

PLACE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Place Scrutiny Committee held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Lewes on 12 July 2024.

PRESENT Councillors Matthew Beaver (Chair), Julia Hilton (Vice Chair), Ian Hollidge, Philip Lunn, Paul Redstone, Stephen Shing, David Tutt, Brett Wright and Trevor Webb

LEAD MEMBERS Councillors Penny di Cara and Claire Dowling

ALSO PRESENT Philip Baker, Deputy Chief Executive
Rupert Clubb, Director of Communities, Economy and Transport
Ros Parker, Chief Operating Officer
Ian Gutsell, Chief Finance Officer
Pippa Mabey, Performance and Service Development Team Manager, Contracts Management Group

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

1.1 The Committee RESOLVED to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2024 as a correct record.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Collier (Councillor Webb substituting), Eleanor Kirby-Green and Steve Murphy.

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

3.1 Councillor Trevor Webb declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest under item 5 and 6, as he is a member of Hastings Borough Council. Councillor Paul Redstone declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest under item 5, as he is Vice Chair of Governors for a schools federation. Councillor David Tutt declared a personal, non- prejudicial interest under item 5, as he is a Director of the Cyber Centre of Excellence which offers services to local government.

4. URGENT ITEMS

4.1 There were no urgent items.

5. RECONCILING POLICY, PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES (RPPR) 2025/26

5.1 The Deputy Chief Executive introduced the report which starts the Committee's consideration of the budget setting process. The report provides an opportunity for the Committee to look back at the Council's performance through the year end Quarter 4 Council Monitoring report, and a look forward via the State of the County report. The key theme is the financial challenge the Council is facing through increases in demand for services and increasing costs. The State of the County report sets out in more detail the nature of the challenges for services in terms of cost and changes in policy. The report also asks the Committee to identify areas of interest or focus, and where it would like further information as part of its RPPR work and work programme.

5.2 The Chief Finance Officer outlined in more detail the Council's financial position and that at the end of the financial year 2023/24 the Council had an overspend of over £30 million. After the use of corporate funding this was reduced to £10.5 million and required the use of one-off grants, collection fund surplus and corporate financial reserves to mitigate this and achieve a balanced year end budget position. This was the first time the Council has had to use the financial management reserve to balance the year end position.

5.3 The State of the County report contains the three year Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) which before scenario planning shows a forecast financial deficit of £55.3 million rising to £83.6 million by 2027/28. There are unallocated financial reserves of £16.7 million. However, even with scenario modelling there is a budget gap of around £26.6 million for the next financial year. Officers are seeking opportunities in all areas within departments to reduce this budget gap. This includes a review of the capital programme to reduce borrowing by scaling back projects as the cost of borrowing, which is £750,000 for every £10 million borrowed, has an impact on the revenue budget. There is a high degree of uncertainty regarding future funding, including from central Government, and different scenarios will continue to be modelled.

5.4 The Committee discussed the report and raised a number of questions and comments. A summary of the discussion is given below.

5.5 Councillor Hollidge asked for clarification on whether the Long Term Plan for Towns funding for Bexhill (page 76 of State of the County report) could be listed under Bexhill as the area rather than Rother District Council so it is clear which town the funding is for. The Director of Communities, Economy and Transport (CET) outlined that the funding may be listed by local authority area, but he could look at the way the funding is listed.

5.6 Councillor Hollidge also asked for clarification on the bathing water quality chart in the State of the County report as the Bexhill beach water quality (Edgerton Park outfall) has only been reported as 'sufficient' since 2019 according to Environment Agency data and this is not reflected in the chart in the report. The Director of CET agreed to clarify this point outside the meeting. *(Post meeting note: The source data has been checked and the State of the County report updated to show the correct data for 2023 with the Bexhill beach bathing water quality classified as 'sufficient').*

5.7 The Committee thanked officers for the report on the Council's financial position and noted that this was the right time to involve the Committee in the discussions about the financial challenges the Council faces. Much of the challenge is around the provision of statutory

services in Children's Services and Adult Social Care, and in respect to Children's Services the Council needs central Government to meet the demand led pressures the Council is facing in the provision of these statutory services.

