

PLACE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Place Scrutiny Committee held at Committee Room - County Hall, Lewes on 18 September 2019.

PRESENT Councillor Bob Bowdler (Chair) Councillors Godfrey Daniel (Vice Chair), John Barnes, Colin Belsey (substituting for Nigel Enever), Phil Boorman (substituting for Martin Clarke), Chris Dowling, Darren Grover, Pat Rodohan, Stephen Shing, Andy Smith and Barry Taylor

LEAD MEMBERS Councillors Nick Bennett, Bill Bentley and Rupert Simmons

ALSO PRESENT Becky Shaw, Chief Executive
Kevin Foster, Chief Operating Officer
Rupert Clubb, Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Katy Thomas, Team Manager Economic Development
Karl Taylor, Assistant Director Operations
Dale Poore, Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services
Mathew Jasper, Team Manager Asset Management

12 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

12.1 The Committee RESOLVED to agree the minutes of meeting held on 11 June 2019 as a correct record.

13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

13.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Martin Clarke (Councillor Phil Boorman substituting) and Nigel Enever (Councillor Colin Belsey substituting).

14 DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

14.1 There were none.

15 URGENT ITEMS

15.1 There were none notified.

16 RECONCILING POLICY, PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES (RPPR) 2020/21

16.1 The Chief Executive introduced the report. The purpose of the report is to provide the Committee with information on the expenditure and performance plans for services within its remit, the Core Offer, and the current savings plan. Cabinet discussed the State of the County report at the meeting on 16 July 2019 which sets out the financial position for the Council. Subsequent to this, the new Chancellor has announced a spending round, the details of which have been circulated in a briefing note to all Councillors. The additional funding that has been announced in the headline figures is very welcome, but Officers do not know yet how much of this additional funding East Sussex County Council (ESCC) will receive. The announcement also includes the ability set a Council Tax precept for Adult Social Care above the current cap on general Council Tax increases. As the settlement is for the next financial year only, all additional funding announced will be one-off in nature.

16.2 The Scrutiny Committee will be updated when there is more certainty on the funding settlement for ESCC for 2020/21. There is also a commitment to ensure Scrutiny will remain involved in the draft budget proposals.

16.3 The Lead Member for Resources welcomed Scrutiny's involvement in the RPPR process and looks forward to hearing Scrutiny's ideas, as there are significant stresses across the services and budget. There is a degree of variability due to changes announced in the financial settlement for Local Government. The next steps for the Council will be to plan the budget in detail once further information is available.

Discussion by the Committee

16.4 The Committee discussed the report and commented that there are a lot of unknowns regarding the budget. The Committee agreed to defer a detailed discussion of the budget until the more detailed figures from the financial settlement are known. It observed that if the more detailed financial information is not available until close to the budget setting meetings, it is more difficult to work up alternatives especially with one-off funding for another year. The Committee also raised the question of how the Council is going to apply the one-off funding and the impact on current savings plans.

16.5 The Chief Executive reassured the Committee that the Council is used to dealing with one-off funding and is careful not to create a continuing revenue commitment from the use of one-off monies. The Committee were invited to contribute any suggestions for areas that may be worth exploring for further savings or investment.

16.6 The Committee discussed forming an RPPR Board to consider the budget proposals in more detail. The Committee agreed to form an RPPR Board comprised of Councillors Bob Bowdler, Godfrey Daniel, John Barnes, Chris Dowling, Pat Rodohan and Stephen Shing. The Democratic Services Adviser is to contact Councillors Martin Clarke and Nigel Enever to see if they wish to take part in the RPPR Board.

16.7 The Committee RESOLVED to agree to:

1) Request further information on how the one-funding, announced in the financial settlement, will be applied when more detailed information is available; and

2) Establish an RPPR scrutiny review board comprised of the Committee members listed in paragraph 16.6 (above) to consider the developing Portfolio Plans, Core Offer, and savings proposals as they emerge in December and to submit Scrutiny's final comments on them to Cabinet in January 2020.

17 CLIMATE CHANGE NOTICE OF MOTION: CLIMATE EMERGENCY

17.1 The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport introduced report. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report stated that far reaching changes will happen unless we tackle climate change. The public are becoming more concerned about environmental issues and in particular climate change. Most local authorities in the South East have declared a climate emergency. It is important to set out the actions the Council is going to take to become carbon neutral. The Council has a good track record in putting in place measures to reduce our carbon footprint and working in partnership with others to bring about change. It is recommended that the Committee recommend Council agree the combined motion in paragraph 3.1 of the report.

