

ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Economy, Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room, County Hall, Lewes on 16 March 2016.

PRESENT	Councillors Richard Stogdon (Chair), Mike Pursglove (Vice Chair), Claire Dowling, Pat Rodohan, Rosalyn St. Pierre and Barry Taylor
LEAD MEMBERS	Councillors Chris Dowling, David Elkin, Carl Maynard and Rupert Simmons
ALSO PRESENT	Rupert Clubb, Director of Communities, Economy and Transport James Harris, Assistant Director, Economy Nick Skelton, Assistant Director Communities Karl Taylor, Assistant Director Operations Jonathan Wheeler, Team Manager, Strategic Economic Infrastructure Katy Thomas, Team Manager Economic Development Lucy Corrie, Head of Communities Barnaby Brown, Trading Standards Team Manager Neil Maguire, Team Manager - Public Transport Services Councillors: John Barnes, Angharad Davies and Francis Whetstone

21 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 SEPTEMBER 2015

21.1 The Committee RESOLVED to agree as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2015.

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

22.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Trevor Webb.

23 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

23.1 Councillors John Barnes, Richard Stogdon, Rosalyn St. Pierre, and Francis Whetstone declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 5 as Conservators of the Ashdown Forest, when discussing the road impact on Ashdown Forest.

23.2 Councillor Pat Rodohan declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 6 as he knows the owners of Check a Trade.

24 URGENT ITEMS

24.1 There were none.

25 REPORTS

25.1 Reports referred to in the minutes below are contained in the minute book.

26 STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE IN EAST SUSSEX

26.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport which provided an update on the strategic infrastructure in East Sussex. The Committee agreed to discuss the section of the report on the Superfast Broadband project first, to allow questions to be put from a number of other Councillors who were attending the meeting.

Superfast Broadband

26.2 The Director for Communities, Economy and Transport (CET) explained that the project includes an initial contract, awarded to BT Openreach, to provide fibre based infrastructure to enable properties to be connected to Superfast broadband services. This contract is the second best performing broadband contract in the UK in terms of coverage and speeds achieved. A second contract has been awarded to improve download speeds and to look at alternative solutions for hard to reach areas. The deployment of the second contract is due to start in June 2016.

26.3 Officers informed the Committee that the project has been working in all exchange areas across East Sussex, but is not allowed to deliver infrastructure improvements where the private sector is delivering or planning to deliver Superfast broadband in the next three years. Outside of the project there is nothing to prevent private individuals, or businesses, from paying for improved connectivity to meet their needs. As at December 2015 the take up of fibre based services was just over 25% against a target of 20%.

26.4 In response to questions from the Committee, officers set out:

- Value for money - The project has secured £10.6m of government funding and the value for money test and criteria are set by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK, the Government department located within the Department for Culture Media and Sport). The value for money cap, which the project cannot exceed, has been set by BDUK at £1,700 per property. This can pose difficulties in rural areas where the distance to a fibre enabled exchange or cabinet can be greater. The project delivery costs are currently just under £500 per property, which has enabled funding to be re-invested in the second contract.
- Download speeds - Typically in rural areas properties are connected to cabinets by copper cabling. Broadband speeds are affected by the length of copper cable that connects properties to fibre enable cabinets or exchanges. So an area may be fibre enabled, but this may not lead to faster download speeds. The second contract aims to tackle this in addition to looking for other solutions to provide faster broadband in hard to reach areas.
- Hard to reach properties - They are defined by the cost of connecting them to the fibre enabled network and does not necessarily mean they are more geographically or technically challenging to connect to the fibre enabled network. As a consequence it is much harder to meet the value for money criteria for these properties.
- Responsibility for connecting properties to Superfast Broadband - The project aims to install the infrastructure necessary to enable access to faster broadband in areas that

would otherwise be commercially unviable. It is then the role of consumers to arrange for connection via a number of retail service providers.

- Uptake of Superfast Broadband services - Although it is hard to predict, the anticipated take up of fibre based solutions at the end of both contracts is expected to be between 30% and 40%. There may be a time delay for these levels to be achieved due people not being able to take up the new service until their current contract for broadband expires.