Areas of focus and requests for further information

5.8 The Committee commented that it would like to see the information and assumptions behind the range of options under consideration to tackle the financial challenges the Council is facing. In particular, it will be important for the Committee to see the facts, figures and rationale behind the difficult choices that might need to be taken on next year's budget and to be able to understand the assumptions and processes used to support decisions at an early stage.

5.9 The Committee identified two areas where it would like further information. These were the review of the capital programme and whether the Council could explore further the use of its land and property assets to generate more income or gain capital receipts from the disposal of assets. It would also be helpful to understand and model the impact on the revenue budget of selling assets and using the receipts to support the capital programme and reduce the cost of borrowing. The Chief Finance Officer commented that work is already taking place in these areas and the ability of the Council to borrow has reduced in recent years as Government guidance has been tightened. In terms of assets, the Council does not have a lot of assets and a level of disposals to fund the capital programme is already part of the way the capital programme is funded before borrowing is undertaken.

Cultural Investment and recovery – Sussex Story works.

5.10 The Committee asked for further information on what went wrong in the delivery of the contract for this work and any lessons learnt. The Director of CET responded that he did not believe that there had been a failure in the procurement process and the issue was the performance of the supplier in the quality of the delivery of the contract. The partners were not happy with the quality of the work provided by the supplier and therefore decided to terminate the contract and retender the remaining elements. There are many reasons why suppliers can run into problems and the procurement process was rigorous with clear mechanisms for the assessment of the quality and value for money of bids.

Staffing and Staff Absences due to mental health issues.

5.11 The Committee noted that the number of days related to mental health absences has increased compared to last year. It asked if the Council could look at the outcomes from the South Cambridgeshire Council trial of a 4 day working week to see if the reported benefits of cost savings, staff recruitment and retention and improved mental health could be applied at East Sussex County Council (ESCC). The Committee also commented that it would be helpful to understand how changes in staffing could help close the budget gap. The Chief Finance Officer commented that the departments are considering staffing structures as officers explore potential options for reducing the budget gap. Any changes have the potential to impact on the overall structure of the Council and will be considered as scenarios are explored.

Percentage of roads requiring maintenance.

5.12 Councillor Stephen Shing asked if in future reports comparative figures could be provided for the number of roads that require maintenance that equate to the percentages in the report. The Director of CET noted the point around understanding the number or length of roads requiring maintenance represented by the percentage figures in the report.

Delivery of the A27 improvements.

5.13 The Committee asked about the delayed timescales reported for the delivery of improvements to the A27 which had been pushed back to 2035, and whether the Council could lobby for the improvements to be made sooner. The Director of CET outlined that it is difficult to know what decision the future Government will make on the Roads Investment Strategy for

improvements to the A27 East of Lewes. However, the Council and Transport for the South East will continue to lobby for improvements to this route which is part of the Strategic Road Network.

Air quality.

5.14 The Committee asked if the Council needs to carry out air quality monitoring across the County to address poor air quality in areas such as Eastbourne and to monitor the impact of new development. The Director of CET clarified that air quality monitoring is the responsibility of the District and Borough councils and air quality varies for a number of reasons. Air quality action plans are developed based on the monitoring information which can have links to ESCC functions such as transport.

Sustainable Warmth Scheme and Energy saving workshop for managers and school caretakers.

5.15 The Committee asked if there were any figures or measures available for the amount of money or energy saved by households as a result of the scheme and the amount of CO₂ equivalent that has been reduced. Also, it would appear to be a cost efficient way of reducing energy use and whether there was any indication that the Government may reintroduce such a scheme. The Committee also asked if the Council has any indication of how much the workshops have reduced school heating bills by. The Director of CET agreed to provide some figures for savings and reduced CO₂ after the meeting. In terms of reinstating the Sustainable Warmth Scheme, it is not quite certain how much priority the Government will give to this but appears to be keen on decarbonising housing and transport and Great British Energy may play a role in this. The Committee commented that it would be helpful to have a list of all the schools and how they are heated and whether they have solar panels or other decarbonisation measures. The Chief Operating Officer agreed to provide a list of a schools and what their fuel source is together with any change in energy use, but it may be difficult to attribute this to the training that was provided.

Report on climate adaptation.

5.16 The Committee asked when the ARUP report would be published and whether it would be available in time to inform budget decisions this year, as climate adaption will have an impact on the Council's services. In addition, reacting to climate and infrastructure failure events can cost money and some analysis of this would be helpful.