17.2 Councillor Bennett as proposer of the Conservative Group Motion outlined that the Motion emanates from a Notice of Motion that was made at the Local Government Association (LGA) conference which received cross party support. He confirmed that he is happy with the principle of a joint motion as this not a political issue and there is a responsibility to work together on this issue. He added that there is also a report going to the Lead Member for Resources meeting that will enable the Council to procure electricity from renewable sources.

17.3 Councillor Godfrey Daniel speaking on behalf of the proposer of the Labour Group Motion commented that it is good to work together on this issue. The only minor disagreement between the two Motions is on the target date of 2050 rather than 2030. The Labour Group would like the target reviewed to an earlier date if possible, but recognise that this may be challenging given the current level of information and funding.

17.4 The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport outlined that overall the proportion of greenhouse gases is increasing. The IPPC report has given 12 years in which to make the necessary changes. So the pace of change will be crucial and a step change like this will have its challenges. However, tackling climate change is the right thing for the Council to be doing.

17.5 The Committee discussed the report and made a number of comments on the contents of the report.

17.6 The Committee asked for clarification whether other greenhouse gases as well as CO₂ are included in the Council's work on climate change. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport responded there are some issues, which are outside of ESCC's control which will need to be tackled through regulatory control or other legislation. Where the issue is within ESCC's control then action can be taken by the Council. For example, ESCC has moved away from landfill to dispose of domestic waste which is an emitter of methane gas. Transport is an overall emitter of greenhouse gases and the Council can reflect this in Transport policies.

17.7 It was clarified that the Council will develop an action plan to tackle climate change and this will include issues such as transport and other greenhouse gas emissions. The Council is also in the process of refreshing the Environmental Strategy with its partners, through the work of the Environment Board, which will address climate change and other environmental issues in East Sussex.

17.8 The Committee discussed the target date for achieving carbon neutrality and noted that most of the District and Borough Councils in East Sussex have agreed a 2030 target date. The Committee expressed the view that it would like an earlier target date if possible. The Committee discussed whether it would be possible to add the wording "or earlier if possible" or other similar wording to item (iii) of the joint Motion.

17.9 Councillor Bennett commented that the Motion is about setting out the overall corporate ambition to tackle climate change. In principle he is comfortable working towards an earlier date

for carbon neutrality if that is possible, but would like some time to consider and reflect on the implications to be sure that this is achievable. He suggested a revised wording of the joint Motion could be agreed between Conservative and Labour Groups before the Motion is debated at Council.

17.10 In the interim, Councillor Godfrey Daniel proposed that the wording of item (vi) of the joint Motion be amended by adding the wording “*and will consider whether the target date remains appropriate*” at the end of the current text. Councillor Bennett and the Director of Communities, Economy and Transport indicated that they would be happy to revise the wording of the joint Motion in this way. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport added that how quickly the Council is going to be able to achieve carbon neutrality will depend on national policy changes and it is likely that a lot will be happening in this area. The Committee agreed the revised wording of the Motion.

17.11 The Committee discussed the scope of a potential scrutiny review of climate change. It was noted that the Committee has established a scoping board comprised of Councillors John Barnes, Bob Bowdler, Martin Clarke and Stephen Shing to examine this issue. It was agreed that the scoping board would consider the scope of any scrutiny review work in this area.

17.12 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Agree that the principles of the Motions as set out in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 of the report are supported;
- 2) Agree to recommend the County Council agree the adoption of the Motion set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report with the addition of the wording in paragraph 17.10; and
- 3) Refer the scoping of any scrutiny review work on Climate Change to the Scoping Board established by the Committee.

(Post Meeting Note: Following discussion after the meeting it was agreed to amend item (iii) of the joint Motion to read “will set a target of achieving carbon neutrality from its activities as soon as possible and in any event by 2050, in line with the new target for the UK agreed by Parliament in 2019” instead of amending item (vi) as outlined in paragraph 17.10).

