer and Transactional Services
Richard Pearn – Head of Waste, Resources and Energy
James Collingridge - Head of Environmental Partnerships
Tom Hennessey – Chief Executive, Opportunity Peterborough
Adrian Chapman – Service Director for Communities and Safety
Paulina Ford – Senior Democratic Services Officer
David Beauchamp – Democratic Services Officer

Also Present: Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Marco Cereste – Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene
Councillor John Fox - Representing the Group Leader of the Werrington First Group
Cllr Steve. Allen – Cabinet Advisor to the Leader
Peter Appleton – Chief Executive, Vivacity
Andrew Lesiw – Managing Director, Westcombe Engineering

51. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Fower.

52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda Item 6- Portfolio Progress Report for the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene

Councillor Farooq declared that he was a member of the Board for Peterborough Limited.

53. MINUTES OF THE GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING AND JOINT SCRUTINY OF THE BUDGET MEETINGS HELD ON

3.1 9 JANUARY 2019 – GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 January 2019 were agreed as a true and accurate record

3.2 12 FEBRUARY 2019 – JOINT SCRUTINY OF THE BUDGET

The minutes of the Joint Scrutiny of the Budget meeting held on 12 February 2019 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

54. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS

There were no requests for call-In to consider.

55. CORPORATE STRATEGY 2019-2021

The report was introduced by the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Integrated Adult Social Care and Health and the Director of Business Improvement and Development. It provided an overview of and sought the Committee's Endorsement for the proposed Corporate Strategy to be considered by Cabinet in June 2019 and Full Council in July 2019.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members praised the fact the Corporate Strategy 2019-2021 was relatively short as it meant that focus would be given to the most important elements.
- Members noted that Peterborough City Council had four corporate outcomes, which used to have Scrutiny Committees based on them, and asked how these were linked to the priority outcomes in the Corporate Strategy.
- Officers responded that the four Corporate Outcomes and seven corporate priorities had been condensed and encapsulated into three main areas of focus.
- The Cabinet Member emphasised that the members should raise concerns if they felt that an issue was not sufficiently covered by the current terms of reference of the Council's Scrutiny Committees so that the Chief Executive and Democratic Services could look into it further. The Council had moved to having less scrutiny committees so that the work would be more manageable .
- Members commented on the lack of explicit reference to climate change or biodiversity loss in the Corporate Strategy, despite these forming part of the Environmental Capital Implementation Plan, the fact that the country had stringent Climate Change targets and the fact that many councils had declared a climate emergency.
- Officers responded that the two most important areas of the strategy were 'Communities' and 'Our Environment' but acknowledged that Climate Change and Biodiversity loss were not reflected in the examples under the 'Pride in our communities and environment' Priority Outcome on page 46 of the agenda pack. Members' views would be taken into consideration and action plans would be developed for each outcome.

- The Cabinet Member added that there was a particular focus on the Environment in the strategy (page 41 of the agenda pack), encompassing the circular economy, green spaces, clean air and green businesses so climate change was covered, just not explicitly and remained high on the agenda.
- Members asked how the Think Peterborough initiative would underpin the corporate strategy. Officers responded that everything in the strategy was based around community thinking.
- Members congratulated officers on the strategy and for consulting with residents
- Members asked if the strategy would be expanded upon in more detail in the future. Officers responded there was an evidence base in place about the issues that needed to be tackled in Peterborough. Once the priority outcomes had been determined, careful action and implementation plans for different timeframes would need to be developed. Much of this work had already started and had revolved around the existing seven strategic priorities and the four outcomes. Officers noted the importance of the elements of the Council's Strategic Framework building on each other.
- Members referred to a line on page 49 of the agenda pack which stated that the strategy would 'foster an innovative culture where continuous improvement is everyone's responsibility' and asked what this meant to officers and how they would encourage this. Officers agreed that resources, support and investment were needed for staff to be innovative but felt that this was achievable by all and not limited to a particular type of person.
- The Corporate Strategy presented to the Committee was not intended to be a public-facing document. A different communication strategy would be needed for members of the public that would appear on the website.