26.5 The Committee discussed the issue of broadband provision, including faster download speeds, and a summary of the main issues the Committee raised is given below.

- The Committee members and other Councillors in attendance expressed concerns that expectations of getting faster broadband speeds exceeded the reality in some areas. Communications could be better as residents and Parish Councils were unclear about what is going on. Some Councillors were unaware that a second contract had been let to improve speeds and deal with the issues being raised by residents. Examples were given where BT Openreach had publicised the installation of fibre enabled cabinets and exchanges which had given the impression that this would automatically lead to faster download speeds for all properties.
- There is great variation in the download speeds and the level of service available village by village. This may be due to the length of copper cabling between properties and cabinets, but there needs to be a more detailed breakdown of broadband speeds at post code level rather than relying on countywide figures. It is important that a clear picture is given of the service levels that are available to residents and businesses. Members of the public do not appear to be aware that ESCC is providing the infrastructure and that retail providers are responsible for the connections.
- Having access to faster broadband speeds is important for rural and diversified farm businesses. It is also important for education, as many school children now need fast and reliable access to the internet in order to undertake school work. Access for groups such as the elderly will become more critical as health and other services are provided online.
- There is some anecdotal evidence that retail broadband service providers are saying that it is too expensive to connect rural properties to Superfast services. Some Councillors expressed the view that BT Openreach should be required to replace the copper cabling (via re-routing or with fibre) as part of their contract.

26.6 The Lead Member for Economy commented that the intervention area covered by the first contract to provide Superfast Broadband infrastructure (signed in May 2013) is entirely made up of rural areas and does not include urban areas, where the infrastructure is provided by commercial operators. Officers have secured better contract delivery from BT Openreach than contracts elsewhere in the country and are meeting the value for money criteria. There are examples of good broadband speeds (e.g. 80Mbps in Heathfield) and there is a target to try and provide Superfast services to every rural trading estate. The project has been well managed and will achieve 95% coverage by the end of the first contract.

26.7 The Director for CET responded that 85% of the intervention area was covered by Superfast broadband (speeds in excess of 24Mbps) by the end of December 2015. Details of the second contract have been communicated to Members and it will take time for all areas of the county to have access to Superfast services. The "Go East Sussex" web site provides a good level of information about the Superfast Broadband project. The rollout of the second contract is not due to start until June 2016 and will address residents' concerns. However, there will remain some rural areas where it will be challenging to provide access to high broadband

speeds. None the less, by the end of the project it is estimated that 97% of properties will have access to Superfast Broadband.

26.8 The Lead Member for Transport and Environment commented that it did appear that residents and some Councillors are unaware of the second contract that is due to start in June 2016. It is important that Parish Councils are made aware of the second contract and that this is a speed based contract in comparison to the first contract that was aimed at providing infrastructure coverage. It would be helpful for Members to have a bullet point information sheet that they could use when talking to residents and Parish Councils.

26.9 The Committee thanked Officers for their work in the delivering this project. However, they had concerns about what they had heard from the other Councillors who had attended the meeting. The Committee had questions around residents' expectations, communications and whether the roll out of the second contract will address residents' concerns in the best way. There is also an issue of fairness when considering access and value for money. There is a need to analyse at a local level how well the project provides access to fast and reliable broadband services for those who may need to rely on them (e.g. school children, students, those in need of support and rural businesses).

26.10 The Committee agreed to establish a Review Board to examine the provision of Superfast Broadband. The membership of the Review Board will include all members of the Economy, Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee and the other Councillors present at the meeting will be invited to give evidence to the Review.

Mobile Telephony Infrastructure

26.11 The provision of 4G mobile telephone services could potentially offer an alternative to fixed line broadband. However, it is subject to the same commercial drivers as the Superfast Broadband. The Committee expressed concern about the number of 'not spots', as this affects local businesses as well as residents. The Director for CET acknowledged that this remains a challenge and the Lead Member for Economy added that ESCC has no resource to deal with this issue. However, this issue has been raised at the South East Economic Partnership (SELEP) Board meetings to seek additional resources. The provision of 4G/5G mobile telephony services will be a priority for SELEP.