18 SCRUTINY REVIEW OF SUPERFAST BROADBAND - UPDATE REPORT

18.1 The Team Manager, Economic Development introduced report. The purpose of the report is to provide an update on the implementation of the recommendations from the scrutiny review completed in March 2017. Further work has been undertaken on the redesigned web site which now provides information on the history of project; how to get the best out of broadband; detailed information on the roll out programme at property level; and a news section to announce when structures go live and other important updates.

18.2 The first two contracts undertaken as part of the Broadband Project have been completed on target, and Contract 2 will come in ahead of target in terms of the number of properties reached. As set out in the report, the delivery of Contract 3 has been delayed slightly. The Team Manager, Economic Development outlined that for Contract 3 the Council wanted more clarity on what is going to be delivered and required the successful bidder to complete a survey of all the remaining properties without superfast broadband. This will provide information on the estimated cost of reaching the remaining properties and will help to target resources cost effectively. This is the only contract nationally that has this requirement.

18.3 Unfortunately there were some issues with the quality of the information from the survey, but this has now been reworked to remove duplicates and other properties where broadband services are not required e.g. landfill sites. This has led to some delays in agreeing a

deployment plan. However, BT Openreach has continued with preparations to deliver the contract, and has submitted revised proposals for deployment. These have been examined and are acceptable. The supplier will be issuing a change request to implement changes to the contract following the data corrections. Consequently, the Council will soon be able to let communities know whether they are included in the deployment plan.

18.4 The coverage achieved by the Broadband Project as at July 2019 is 97.3%, compared to 65% in July 2013. The take up rate for superfast broadband services is 64% against a national benchmark of 20%. This means that there is good superfast broadband coverage across the County and people are using it.

18.5 The Committee discussed the report and noted the excellent work that had been undertaken on the Project to reach as many properties as possible. It was clarified that there will be a map, or other tool, that will identify those properties that will not be covered by the deployment plan agreed for Contract 3. The Committee commented that as coverage was now just over 97% and most of the work had been done, it might be better for Scrutiny to focus work on the remaining hard to reach properties after the completion of Contract 3.

18.6 The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport outlined that the Project has done a lot for the rural community through the roll out of the various contracts, but the last 3% of properties will be more expensive to connect. The Project still has to apply a value for money cut off for the cost of service provision of £2,600 per property. So there may be properties that are out of reach of the Project due to the value for money cap. It was clarified that although the cost cap is important, it is the average cost to cover properties that is crucial as this is the measure used to ensure the project does not go over budget and ensures as many properties as possible are covered.

18.7 The aim is still to try and enable superfast broadband services for 100% of properties in East Sussex, so there may be another round of work once the deployment of Contract 3 is completed. The introduction of a Universal Service Obligation by the Government for Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to provide 10Mbps broadband services may change the emphasis of the work. ESCC is one of a few Local Authorities that have gone further than the first contract and there is a clawback mechanism in the contracts, so the Council may have further money available for investment.

18.8 The Lead Member for Economy added that ESCC has been alone in championing rural economies to the extent that it has. The Broadband Team has made a great effort to get to at least 99% coverage. It is recognised that having superfast broadband services is important for rural businesses. However, there may be more innovation required to reach the last premises.

18.9 One of the Committee members commented that communications about the project were not as good as they could have been, especially regarding the connection fees charged by ISPs for fibre to the premise (FTTP). The Council should make it clear that the householder may have to pay for the final connection by the ISP. The Economic Development Team Manager commented that extra payments by the householder are very rare and that the Openreach team have specifically built in order to avoid this happening.

18.10 The Committee commented that it is important to try to reach everybody especially as the Council seeks to digitise more of its services. There is also an issue of equity to ensure that everyone has access. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport responded that it is challenging to get superfast broadband (24Mbps) to everyone. The Council is constrained by Treasury limits but there are alternatives (e.g. satellite or paying directly for service provision). There is information on e-Sussex web site about broadband coverage and broadband speeds. The website also gives advice to communities about alternative technologies.

18.11 The Committee thanked the Broadband Team for their work and congratulated them on their success in reaching and exceeding the coverage targets.

18.12 The Committee RESOLVED to note the progress on the implementation of the recommendations made in the Scrutiny Review Board report on the Superfast Broadband Project in March 2017.