Councillor King entered the meeting at 7.20pm

- The consultation that had taken place with residents was not about the Corporate Strategy itself as this was still in draft form. It was instead about what citizens wanted from the Council from an amalgamation of surveys.
- Members asked how the evidence base for the corporate strategy had been documented. Officers responded that although there was no commentary on this in the report, the draft Corporate Strategy would receive a wide consultation. This would include written surveys to inform priorities with 3,000 people to be engaged.
- Members thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for producing the Strategy and felt the priority outcomes would improve the lives of people in Peterborough.
- Members suggested that the Strategy could raise residents' expectations and sought reassurance that these expectations could be met. Officers responded that the Council were engaged in new initiative such as the Think Communities Strategy. The new Corporate Strategy revolved involving the public in the new priorities. People would have to take ownership of work that needed doing in their communities.
- Different partners had been engaged with in different ways. For example, the views of Vivacity were sought through officers and members' in the council who manage this contract, but the approach was more deliberate with regards to engagement with voluntary and public sector partners. During the wider consultation, the views of partners would be captured and they were an important part of delivering on the strategy.
- Members asked if the Corporate Strategy had been put together by officers or the Conservative Group. Officers responded that this corporate strategy had

been put forward by the governing administration but that officers had helped to compile it, with input from the wider public through the means of surveys and street meetings. A large sample size had been used.

- Both officers and the Executive contributed to the development of the strategy.
- The Cabinet Member added that anyone could make suggestions for inclusion in the Strategy at any time.
- Officers reaffirmed the commitment to environmental issues in the Strategy.
- Officers stated that the Corporate Strategy would provide a framework for staff to use in connection with their own roles and for the City Council to use when interacting with partners to highlight its priorities. The strategy showed a clear commitment to issues related to the environment.
- It was UNANIMOUSLY agreed that the Committee would recommend to Cabinet that the Strategy includes specific reference to Climate Change and Loss of Biodiversity under the 'Pride in our Communities and environment' Priority Outcome.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to

1. Endorse the proposed Corporate Strategy 2019-2021 to be approved by Cabinet in June 2019 and Full Council in July 2019
2. Recommend to Cabinet that the Strategy includes specific reference to Climate Change and Loss of Biodiversity under the 'Pride in our Communities and environment' Priority Outcome.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to

1. Comment on the proposed Corporate Strategy 2019/2021
2. Request a briefing note containing further information about how the Corporate Strategy 2019/2021 relates to the Environment Capital Action Plan.

56. PORTFOLIO PROGRESS REPORT FOR THE CABINET MEMBER FOR WASTE AND STREET SCENE

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene accompanied by the Head of Environmental Partnerships, the Head of Waste, Resources and Energy, the Head of Customer and Transactional Services and the Managing Director of Westcombe Engineering. The report updated the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee on the progress of items under the responsibility of the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- An error was noted in the table on page 54 of the agenda pack. The figures given for Residual (Black) containers actually related to Garden (Brown) containers and vice versa.

- Members highlighted the 2018/19 recycling rate of 42.77 in section 4.3.2 on page 54 of the reports pack, noted that this used to be 78% and that Peterborough used to be one of the leading Local Authorities in the country for recycling rates. Members asked why Peterborough's recycling rates had dropped when they were improving for other authorities. The Cabinet Member responded that:
 - The reasons for this decrease were being investigated and he was keen for this to improve. An accurate response could be provided within months.
 - Residents needed to be made aware that the amount of waste they recycled was not limited by the size of the green bin. Additional recycling could be placed within a clear plastic bag and left near the bin and it would be collected.

Officers added that it was important to note that recycling rates were plateauing nationwide. A consultation was underway on investigating possible changes to the management of waste. This would result in the first new policy instrument in 10 years. Peterborough officers were aware of the opportunity to feed into this consultation. Systems needed to be rebalanced nationwide. Support would be provided by central Government to support change and meet targets.