Other Strategic Infrastructure

26.12 The Team Manager for Strategic Economic Infrastructure introduced the remainder of the report covering:

- Rail Infrastructure
- Strategic Road Infrastructure
- Aviation
- Ports
- Local Growth Fund Projects

26.13 The Committee asked further questions on a number of sections of the report. A summary of the points raised by the Committee is outlined below.

Rail Infrastructure

Lewes to Uckfield line re-instatement

26.14 The Committee discussed the strategic importance of another London to South Coast route that offered an alternative to the existing line that runs through the Balcombe Tunnel. Part of the line is being run as a heritage railway at present and the route of the line is protected in the Lewes and the Wealden District Councils' Local Plans. Reinstatement of the line would have

benefits in relieving road traffic congestion and could support housing development. The Committee considered that it was important to continue to lobby for the reinstatement of the line.

26.15 The Lead Member for Economy responded that the rail strategy had been carefully considered before establishing the priorities. The Marshlink proposal offers a potential economic gain of £354 million. The Uckfield line electrification, including the associated projects to extend the platform and construct a new car park, was also considered a priority.

26.16 The Team Manager, Strategic Economic Infrastructure together with Planning officers and two of the local Members of Parliament (MP's) went to see the Department of Transport (DfT) concerning the Uckfield to Lewes line re-instatement. The consultants who are reviewing the feasibility of re-instating the line are also considering the provision of a shuttle service over the 8.1km original route.

Willingdon Chord

26.17 The Committee also discussed the reinstatement of the Willngdon Chord (which was a section of track that allowed trains to by-pass Hampden Park and Eastbourne on the Brighton to Hastings line) and the provision of a station to serve the Stone Cross / Willngdon area.

26.18 The Team Manager, Strategic Economic Infrastructure responded that the re-instatement of this section of track has been highlighted in responses to route studies in 2010 and 2015. However, the cost benefit ratio identified by a study in 2000 was only 0.79, whereas the DfT require a minimum ratio of 2.0 before they will consider providing funding. The situation may have changed with the addition of housing in the area. However, the old Stone Cross station, which closed in 1935, could not be redeveloped due to the proximity of some of the new housing.

Newhaven improvements

26.19 The Lead Member for Economy informed the Committee of work to improve the rail infrastructure in Newhaven. This involves work with the Newhaven Port Authority to create a new loading bay and work with Network Rail to consider better rail links and the future of the three stations.

Devolution Proposals

26.20 The Assistant Director, Economy outlined how the Three Southern Counties (3SC) devolution deal will place further emphasis on strategic needs. It will mean that issues such as the Lewes Uckfield line re-instatement will not be considered in isolation, but will be considered alongside other rail growth projects.

Strategic Road Infrastructure

A27 Lewes to Polegate

26.21 The Committee supported the need to improve this section of road and noted the work of the A27 Reference Group. The Committee considered that the £75 million currently allocated for improvements would not provide the long term solution that was needed. A view was expressed that it would be better to focus all the allocated money on improving the Polegate (Cop Hall) roundabout part of the A27, rather than spreading the improvements along the length of the Lewes to Polegate section on the road. The Committee was also concerned that accepting the smaller improvements may undermine the case for a better long term solution.

26.22 The Director for CET responded that all the MP's in the A 27 Reference Group believe the solution is the making the Lewes to Polegate section of the A27 a dual carriageway and are

lobbying the DfT for a larger £350 - £400 million improvement scheme. This section of the A27 is very close to meeting financial criteria for a larger improvement scheme, and there is a risk that improving the Polegate (Cop Hall) roundabout in isolation may weaken the cost benefit case for a dual carriageway.

Road impact of Gatwick Airport expansion

26.23 The Committee expressed concerns about the impact of increased road traffic through Ashdown Forest, as a result of expansion at Gatwick Airport. One of the main impacts is air pollution and the consequent atmospheric deposition of nitrogen, which affects the ecology of the Forest.

26.24 Officers responded that at present 40% of arrivals and departures at the airport travel by train. Gatwick Airport want to increase this to 60%. They are also developing an Ashdown Forest transport model to address the road traffic impacts on the Forest and to slow the nitrogen deposition.