19 HIGHWAY DRAINAGE - UPDATE REPORT

19.1 The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services introduced the report. The report provides an update on the strategy set out in 2017 to improve highways drainage. It is a significant area of expenditure which uses £3.2million per annum of capital and revenue funding. The main elements of the strategy are:

- identifying, prioritising and resolving drainage issues, including dealing with known flooding hot spots;
- improving our drainage asset knowledge through investigation and encapsulation of historic records and knowledge; and
- working with partners and local communities to understand and proactively manage drainage together.

19.2 The report sets out how the work to improve highway drainage has been tackled. The Asset Management Team has been learning as work has progressed and invested in new techniques and technology. The strategy and approach is working quite well and has included work in the following areas:

- The approach to blocked gullies and drain outlets has been changed by using more powerful jetting equipment and camera surveying blockages at same time.
- Of the 157 flooding hotspots originally identified, 97% will be resolved by end of this year.
- The fence to fence design approach is now working very well for carriageway investigations and designs.
- A lot of time and energy has been dedicated to improving the ditch and grip network. This is an area of maintenance that has not received as much attention as it may have needed in the past. This has now been corrected with programmes of ditch reconstruction and the reforming of grips (the channels that run between the edge of the road and the ditch).
- Work to improve the knowledge and understanding of the drainage network has included digitising all paper based records to help investigations and design. The Asset Team is capturing new information on drainage network through the survey work involved in investigations of flooding hot spots and blocked outlets. The Team is following a best practice approach to information gathering focussing on problem areas. Due to the time and cost that it would take to get a complete understanding of the drainage network, it will take some time to achieve this.
- The Asset Team is engaging with Borough, District and Parish councils to work on drainage issues such as highway flooding, road sweeping and improving knowledge.

19.3 The Committee noted the scale of improvements outlined in the report and commented on the excellent ditching work that had taken place. In discussion, the Committee outlined that it is sometimes difficult to know where the boundary is between the work of East Sussex Highways and the Asset Management Team, especially in situations where drainage problems may need to be escalated for resolution. The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services responded that for drainage issues the first point of contact should be the Highway Steward or Customer Service Manager. If Councillors are not getting the information they need, then they should raise it with either himself or the Assistant Director, Operations. Sometimes there is a lot

of history behind a particular drainage problem and it may be necessary to obtain further information from the Asset Management Team before responding.

19.4 The Committee commented that it would also be helpful to have a list, or breakdown, by Division of known flooding problems together with the work planned or completed to resolve them. This could include the results of investigations even if no immediate solution is possible. Having more information on drainage issues would enable Local Members to respond appropriately to enquiries and they can also help publicise the action that is being taken. The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services agreed to investigate ways to provide this information to Local Members.

19.5 The Committee discussed the problem of leaf fall and the blocking of drains. It was clarified that the Highways Team does communicate locally with District and Borough councils to clear gullies and to identify problem areas. Leaf clearance is done through the waste collection or street cleansing contracts, which tend to concentrate on urban areas. The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services outlined that generally there does not appear to be a frequent problem with leaves blocking drains, and District and Borough councils seem to be quite good at targeting them for clearance.

19.6 It was clarified that if gullies are not collecting water, the Team is made aware of them and they will be dealt with. The Council does carry out work to improve drainage where falls are incorrect and carriageways regularly flood. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport added that as most highway drains are only 150mm in diameter, it means that there is the possibility that there will be temporary flooding during extreme rainfall events. Consequently, it is important to make sure expectations of the highway drainage network are realistic.

19.7 In terms of communication, it is best for members of the public and Parish councils to contact the Council through the Highways Contact Centre, rather than going to the Highway Steward directly to avoid problems if they are not at work. Unfortunately it is not possible to keep the contact telephone numbers and email addresses for Stewards covering a given area constant when they change roles, or when new Stewards are recruited.

19.8 The Committee RESOLVED to note:

- 1) The good progress made on the action plan agreed by Cabinet;
- 2) Progress since the last Highways Drainage Service update as part of Scrutiny Review of Road Repairs; and
- 3) Progress on the actions arising out of recommendations from the report of the Scrutiny Review of Road Repairs in March 2019.

20 HIGHWAYS ASSET PLAN

20.1 The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services introduced the report. ESCC has been an early adopter of the asset management approach, which is now linked to the Department of Transport (DfT) incentive funding. The incentive funding was introduced in 2014 and is assessed by a set of 22 self-assessment questions which are submitted to DfT each year. Evidence is required to support the assessment and the submission is verified by the Council's Section 151 Officer, the Chief Finance Officer. If the Council had not achieved band 3 status, it would have lost £1.73 million of DfT revenue funding from the incentive fund.