- Members suggested the Council should examine achieving greater source-separation in order to increase recycling rates, as done by Welshpool and Bristol. The Government felt that this would improve recycling rates if done throughout the country.
- Members suggested that if food and garden waste were collected free of charge, there would be a significant increase in recycling rates. It was suggested that the introduction of the charges might have contributed to the lowering of Peterborough's recycling rate.
- The Cabinet Member responded that every option was being examined. A key focus was the 'circular economy' in response to a government consultation. Further work was needed in this area in over the following months.
- The Cabinet Member mentioned that there were five collections a week in Italy for different types of waste.
- There were many factors involved in gaining a Green Flag award including community work, parks and biodiversity.
- Members expressed support for the work done by Westcombe Engineering.
- The Leader of the Task and Finish Group to Review Fly-Tipping and Waste Policy stated that the group were currently working on additional proposals to take to Cabinet.
 - Officers added that money was being made available in the next financial year for the police tape, covert cameras and the cost of Joining Keep Britain Tidy.
- The Cabinet Member would consider introducing three weekly bin collections if there was evidence that this would be effective
- Some members expressed doubts that the target of 65% of waste being recycled by 2020 would be achieved and suggest accelerated action was needed.
- Members raised concerns surrounding the contamination of paper banks with glass. Officers responded that Peterborough had a Materials Recovering Facility which was specifically designed to deal with a mixture of these two materials.
- The Government Consultation was considering issues such as increased separation of materials.

- The Government was aware of industry concerns regarding paper separation and would like to achieve greater consistency in this area throughout the country.
- Some members stated that the information provided to the public about what could and could not be recycled needed to be improved, citing an example of a meeting in which the attendees' impression of appropriate green bin usage did not align with official Amey policies. Members asked if there were plans to improve the Council's website or run an education programme focussing on this.
- Officers responded that Brown Bins had been discussed at Budget CMT, with a specific paper having been produced by the Service Director for Environment and Economy regarding current charges for the service. There were currently 21,651 subscribers to the brown bin service. There was a marketing budget for this.
- Officers stated that one of the reasons for the non-renewal of the contract was recycling performance and communications. The Council would now have more power to influence these areas. Information to residents could be updated. It was noted that there was an education facility at the Energy Recovery Facility that expanded beyond energy recovery to include food collections and recycling.
- Officers referred to a Government consultation containing proposals to introduce colour coding on products to indicate if an item could be recycled with a number to indicate which bins should be used regardless of the system used by a particular local authority. Officers were keen to ensure that consumers were informed when purchasing packaged products although it was difficult for the council to influence consumer behaviour in this area. The Consultation therefore suggested that the packaging industry should take on more cost and responsibility in this area.
- The Cabinet Member acknowledged that recycling rates had decreased, and work was underway to address this. It was noted that for every tonne of waste not sent to the Energy from Waste plant £45 was saved. It was therefore in the Council's interests to favour recycling over incineration.
- Officers added that the amount of residual waste had stayed reasonably consistent considering the growth of the City. The amount of waste going to the Energy from Waste plant had not increased significantly. The figures were recorded in tonnes. Wine bottles and packaging were becoming lighter and it therefore looked like the Council was recycling less. Consideration could be given to using an alternative measure of recycling performance, such as the Carbon Footprint.
- Members noted that Amey had failed to meet its KPI targets for recycling by a considerable measure but noted the Cabinet Member's sincerity in trying to tackle the issue. Members raised suggestions such as removing the charge for garden waste collection
- Members suggested that covers should be used on gym equipment installed in parks.
- The new recycling centre had received a positive response. Feedback had been actively sought six months after opening. Feedback did suggest that a map should be provided to show people where they needed to take different types of waste, using the same iconography used on site.
- Members expressed concern that the Council were trying to avoid using the Energy from Waste plant because of its ability to generate income and useful by-products. Members enquired about whether there were still opportunities to use the by-products. Officers responded that ash was recycled in Nottingham to produce many types of aggregate. Air cleaning chemicals were sent to

Avonmouth to be bound into concrete material. Nothing was sent to landfill and all residue was recycled.