Aviation

Gatwick Arrivals Review

26.25 Officers and the Lead Member for Economy have been lobbying Gatwick Airport over the impact of aircraft noise and other issues. A Gatwick Arrivals Review has been carried out which contains 23 recommendations that aim to address all areas of concern. Two of the main measures are to raise flight paths to 7000 feet and alternate approach patterns. Gatwick Airport is due to publish their response to the Review at the end of March 2016.

Gatwick second runway

26.26 The Director for CET commented that if the decision is made to build a second runway at Gatwick, it would have a significant impact on the strategic infrastructure. The Lead Member for Economy commented that provision would then need to be made for improved road access on or around the Forest. Councillor Whetstone responded that the villages in the Medway Valley would not want to see an increase in traffic diverted through them.

26.27 The Committee welcomed all the work that was being undertaken to meet the needs of local businesses and residents. It also noted the amount of work that is being undertaken with partners on strategic infrastructure issues.

26.28 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Note the report and the progress being made;
- 2) Express its support for the work being undertaken on Strategic Infrastructure; and
- 3) Establish a Review Board to examine the provision of Superfast Broadband.

27 AN UPDATE ON THE REPLACEMENT OF THE BUY WITH CONFIDENCE SCHEME WITH AN ALTERNATIVE APPROVED CONTRACTOR SCHEME

27.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport which provided an update on the provision of an alternative to the Buy with Confidence (BWC) approved trader scheme and work of the Trading Standards Service.

27.2 The Head of Communities introduced the report and outlined the main developments since the decision was taken in January 2015 to seek alternative ways of providing an approved trader scheme. The management of the BWC scheme will be transferred to Hampshire County Council who will maintain standards through background checks, peer reviews and the administration of the scheme. ESCC has also partnered with a commercial provider, Check a Trade (CAT), whose quality standards will be monitored through the Primary Authority Agreement (PAP) with Kent County Council.

27.3 ESCC Trading standards will monitor both schemes via customer feedback and complaints. Having a Trading Standards approved trader scheme means that ESCC Trading Standards can say no to traders wishing to join the schemes and can suspend or remove membership if necessary.

Quality Standards for Approved Contractor schemes

27.4 Some Committee members had expressed concerns about the use of a commercial partner to provide an approved trader scheme. The Head of Communities outlined the checks and balances that had been put in place by the Primary Authority Agreement, which has driven up standards. For example all traders have to have standard terms and cancellation clauses in their contracts. Check a Trade provides open access to all records and Trading Standards can suspend membership if it has any concerns. There is an appeals process administered by CAT, and Trading Standards and CAT will work with traders to get them up to the required standard.

27.5 The Committee was satisfied that sufficient safeguards had been put in place to ensure the quality standards of the approved trader schemes are maintained.

27.6 The Committee discussed the following areas of Trading Standards work:

Capacity of the Trading Standards Team

27.7 The Committee noted that there had been a reduction in staff and questioned whether the team had sufficient staff and resources to deliver all the services (statutory and non-statutory), they are required to provide. It also asked how the prioritisation of work was being managed.

27.8 The Head of Communities responded that the reduction in staff included four posts linked to BWC scheme, so the impact on capacity was less than it appeared. More of the team's work is intelligence led and there are other places, such as Citizens Advice, where consumers can get help and advice. The team takes a risk based approach to their work. They look at the level of consumer detriment that is apparent and target work accordingly.

27.9 The team will work with individuals and will offer one to one advice if the consumer is vulnerable. The team checks the national Trading Standards database for leads and holds fortnightly tasking meetings to agree priorities and investigation work.

Enforcement

27.10 The team would like to have more staff for enforcement work and do prosecute larger and more serious cases. Enforcement action is taken where appropriate and the team is using civil injunctions more frequently. The team has an accredited Financial Investigator, under the Proceeds of Crime Act, which allows them to pursue bigger offenders. There are a range of tools that they can use for enforcement:

- Written warnings
- Fixed penalty notices (FPN's)
- Civil enforcement – injunctions to stop activities

- Criminal enforcement (although a large number of defendants elect to have cases heard in the Crown Court due to the reductions in legal aid)

Business Advice

27.11 The Trading Standards Team Manager explained that the training courses that had been delivered this year had been very successful and the team has been showing businesses where to find sources of guidance. The team are proposing to run more training courses which are self-financing. The intention is to advertise them more widely and tie the publicity in with national events. The training aspect of the team's work is not a legal duty, but is becoming an essential way of getting compliance through education.