5.17 The Director of CET agreed to check and come back to the Committee on when the ARUP report would be available. In terms of the budget, generally climate adaptation and resilience measures incur an additional cost. There is a national climate adaptation programme that sets out activities various sectors, including local government, should pursue and it will be interesting to see how the Government addresses this. Historically there has not been a great deal of Government funding for this, and therefore any work on, or investment in, climate adaptation and resilience measures would have to be funded from existing budgets or borrowing which is very challenging. The Director of CET acknowledged that the cost of reacting to events can be more costly than investment in adaptation measures, but this is constrained by the available funding. The Chief Operating Officer added that organisational resilience is something that the Audit Committee looks at and that the climate adaption report may also be included as part of that work.

Risk Register - Cyber Attack.

5.18 The Committee commented that the mitigation measures for cyber-attack on the strategic risk register refer to prevention rather than prevention and recovery. If the Council were to suffer a successful attack, would the Council be able to recover from it. The Chief Officer responded that recovery can be included in the risk register and expand the description to include the implications of an attack and the actions that would be needed.

5.19 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Note the information within the 2023/24 end of year Council monitoring report and State of the County 2024 report and the implications for services within the remit of the committee;
- 2) Request information on the range of options under consideration to tackle the financial challenges the Council is facing; the outcome review of the capital programme; and the impact of any asset disposals or additional income generation from assets on the budget position;
- 3) Establish an RPPR scrutiny board to consider the developing Portfolio Plans and financial plans and to submit scrutiny's final comments on them to Cabinet in January 2025.

6. EAST SUSSEX HIGHWAYS YEAR 1 PERFORMANCE REPORT AND POTHOLE REVIEW UPDATE

6.1 The Performance and Service Development Team Manager introduced the report. The report sets out the first year performance of the highways maintenance contract with Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP) and an update on the implementation of the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review of Pothole Management. Ten of the recommendations from the review have been completed and the remaining three will be completed during the current financial year.

6.2 It was acknowledged that there have been some factors outside of BBLP's control, but the performance of the highways contract is not where the Council would expect to be and this is being proactively managed. The report provides information on the performance against the Service Performance Indicators (SPIs) which were agreed as part of the re-procurement of the contract. The performance of some areas of the contract are measured in other ways and are not covered by the SPIs. Actions in these areas could involve early warning notifications, risk reduction meetings and improvement plans.

6.3 The report outlines that BPLP have met and exceeded expected levels for some SPIs, whilst other SPIs have not met the target levels set. These are being proactively managed by the Contract Management Group (CMG) and the contractor. Particular attention has been paid to the backlog and quality of pothole repairs through an improvement plan. There has been a marked improvement in performance over the last six weeks and there is no longer a backlog of pothole repairs.

6.4 The Committee discussed the report and a summary of the questions and comments raised is given below.

Service Performance Indicators (SPIs)

6.5 The Committee asked if ESCC had got the Service Performance Indicators (SPIs) right for the contract bearing in mind the poor condition of some sections of road which need to be monitored, recorded and action taken. The Director of CET responded that in his opinion the Council had got the performance indicators right. There are metrics which measure the percentage of roads requiring repair and these drive the programme of planned repair works. The performance indicators are more about measuring the performance of the contract and have a commercial impact on the contractor if they are not met. So it is in the contractor's interest that the required levels of performance are met. Also, the previous scrutiny committee reference group that worked on the re-procurement of the highways contract were involved in the performance indicators for the new contract to ensure they were the right ones, and a number of SPIs were developed as a result of input from the scrutiny group.

6.6 Quality Assurance SPI 6 Defect free works. The Committee asked for clarification on what 'defect free' meant in relation to quality of work and the actions being put in place to address the failure to reach the agreed quality standard for repair works. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager clarified that SPI 6 measure is made up of two elements, the quality of reactive pothole repairs and wider improvement schemes. It relates to works being done to the expected quality standard as set out in the contract. Currently the contract is failing on both elements of this quality measure. The Director of CET outlined that there are a number of contract mechanisms which the Council can employ to improve performance. There is an improvement plan in place with the contractor, who has removed and replaced one of the sub-contractors responsible for pothole repair works due to the quality of their work and the new sub-contractor's performance is better. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager added that SPIs are monitored on a daily basis and if patterns of performance are developing these can be addressed with the contractor and changes made.