- The Cabinet Member added that the ideal scenario would be for the city to consume the energy and heat produced by the plant and this was being seriously examined and was dependent on the technology available and contractual circumstances. This would make a difference to the council's environmental credentials and the revenue going to the City Council.
- Members expressed concerns that cemeteries were not being maintained as well as crematoriums and asked what the plan for cemetery maintenance was in the future. Officers responded that the nature for cemeteries made them more challenging to maintain than crematoriums. Peterborough had been awarded a green flag for the latter but not the former. The Council were still looking for new cemeteries, to be arranged in a 'Commonwealth Graves' layout. The Cabinet member had committed to keeping existing cemeteries open. In 2005 it was recognised that there was a risk of running out of cemetery space and that there was 24/25 years' worth of usage left in existing cemeteries.
- The Cabinet Member stated that a specific team could be created for open spaces, cemeteries and parks as part of the new Local Authority Trading Company (LATCo) to improve these areas. It was not yet clear whether this would be possible as only some services had currently been transferred from Amey and there would need to be an economic case made.
- Members praised the work done to improve the crematorium, in particular the cover outside the entrance to the Chapel.
- Officers stated that there was a full-time gardener employed at the crematorium which was highly beneficial.
- Members enquired who the correct person to contact was to seek advice on building a new cemetery. The Head of Customer and Transactional Services responded that he would be happy to receive such a query and would direct it to the appropriate person.
- The Committee requested that the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene bring a report back to the Committee on improving the Council's recycling rates, once the work investigating this issue was complete.

--

ACTIONS AGREED

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to

1. Note the contents of this report.
2. Request that the Cabinet Member for Waste and Street Scene bring a report back to the Committee on improving the Council's recycling rates, once the work investigating this issue was complete.

57. OPPORTUNITY PETERBOROUGH BUSINESS PLAN 2019/20

The report was introduced by the Chief Executive of Opportunity Peterborough which asked the Committee to consider and endorse the Opportunity Peterborough Business Plan 2019/20.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Engineering and manufacturing companies in the City and nationwide were struggling to recruit people with the skills they needed from the existing workforce and particularly from school leavers. This was reflected in the fact that most people on courses at University Centre Peterborough were being supported by employers rather than having entered University straight from school. Engineering and manufacturing would be a key focus for Opportunity of Peterborough in its business support and skill service activities. This was a key growth sector for the city.
- Members praised the report and the opportunities for joint working.
- Joint Working took place with other authorities besides Cambridgeshire County Council, especially in the area of Economic Development. There were strong links with the Growth team at South Kesteven for example and officers were hoping to continue these strong ties.
- Members asked when Opportunity Peterborough would become self-sustainable. Officers responded that the Economic Development team tried to address market failure and support efficiencies within the market. If this could be addressed via market mechanisms, then the private sector would pick up these activities. As these challenges were met by the private sector then Opportunity Peterborough would identify other challenges that they could address. There would always be a role for public sector funding however in supporting economic growth. It was unlikely that the organisation would self-fund itself solely from its commercial activities because that would mean that they were competing with the rest of the market. This could be an eventual outcome for the organisation.
- It was not yet certain how Brexit would affect the funding of Opportunity Peterborough due to the complexity of the issue. It was acknowledged that the organisation did receive European Funding at present for some programmes.
- Officers were examining an opportunity to join another European-funded programme with Anglia Ruskin and TWI to support the engineering sector across the City and beyond.
- Should these opportunities come to an end, there were other funding schemes that could be accessed through the U.K. Government such as the Shared Prosperity Fund. The priorities for this fund had yet to be determined but it was proposed that this would be a direct replacement for the European Structural Investment Funds and Opportunity Peterborough would look at this for funding opportunities in the future as well as working with partners such as neighbouring local authorities, the Combined Authority and the private and education sectors.
- Members stated that the government had made £670m available for high street funding via local councils as well as the recent 1.6bn for 'Brexit Towns' and asked if Opportunity Peterborough would work with the City Council to access this funding. Officers responded that they would do so. The focus of Opportunity Peterborough's focus had been regeneration but was now economic development; looking at 'soft' economic development such as Inward Investment and Skills. Physical regeneration was under the remit of the City Council although Opportunity Peterborough worked closely with them in this area, especially around the development of new employment sites. Opportunity Peterborough were working closely with the Interim Development Director to develop a strategic approach to city centre redevelopment. A bid was being developed at officer level, but subject to extensive consultation, to

access money from the Future High Streets Fund The deadline for this was Friday 22 March 2019. The focus was the Northminster area and replacing the City Market.