Project Work

27.12 The Committee noted the very successful illegal tobacco trading work, which was funded by some one-off funding from Public Health. The team's work to protect the community from rogue traders has also been featured on the BBC2 Illegal Grafters programme. Although it is not always possible to sustain this type of work, the project benefits have been in the intelligence gained and how much more the team knows about the way in which illegal activity is conducted.

27.13 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the report; and
- (2) thank the Trading Standards staff for all their work.

28 REFORMULATED SUPPORTED BUS NETWORK - MITIGATION MEASURES

28.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport regarding the mitigation measures put in place following the launch of the Reformulated Supported Bus Network (RSBN).

28.2 The Team Manager, Public Transport Services introduced the report. A lot of work has been undertaken to mitigate the impact of the changes brought about by the introduction of the RSBN and the address the concerns expressed at the time of the Cabinet report in December 2014. Fewer services and bus users have been affected than expected through the commercialisation of routes and other changes that have been made to services (e.g. through timetable changes and better connections to other services). The work with partners, such as Parish Councils, and providers has been a very positive development and has increased the level of understanding of the issues involved in bus service development.

28.3 The Committee thanked the officers for a thorough report, and discussed the following issues.

Dial-a-Ride

28.4 The Committee expressed some concern about the uptake and viability of these services. The Committee asked who was eligible to use these services and if it was possible to expand the publicity for them.

28.5 The Team Manager, Public Transport Services explained that these services are available to anybody who cannot use public transport (i.e. anyone who finds it difficult to use public transport). To use the service, you need to register with the Community Transport Operator first. There is a charge for using Dial-a-Ride services which is typically £2.50 for a single journey. They are not intended to compete with other services and are usually operated

in conjunction with a number of organisations (e.g. for the Lewes and Newhaven area the Public Transport team works with Town Council and Community Transport provider).

28.6 The cost of Dial-a-Ride services is around £18 per passenger, and the costs a met from the main Passenger Transport budget. They are relatively expensive due to poorer utilisation rates as they are a door to door services and do not tend to carry as many passengers. In Eastbourne the Dial-a-Ride service typically carries 8 passengers a day. The Public Transport team are working to improve this with zoning and will review after six months. In many areas the accessibility of buses has been improved, which may have had an impact on the uptake of Dial-a-Ride services. In the case of Eastbourne there is also a very well developed network of commercial bus services.

Sustainability of smaller operators

28.7 The Committee expressed some concern about the financial viability of some of the smaller operators. It had heard, for example, that Compass was losing access to its depot in Lewes, which may lead to them ceasing to provide some services.

28.8 The Team Manager, Public Transport Services replied that it was important in the wider provision of bus services to have a mixture of smaller and larger operators. The department is in discussion with Compass to identify a suitable alternative operating base in Lewes.

Bus Operators ability to provide and change services

28.9 Any operator can provide a new service, or change an existing service, by giving 56 days notices of their intention to do so. The Public Transport team work continually with operators to improve services. This work includes discussing any proposals to change or provide new services, but it should be borne in mind that there is a finite time that a bus and it's driver can operate. Route congestion can have an impact on service provision as operators have duty to operate service punctually. Where punctuality can be improved through bus improvement partnerships, it is sometimes possible re-invest the savings (e.g. Stage Coach were able to offer to operate a new service along the Bexhill to Hastings link road due to the improvement the link road made to the A259 congestion).

School services

28.10 Councillor Whetstone asked it of was possible to band the charges for home to school transport and link them to distance travelled rather than charge a flat rate. The Team Manager, Public Transport Services responded that these are 'closed door' services for schools and were essentially private buses for schools. As such the charging policy is set be the Children's Services department.

28.11 'Closed door' services are provided to meet a statutory need as part the duty to provide free home to school transport to the nearest suitable school for eligible children. The department will sell spare seats on these services and will try to get public bus services to meet the need where possible. In cases where the nearest school is full, the Children's Services departments may pay for travel to a suitable school that that is further away.