6.7 Claims handling SPI. The Committee asked why there was a nil return on the claims handling SPI. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager outlined that BBLP inherited a backlog of claims at the start of the contract and there was an agreement that this would be excluded from performance monitoring for an initial period, which is the reason for the nil return. An improvement plan was agreed, and additional resources brought in to deal with the backlog of claims. The claims handling SPI has been included in performance reporting from June 2024.

6.8 Councillor Stephen Shing asked for clarification of the performance levels against the SPI targets as the traffic light rating of Red, Amber and Green (RAG) appeared to be confusing. Councillor Wright also commented that the RAG rating system appeared to be incorrectly applied. The Director of CET responded that each SPI has a different target, and what is being reported is the SPI performance against each target. It was suggested that the report should have the target next to each SPI to make it easier to interpret, which was acknowledged by the Director of CET. The Committee asked if future reports could have some clearer definitions of the SPIs together with the SPI targets for each SPI.

6.9 SPI 10 Permit conditions met on site and SPI 11 Well planned permits. Councillor Stephen Shing asked for clarification of what is being measured by SPI 10 and the difference between SPI 10 and SPI 11. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager outlined that SPI 10 is where the contractor has to display a permit notice on site with the correct permit number on it for works on the highway. SPI 11 relates to East Sussex Highways works to make sure that all works have a permit with the correct start time and that the works are not overrunning or late.

Improvement in performance.

6.10 The Committee asked if officers were confident that the performance of BBLP will improve from a qualitative point of view. The Director of CET outlined that he had met with the Chief Executive of BBLP on a number occasions to discuss this and has received assurance around future performance levels. The contract is a 7+7 year contract and if there were concerns around long term performance, the Council could re-procure the contract at the end of year 7 rather than offering an extension to the existing contractor. This provides an incentive to improve and there is a commitment at a high level within BBLP to improve performance through an improvement plan. The Director of CET considered that performance is improving and is on the right trajectory.

6.11 The Committee asked about the timelines for the completion of the improvement plan and whether it would be possible to have a further update on the contract performance in six months time. The Director of CET outlined that the remedy measures within the contract have prescribed timescales for completion. Where the contractor has put in place an improvement plan, the next stage is to issue an early warning notice and then a defect notice if the desired improvement has not been made. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager

added that the current service improvement plan has a number of strands with different timescales, but there is an expectation that the overall improvement plan will be completed within the next couple of months. The SPIs are monitored continuously and reviewed at monthly meetings with the contractor. The contractor has brought in a Service Improvement Manager into the contract to look at the SPIs and contract performance improvement overall. The Director of CET commented that the department would be happy to come back in six months time with a further update report if this was something the Committee would like.

6.12 The Committee asked whether the amount of supervision of sub-contractors by BBLP was an issue. The Director of CET responded that BBLP should be employing competent sub-contractors and would not expect BBLP to be directly supervising every work gang. BBLP have their own quality assurance processes and the Client Management Group also randomly inspect a sample of work to ensure it is meeting the required standards. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager added that the level of supervision provided by BBLP was also something that was being looked at as part of the improvement plan.

Sink Holes

6.13 The Committee highlighted the problem of sink holes in the highway and the length of time it can sometimes take to fix these defects (e.g. Bolebrooke Road, Bexhill; Eshton Road, Eastbourne). The Committee asked if there was anything that could be done to complete sink hole repairs in a more timely way. The Director of CET outlined that sink holes are complicated to deal with and the cause of the sink hole needs to be established first (e.g. a leak in a water supply pipe or sewer, ground movement or a highway drainage issue) and then who is responsible for the repair. It can take time to understand the cause and who is responsible in order to undertake a repair. The Director of CET acknowledged that the time it takes to repair sink holes can be frustrating for residents and apologised for the length of time it sometimes takes to resolve these issues, but usually there is a reason behind this. The Performance and Service Development Team Manager added that an update on the Bolebrooke Road sink hole will be provided shortly.