- The vast majority of Opportunity Peterborough's rural activity was linked to the European LEADER programme funding. The organisation was looking to work with The National Farmers Union (NFU) and Country Land and Business Association (CLA) on how to support the rural economy. It was currently unclear how the Shared Prosperity Funds and any additional Defra funds would provide support in this area in the future.
- The LEADER programme was the only one of Opportunity Peterborough's programmes to rely on European Funding. The application process for this had closed and the programme was coming to an end. Defra had ringfenced funding to deal with claims administration over the next 18 months but there was otherwise no financial impact to Opportunity Peterborough on the withdrawal of European funding caused by Brexit. It might affect which programmes could be delivered in the future, but this would be determined by the level of U.K. government funding available at the time.
- The Opportunity Peterborough team was robust with staff working across several activities which would help if a member of staff decided to leave. No one was currently planning to do so. The organisation had previously been in a period of change with Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) boundary reviews and a review of the delivery of services going forward.
- Members queried whether work was continuing on signing Opportunity Peterborough up the Employer Recognition Scheme as encouraged by the Armed Forces Partnership Board. Officers responded that they were not aware this has stalled and would investigate further.
- Some members felt that the creative industries needed to be viewed as business opportunities, not charities in need of support. A vision for creative industries was needed to analyse the sector's size in the city compared to what it should be.
- Officers added that the 'creative industries' were a very broad category. There had been a focus on supporting the digital sector in the past. Opportunity Peterborough had also supported submissions to the Creative Hub. Officers could not comment on the scale of the industry but felt that culture and the creative arts were the soul of the city and supporting them was important to inspire young people and bring businesses into the city.
- Officers referred to the recent launch of the Empowering Creative People Hub which had been opened by a local young entrepreneur who had benefited from support from Opportunity Peterborough and Peterborough DNA funding under the Future Cities Demonstrator Programme. A dance and recording studio had been set up at the Peterborough United Football Club's stadium to help local artists engage with businesses and young people. Support would continue to be provided.
- Officers noted that the creative industries represented an important opportunity for the City given its growth rates. It was noted that the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport and the U.K. sector body on Creative Industries had conducted extensive research on the economic impact of this sector and the jobs it created.
- Officers felt it was important to develop the asset base of the city as it was undersized compare with others, such as Dundee. The new university presented an opportunity in this area.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to endorse the Opportunity Peterborough Business Plan 2019/20.

58. VIVACITY ANNUAL REPORT

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Advisor to the Leader, the Service Director for Communities and Safety and the Chief Executive of Vivacity which enabled the Committee to scrutinise the activities and develop a deep understanding of the strategic direction the organisation is taking and to provide an overview of partnership and service delivery, performance, challenges and opportunities.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members felt that establishment of Vivacity had been a success, avoiding cuts that might have occurred if the Council had been running services directly.
- Zero-hours contracts were common in the leisure industry and enabled the organisation to respond flexibly to demands. Vivacity had canvassed its employees on these contracts and no-one wished to move to a fixed contract instead. Employees liked the choice zero-hours contracts offered and they worked well for young people who wanted to work while they were studying. Vivacity had always used these contracts and other employers in the city also used them.
- Members asked how the members of the Vivacity board were appointed. Officers responded that there were two councillors on the board, one of whom was the Cabinet Advisor to the Leader. All trustees were users of the service and provided useful intelligence. Vivacity was not a cooperative so there was no staff representative on the board although Vivacity do engage with staff and trade unions. Officers were not sure where an employee representative would come from if such a role was created because of the low rate of trade union representation among the workforce
- Some members felt that veterans should be given a discount at Vivacity facilities, especially those with disabilities, noting that there was no mention of this in the report. Officers invited the member to contact them and discuss the Employer Recognition Scheme. Officers responded that would be happy to look at these areas in more detail.
- Members commented that there was an absence of facilities in rural areas. Officers responded that this was by default rather than design as Vivacity had inherited existing facilities rather than building new ones. Some outreach work was underway with rural areas although city-based facilities were more financially viable.
- Vivacity's relationship with the City Council was changing and was being moved from to the People and Communities Directorate. A dialogue was underway with Vivacity regarding its diversification and expansion. Vivacity must be compliant with its contract but it was important that all citizens were reached.
- The Cabinet Advisor stated that the board would always look at the potential for expanding into rural communities but Vivacity must be commercially driven and make financial sense.
- Members asked if Vivacity were exploring commercial opportunities to develop revenue streams. Officers responded that Vivacity now had a commercial team and a Commercial Director and these opportunities were being looked at in collaboration with partners in the Greater Peterborough area. A long development period was necessary for these opportunities to make money however.
- Members felt that the decline of the high street for retailers presented an opportunity for the development of commercial leisure facilities. Officers responded