20.2 It was clarified that in order to achieve band 3 funding the Council has to meet band 3 in 18 out of 22 questions. Currently the Council has been assessed as achieving band 3 in 19 out of the 22 questions. The Contract Manager Highway Infrastructure Services outlined that the Council has achieved band 3 so will not drop down to band 2 funding levels, and the Team are working on the remaining questions to be guaranteed band 3 status in future. It is likely that the

Council will be able to achieve band 3 scores in resilient network and drainage. The final area is developing longer term forward programmes of work. At present there are well developed forward work programmes in some areas such as carriageway repairs, but there are others where more work is needed.

20.3 The Assistant Director Operations added that in future the incentive funding may be linked to the Well Managed Highways Infrastructure Code of Practice. The Council is in a good position should this be the case. The early adoption of an asset management approach by the Council is paying dividends and has enabled the Council to maintain 100% of the available DfT funding.

20.4 The Committee discussed the report on the Highway Asset Plan and the DfT incentive funding. The following points were made during the discussion of the report.

- The information for the DfT incentive funding has to be submitted annually at the end of the financial year.
- The road network classifications used in the road network hierarchy are reviewed at regular intervals and the Team Manager, Asset Management confirmed that the Team are currently updating road network hierarchy.
- It was clarified that concrete roads in appropriate conditions (e.g. housing / industrial estates with low statutory undertakers renewals) have a long lifespan, but they take much longer to construct due to curing times and are difficult to repair, so this method is rarely used outside of motorways and industrial estates.
- The resurfacing programme usually employs around three teams to carry out resurfacing across the County.
- Thin surfacing (e.g. surface dressing) and other specialist treatments like jet patching usually involves using specialist equipment which is delivered using one team to carry out a programme of work once a year, usually during summertime due to materials being temperature sensitive.
- The Council does use night time working for busy roads, but this costs more and there are limitations on working at night due to need to undertake the work at the right temperature and humidity levels.
- The Highways Team do react quickly to reports of road subsidence via the Contact Centre and will send a Steward to investigate. If an emergency repair is needed then it will be carried out.
- Officers are aware of the issue on the A259 at Rushy Hill where there is a long term problem with carriageway movement. It requires significant investment to investigate and resolve this problem, but in the meantime the condition of this section of road will be monitored. The situation in Rodmill Drive, Eastbourne is under investigation as the work is still under guarantee.

20.5 The Committee commented that when a surfacing request is passed to the Asset Management Team by the Highway Steward, there is often little feedback on whether or when the work will be done. It would be helpful if Local Members could have some feedback from referrals made by the Highway Steward. The Assistant Director Operations agreed to investigate finding a better way of informing Local Members about planned and referred work.

20.6 The Committee welcomed the amount of resurfacing work that is taking place across the County. However it became apparent during the discussion of the Asset Management Plan that some members of the public, Parish Councils, ESCC Councillors and Place Scrutiny Committee members not involved with the recent Scrutiny Review of Road Repairs, do not have a clear understanding of the prioritisation process used in the Asset Management Plan. For example, how work programmes are developed; the different maintenance techniques used and; why some sections of road are resurfaced or surface dressed and others nearby are not. A better understanding would enable Local Members to explain the approach to their constituents and local communities.

20.7 The Assistant Director Operations offered to repeat the presentation on the asset management approach that was given to Scrutiny Review of Road Repairs review board. It was explained that sometimes the Highways Team may carry out thin surfacing on a reasonable section of road (preventative treatment) rather than full resurfacing (which is a more expensive treatment) of a poor section of road in order to prolong the life of the better road and stop it falling into poor condition. Road surfaces that are on cusp of becoming brittle and breaking down can be treated to rejuvenate them. In these situations it is possible to still see the road markings after the treatment as the treatment penetrates rather than covers the existing surface material. Whereas surfacing dressing which involves spraying liquid bitumen and then rolling chippings into the surface will obscure the road markings unless they are masked off.