Success of Mitigation Measures

28.12 The Committee congratulated officers on the work they had done to mitigate the impact of the introduction of the RSN. The outcome has been far better than the Committee thought it would be. The Committee was satisfied that the mitigation measures put in place have been effective.

28.13 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- (1) Note the implementation of the reformulated supported bus network in conjunction with the priorities set out in the Public Transport Strategy Commissioning Strategy; and
- (2) Note the progress made in mitigating the effects of the reformulated supported bus network on local communities.

29 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF HIGHWAYS DRAINAGE - REPORT OF THE REVIEW BOARD

29.1 The Committee considered a report by the Chair of the Review Board concerning the Scrutiny Review of Highways Drainage.

29.2 The Assistant Director, Operations commented that the report makes the case for extra investment in the highway drainage infrastructure, but this will have to be considered with other requests for funding as part of the Reconciling Policy, Performance and Resources (RPPR) process.

29.3 The Committee discussed the report and made the following comments:

- There appears to be a lot of run-off from farmer's fields and the Committee asked if the department had enough resources for enforcement. The Assistant Director, Operations responded that the department did not have a great deal of resources for enforcement, but would undertake a piece of work to educate land owners through work with Parish Councils and the National Framers Union etc. The department will also undertake some enforcement action in high profile cases.
- Councillor Whetstone suggested that maps should be made available to Parish Councils that indicate clearly which drainage ditches and other drainage features are ESCC's responsibility. It was noted that the report recommendations address the point about providing information on adjacent landowners and ESCC's responsibilities.

29.4 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- (1) agree the report of the Review Board; and
- (2) support its submission to Cabinet for comment and County Council for approval.

30 RECONCILING POLICY, PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES (RPPR) FOR 2016/17 AND BEYOND

30.1 The Committee considered a report by the Chief Executive which provided a review of the Committee's input into the RPPR process for 2015/16 and sought views on how the process could be improved in future years.

30.2 The Committee discussed the RPPR process and made the following comments:

- The lack of clarity on the budget settlement in the run up to budget setting made the process very difficult.
- It would have been helpful to have more information on the corporate budgets that have an impact on the CET department and in particular the Corporate Resources and Business Services budgets.

- The Committee considered it was important to make the case for department's budgets, as the Scrutiny Committee had the most detailed knowledge and understanding of the impact of proposed budget savings.
- Many of the savings proposals were offered without any real alternatives or options for how they might be achieved. It would be desirable to have some alternatives for the for the next RPPR process that is due to start in the autumn.

30.3 The Assistant Director, Operations commented that it was rational for the Committee to focus its work on the expenditure of the department. It was becoming increasingly difficult for Officers to provide savings alternatives as many areas for savings had already been explored and savings proposals taken. Some options have been tested before but it may be possible to re-visit them in the autumn RPPR process.

30.4 The Lead Member for Resources acknowledged that it is sometimes difficult to look at corporate issues, and the lateness of the settlement announcement had caused particular difficulties.

30.5 The Committee RESOLVED to request that:

- (1) further information be provided on corporate budgets for the next RPPR process; and
- (2) future budget savings proposals are provided with options, or alternatives, for the Committee to consider.

31 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

31.1 The Committee considered the Committee's future work programme.

31.2 The Committee discussed the Scrutiny Committee's future work programme and agreed to add the Scrutiny Review of Superfast Broadband with a report back to the Committee at the 9 November Scrutiny Committee meeting (see 26.10 above).

31.3 The Committee agreed that it would like to have a report on the Local Transport Plan (LTP) second implementation plan. The Senior Democratic Services Advisor is to confirm with the Assistant Director for Economy that a report can be brought to the 14 September Scrutiny Committee meeting.

31.4 The Committee noted that a presentation on the new highways contract by Costain CH2M would be made to all Councillors after the County Council meeting on the 10 May 2016.

31.5 The Committee RESOLVED to note the programme and add the items discussed in 31.2 and 31.3 above.

32 FORWARD PLAN

32.1 The Committee considered the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

32.2 The Committee RESOLVED to note the Forward Plan.

The meeting ended at 1.40 pm.

Councillor Richard Stogdon
Chair