Pothole repairs

6.14 The Committee observed that potholes are the number one issue that residents contact councillors about and a recent Channel 4 Dispatches programme suggested that East Sussex was the third worst county in the country for pothole repairs. The weather in the South East is not as severe as in other parts of the country and therefore it would be expected that the road condition would be better in East Sussex. The Committee asked if there is enough flexibility in the highways contract for the contractors to use their discretion when repairing potholes, especially in circumstances where a reported pothole is repaired but others growing in size nearby are not.

6.15 The Director CET responded that the weather is a factor and the amount of rainfall coupled with freezing conditions is a significant factor in road condition in the County. This is why more money has been allocated to road drainage to tackle some of the impacts of increasingly wetter weather conditions. It was acknowledged that road condition is not as good as we would want it to be, and this is why Cabinet has consistently agreed additional investment in highways. However, poor road condition is a national issue and other authorities around the country have similar if not worse repair backlogs. There is an issue around whether the Government should provide more financial support for local road maintenance, and ESCC has spent more money on road maintenance than it receives from Government in the form of the road maintenance grant.

6.16 The Director of CET outlined that in relation to the amount of flexibility the contractor has to repair potholes that are not at the safety intervention level, this is constrained by the need to repair reported defects that are a safety risk in a timely way. If the contractor repaired all the potholes they would not be able repair the safety defects within the prescribed timescales nor have enough materials to do so. Highway Stewards do have the flexibility to raise a Stewards

Advisory Note, that is submitted for consideration for a wider patching repair as part of the patching programme. Members are able recommend a change in the pothole repair intervention levels, but there would be an increased cost associated with that.

Utility company work on the highway

6.17 The Committee asked if there are enough inspections of utility company reinstatement works so the Council can call them back to correct poor quality reinstatement work and whether there is anything that can be done to reduce the amount of time it takes for utility companies to carry out rectification works and repair sink holes. The Director of CET outlined a number of actions being taken to try and address these issues. One has been to apply for approval to introduce a Lane Rental scheme which would give more control of utility company works on certain roads. There has been lobbying by ESCC and the South East 7 (SE7) group of local authorities to deal with the points about reinstatement and the time it takes for works to be completed. The Committee asked if it was possible to see a copy of the letter sent and the response that was given to the request for changes in the way utility company work is carried out. The Director CET agreed to circulate the letter and response from the Department for Transport if there has been one.

6.18 It was clarified that approval for the Lane Rental scheme is being sought from Ministers within the Department for Transport and it is hoped that approval will be given at some time during the autumn.

6.19 The Committee also commented that utility companies were slow in responding when there were problems on the highway such as leaks, and the Council should try and help BBLP as much as possible in dealing with utility companies. This could be through further communication with the new Members of Parliament (MPs) in East Sussex to outline the problems that the Council is experiencing with utility companies. The Director of CET responded that this might be something worth raising with the Leader of the Council as he Chairs the SE7 group to reiterate the points raised in the previous letter to the new Government and local MPs.

Members portal.

6.20 It was confirmed that the new Members portal for councillors would be available from September 2024 at the latest, which would enable them to see all reported defects amongst other features.

Process for dealing with complicated or complex issues

6.21 The Committee asked if there were systems and processes in place for dealing with complicated issues, such as sink holes, that involve more than one party in their resolution as this appears to be an ongoing problem. The Director of CET outlined that in a lot of situations the process starts with establishing land ownership and thereby who is responsible. In some cases, we know who owns the land in others a land registry search may be necessary. Where land is unregistered that can be a further complicating factor. In some situations the Council may not be responsible for carrying out the work, and may need work out who is responsible which can be frustrating for residents. The officer team has a well-rehearsed process for dealing with these sort of matters.

Hedge cutting

6.22 The Committee asked about the performance of other aspects of the highways maintenance contract not covered by the report which had also been raised as issues by members of the public such as hedge cutting. The Director of CET responded that the responsibility for hedge cutting depends on the ownership of the hedge. If it is on adopted highway land, then this is something the Council can deal with. If the hedge is on private land and needs cutting back, then the first stage in the process is to issue a hedge cutting notice to the private landowner. Then if the landowner does not cut back the hedge the Council can do the works in default and recharge the landowner, which can take some time. Residents may

question why the Council cannot simply cut back the hedge, but this would not be the best use of resources where others have the responsibility for maintaining assets.