that while they were happy to examine anything, it was not possible to work on all opportunities at the same time due to limited capacity. A new project pipeline process had been introduced to find opportunities that were likely to result in positive yield. An opportunity had been presented to work with a commercial partner in the previous year but the timescales for a return on investment was not viable.

- Officers felt that as the framework for the city was developed, there would be a need for strategic planning and greater density of facilities in urban areas. The High Street was becoming more centred around leisure activities as the number of shops reduces and this would present opportunities for Vivacity.
- One-third of Vivacity's turnover (a £2.1m management fee) came from the City Council funding. An additional approximate £1m was paid by the Council in property related costs, e.g. utilities and major repairs.
- Some members raised queries regarding why a senior member of Vivacity's management staff was able to take early retirement than being dismissed. Officers responded that an organisation could not simply dismiss someone due to the necessity of performance management processes and the risk of being challenged. Instead, a pragmatic approach to changing the organisation's direction was needed.
- Some members felt it should be noted that the previous comment was a matter of opinion, not fact.
- Members asked what Vivacity's plan was for the next five years. Officers responded that they were starting to plan for the future. One focus was on reducing Vivacity's financial dependence on Peterborough City Council by growing the business, pursuing new opportunities and taking on new clients. This would take some time to plan. Discussions were underway with other partner organisations. Vivacity were ready to accept commissioned work from the Public Health directorate and the Clinical Commissioning Group. Pursuing this approach took time and then were no 'easy wins'. Officers were actively seeking ways to give Vivacity the chance of sustainable future and if the organisation stood still, it would not last very long.
- Members asked if the Must Farm Boats were part of Vivacity's plans going forward. Officers responded in the affirmative and mentioned that they wanted to submit a Heritage Lottery Fund bid in Summer or Autumn, taking into account the feedback from the previous unsuccessful bid.
- Officers had posed the question that that if the Must Farm collection was so important to the City then why was there a lack of public money. The Business Board of the Combined Authority were due to consider a paper on this subject to investigate getting public funding. An initial injection of funding could encourage other partners to invest as a 'snowball effect'.
- It was UNANIMOUSLY agreed that the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee would continue to receive the Vivacity Annual Report in the future rather than another committee due to Vivacity's role in the Growth agenda.

--

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to

1. Note and scrutinise the contents of the report
2. Note the progress the partnership had made over the past nine months and the opportunities for the future.
3. Continue to receive the Vivacity Annual Report in the future rather than another committee due to Vivacity's role in the Growth agenda.

59. MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which enabled the committee to monitor and track the progress of recommendations made to the Executive or Officers at previous meetings.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to note the responses from Cabinet Members and Officers to recommendations made at previous meetings as attached in Appendix 1 to the report.

60. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which invited Members to consider the most recent version of the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and identify any relevant items for inclusion within the Committee's work programme or to request further information.

ACTIONS AGREED: The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to consider the current Forward Plan of Executive Decisions:

Chairman

7pm – 9pm