20.8 Some Committee members stated that they would like more communications and information for Local Members on work programming and how we are prioritising work. The Assistant Director Operations explained that the Members guide that is currently on the intranet and that was sent to all Councillors clarifies these issues. There is also a wealth of information on ESCC website and a public version of the Members guide is available which can be used with Parish, Borough and District councils, and Strengthening Local Resources (SLR) meetings. It was also clarified that a link to the recent video made on the resurfacing and surfacing dressing programme was sent to all Councillors. The Highways Team not only repair roads that need resurfacing, but also following an evidence based asset management approach, focus on preventative work to reduce the need for more expensive work in the future.

20.9 The Lead Member for Transport and Environment commented that it appeared that there is a need to provide more information on asset management to the whole Committee. It would be helpful if the Committee could have the same presentation as the Road Repairs Review Board. She suggested sending a link to the Members highways guide to all Councillors and to re-send a link to the video on the surfacing programme. The Assistant Director Operations confirmed that he could re-run presentation after the end of the next Committee meeting and could re-send the links to all Members. The Committee agreed to have a presentation on the asset management approach after the next Committee meeting on 20 November 2019.

20.10 The Committee commented that the Council appeared to be quite good at repairing A roads, but unclassified roads seemed to be falling behind in terms of planned repair work. Most Councillors are not getting a positive response from Stewards on the repair of unclassified roads. The Assistant Director Operations responded that work is prioritised for A and B roads as they carry the most traffic, but the Council does undertake work on other roads such as unclassified roads. For instance, Cabinet agreed an extra £5 million investment in the capital programme for 2 years for unclassified roads, which has led to an improvement in their condition as measured by the percentage in need of repair.

20.11 The Committee asked for clarification on the way the asset management approach is applied to pavements. The Assistant Director Operations responded that the Team applies same process to pavements as it does to roads, but the budget is much bigger for carriageways, hence the appearance that less planned pavement repairs are undertaken. Pavements are maintained on a priority basis in accordance with the agreed policy. In the last year £800,000 was spent on pavements in Eastbourne out of a total budget of £1.6million. The Scrutiny Committee can recommend more money is spent on pavements, but it would need to identify where this additional expenditure would come from, as the Council cannot always borrow more money to fund capital expenditure due to the capital financing impact on the revenue budget.

20.12 The Committee RESOLVED to note the role of the Asset Plan in Highway's Asset Management approach and how this is evidenced to meet the DfT incentive fund requirements.

21 WORK PROGRAMME

21.1 The Committee discussed the work programme and reviewed the reports coming to the future meetings. Under the Reference Group section it was suggested that the Committee form a Review Board to examine the work being undertaken to make savings in the Archives and Records Service (including the services provided at The Keep), and to prepare for changes in digital communications for future archivists. The Committee agreed to form Review Board to examine this issue comprised of Cllr Barnes and Cllr Smith.

21.2 The Committee enquired about the timing for a meeting of the Review Board to consider the Parking Charges consultation. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport responded that the Board will have the opportunity to see the report on the consultation and proposals before it goes to the decision making meeting.

Orbis Scoping Board

21.3 The Committee received a report back on the scoping work that had been undertaken which focussed on the capacity of Orbis to increase traded services. The Scoping Board heard that there is already considerable work underway to assess business readiness and develop a strategy to increase the amount of traded services provided by Orbis. Therefore the recommendation of the Scoping Board is not to proceed with a scrutiny review at this stage but to establish a reference group to monitor the delivery of this work.

21.4 The Committee agreed to establish a reference group comprised of Councillors Martin Clarke, Nigel Enever and Andy Smith.

Road Markings Scoping Board

21.5 The Committee received a report back on the scoping of a potential scrutiny review of road markings. The recommendation from the Scoping Board is to proceed with a scrutiny review of this service area, with the initial lines of enquiry being:

- the prioritisation of the existing programme for renewing road markings;
- the materials used;
- funding levels and;
- options for improving road marking maintenance.

21.6 The Committee agreed to proceed with a scrutiny review of road markings with the Review Board comprised of Cllr Taylor, Cllr Shing and Cllr Daniel. It was agreed that Councillor Godfrey Daniel will Chair the Review Board.

21.7 The Committee RESOLVED to amend the work programme with the items agreed in paragraphs 22.1, 21.4 and 21.6 above.

The meeting ended at 12.01 pm.

Councillor Bob Bowdler (Chair)
Chair