Parking on the pavement.

6.23 The Committee highlighted the problems caused by members of the public parking on the pavement and damaging paving slabs and surfacing, which BBLP then has to repair. The Director of CET responded that where a member of the public causes damage to the highway or highway infrastructure, the department can and does claim for damage to highways assets where it is able to.

Lead Member involvement

6.24 The Lead Member for Transport and Environment outlined her engagement with BBLP senior management to address contract performance issues and provide a councillors' perspective on these issues. She will be meeting with BBLP senior management again over the summer to check on progress and is confident BBLP have understood what the issues are and what is required of them to improve performance.

6.25 The role of the Lead Member and officers in overseeing the contract was discussed. The Director of CET clarified that the report was an officer report on contract performance, and it was appropriate for the officers who are responsible for managing the performance of the contract to outline the steps that are being taken to address the performance issues. The Chair commented that he wished to put on record the significant amount of work the Lead Member had undertaken to secure additional resources for road maintenance and address the current performance issues of the contract.

Scrutiny Review of Pothole Management

6.26 Councillor Redstone congratulated the officers and members of the Review Board on the way in which the recommendations of the review had been implemented so quickly. The Director of CET welcomed the scrutiny committee's involvement in the re-procurement process and the pothole management review which provided opportunities for challenge and to hear Member views.

6.27 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Note the performance of the first year of the Highways Infrastructure and Services contract with Balfour Beatty Living Places; and
- 2) Note the updates to the pothole review recommendations contained in Appendix 2 of the report.

7. WORK PROGRAMME

7.1 The Chair introduced the report and went through the recommendations of the report. There were no changes to the work programme in appendix 1 and no items were identified from the Forward Plan for inclusion in the work programme.

7.2 Councillor Redstone, Chair of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Reference Group commented that the Committee should note that the Reference Group is one of a number of stakeholders that are being engaged with, and the Group is not producing or driving the production of LTP4. The Group is meeting again in September to discuss the final version of the LTP which will be presented to Cabinet in mid-September and then on to Full Council for approval in October. The LTP4 is seen as a living document and there will be changes to over the course of the 26 years which the LTP4 will cover.

7.3 Councillor Hilton updated the Committee on the work of the Economic Growth Strategy Reference Group. There was general support from the Reference Group for the Strategy, although there were some reservations about the length of the Strategy which is up to 2050. The Reference Group also indicated it wished to see the implementation plan for the Strategy once it has been developed. The presentation of the Strategy to Team East Sussex for approval has been delayed by the General Election and will take place later in the year.

7.4 Councillor Hilton asked for some updates on the actions contained in the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 March 2024. Minute 31.4 asked for an update on the trial of a different approach to securing Social Value commitments and arranging a demonstration of the carbon emissions reporting platform once the test or live system had enough data in it. The Chief Operating Officer responded that the trial was for a year which comes to an end at the end of July and will be reported to the Committee in September. Arranging a demonstration of the carbon emissions reporting platform will be actioned after the meeting.

7.5 Under the SPACES programme report the Committee asked if a mechanism could be put in place for notifying Local Members of SPACES projects taking place in their Division and those pending an external funding application. Councillor Hilton asked for an update on when the Committee might know what the mechanism is. The Chief Operating Officer agreed to provide an update after the meeting.

7.6 There was a request for the Waste Team Manager (minute 34.1) to approach Surrey County Council about their waste composition analysis to find out if there was a reason why there was so much food waste in their residual (black bag) waste. The Director of CET agreed to ask the Waste Team Manager to contact Councillor Hilton regarding the Surrey waste composition analysis.

7.7 The Committee RESOLVED to:

- 1) Agree the agenda items for the future Committee meetings, including items listed in the updated work programme in appendix 1;
- 2) Note the items on East Sussex County Council's (ESCC) Forward Plan in appendix 2;
- 3) Note the report back from the Scoping Board in section 4.1 of the report and agree to proceed with a review of Local Speed Limit Policy and appoint Cllr Hollidge as chair of the Review Board; and
- 4) Note the update from the LTP Reference Group and Economic Growth Strategy Reference Group as set out in sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the report.

The meeting ended at 12.15 pm.

Councillor Matthew Beaver (Chair)