

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 5 December 2022 at Surrey County Council, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 8 February 2023.

Elected Members:

- * Catherine Baart
- * Stephen Cooksey
- Colin Cross
- * John Furey
- * David Harmer
- * Jonathan Hulley (Vice-Chairman)
- * Andy MacLeod (Vice-Chairman)
- * Jan Mason
- * Cameron McIntosh
- * John O'Reilly (Chairman)
- Becky Rush
- * Lance Spencer
- * Keith Witham

(* = present at the meeting)

45/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Colin Cross.

46/22 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 6 OCTOBER 2022 [Item 2]

The minutes of the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee held on 6 October 2022 were formally agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

47/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None received.

48/22 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

1. There were three Members questions and responses were published as a supplement to the agenda.
2. With regards to the third question, Fiona Davidson asked if performance information against Key Performance Indicators (KPI) in relation to highways delays would be made available to all Councillors on a year-to-date basis. As costs continue to rise, any

outstanding estimates for schemes would disadvantage Members whose estimates have been delayed. The Director of Highways and Transport confirmed that performance data was now being collected for this transition year and would be shared with the Select Committee as committed to previously. The focus was on efficient delivery of the scheme between Ringway and Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Director of Highways and Transport invited any specific concerns from Members if this was not the case. The Chairman suggested that prior to the KPIs being reported to the Select Committee, a session in January 2023 between the Highways Reference Group, Ringway and the Highways department to discuss the points raised should take place.

49/22 YOUR FUND SURREY UPDATE [Item 5]

Witnesses:

Denise Turner-Stewart, Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety

Marie Snelling, Executive Director of Customer and Communities

Nikki Tagg, Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager

Jane Last, Head of Community, Partnerships & Engagement

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety provided a summary of the work that had taken place following the constructive suggestions and recommendations provided by the Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee (CEHSC) in March 2022.
2. The Chairman, in referring to paragraph 11 of Annex 1 of the report noted that there had been no funded applications in the first decile and queried if the new Community Link Officers, dedicated to working in the more deprived areas of Surrey, had reported any interest or identified areas of capacity building for future approval. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety said that the impact of the Community Link Officer (CLOs) and their targeted focus on those key areas had been felt immediately with one application within decile one expected at Advisory Panel this week. The Head of Community, Partnerships and Engagement added that interest from these areas had increased following 'Let's Talk' events to encourage residents to consider which projects could benefit their communities and how to organise themselves to achieve their aims with the support of Your Fund Surrey officers. The 'let's Talk events will take place in 21 key areas.
3. A Member asked how officers expected Your Fund Surrey (YFS) to develop over the five-year period since it was launched two years ago. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety

said it was evident that the flow of the programme is increasing, partly due to complex projects, which had applied at the beginning of the programme, now being ready to be assessed.

4. A Member queried the scope to reduce the lower limit for applications to £1,000 to allow more groups to apply for smaller projects and to address the gap between the current Member Community Allocation (MCA) grant of £5,000 a year and the starting point for Your Fund Surrey applications of £10,000. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety explained that the minimum for the new smaller projects fund would be £1,000 and as such, bridged the gap between Members Community Allocation and the Your Fund Surrey large projects fund. The smaller projects fund was designed to enable a more flexible and simpler local allocation. A Member asked that applications made during the last two years be revisited with the new lower limit in mind and requested that all Members be notified regarding the new £1,000 minimum for smaller projects. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety Confirmed that a report to Cabinet was planned for late December 2022 followed by a full briefing to all Members adding that all previous unsuccessful applications would be revisited.
5. A Vice Chairman, in referencing that 16 per cent of current live applications were valued at £50,000 or less, queried the percentage of current live applications valued at £100,000 or less. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager confirmed that 32 per cent of applications in the current pipeline were under £100,000.
6. A Vice Chairman asked for clarification around the reference to projects valued under £100,000 being less complex. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager said that less complex projects were simpler to manage because they involved fewer partners, funding streams and planning permissions thus requiring less due diligence and governance. The Vice Chairman asked if the proposal to cap the smaller projects fund contribution could be increased from £50,000 to £100,000 for these simpler projects. The Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety explained that the process would be reviewed, however the current cap was considered a balanced approach at this time following an evaluation of public value, the current economic climate and the need for a directly devolved budget for Members.
7. A Vice Chairman suggested that information about the total value allocated by Surrey decile in addition to the number of applications and the average value would be useful.
8. A Vice Chairman asked why Surrey deciles were being used instead of national deciles and requested clarification between the two. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety explained that nationally, many Surrey areas sat within deciles nine

or ten. There are many complexities of the county which include extreme affluence adjacent to extreme deprivation. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager said for national deciles, each area within the country was split into smaller areas known as Lower Layer Super Output Areas (LSOA) and ranked based on specific criteria including education and housing and allocated equally into ten equal parts (ten deciles). The data analytics team had advised that Surrey deciles should be used for YFS to consider the relative deprivation of different projects whilst using the same statistics at national level.

9. A Vice Chairman asked which decile an application from a deprived area located within an overall wealthier area would be included in. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager said postcodes and a broad range of additional information were used to provide an indication of ranking.
10. A Member asked if the £50,000 Members allowance was per year for two years or £50,000 over two years. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager confirmed that the YFS small project Fund allocated £50,000 for each Member to the end of March 2025.
11. A Member asked if the £50,000 Members allowance could be prioritised for Greener Futures projects by division. The Cabinet member for Communities and Community Safety said that a menu of choices, particularly for those applications that had not previously met the threshold was being looked at with the Greener Futures team in the hope of encouraging spend on Greener Futures projects. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager noted the involvement of the Greener Futures team in every project for their opinion and to ensure that applications approved complimented the green agenda.
12. A Member queried the current cost of running the scheme, including headcount deployed centrally, CLOs and interest costs. The Head of Community, Partnerships & Engagement confirmed £240,000 for the cost of the core YFS team from the Community, Partnership and Engagement budget. An expert panel formed of colleagues from other departments such as Greener Futures and Finance also assist in the assessment of applications and the organisation of funding agreements. Officers responsible for the Member Community Allocation fund were now part of the YFS team and would have capacity throughout the year to look after YFS applications.
13. A Member asked which budget area the running costs were included in and queried if interest costs and capital costs would remain on the Council's balance sheet causing depreciation and if so, where would the depreciation appear in the budget. The Executive Director of Customer and Communities confirmed that

capital allocations for YFS were treated in the same way as the wider capital programme.

14. A Member, in referencing chart 2 –the Annex of the report asked what Officers would like the final chart to look like. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety said that an even distribution of funding across Surrey was the aim with specific investment in deprived communities.
15. A Member was concerned that using deciles was not appropriate for some rural areas. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager agreed that whilst using deciles as one element was useful, other avenues were also considered to form the basis of decisions including Member knowledge, CLOs and the voluntary sector.
16. A Member welcomed the improvement evident since the March 2022 report to the Select Committee and asked if Members and their input would be included in marketing campaigns and events organised by CLOs. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety said web pages had gone live with contact details available in addition to regular Member updates which were being planned. Members played an integral role with their input carrying considerable weight in encouraging the advisory panel's support of applications.
17. A Member, despite having had some issues with YFS, noted their support of the ambitious scheme and suggested that more focused Surrey County Council branding was required.
18. A Member asked if officers had been in touch with organisers of the schemes already approved that involved building projects to discuss increased costs and to revisit the contingency previously approved. The Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety said that in addition to the original 20 percent contingency, Cabinet had approved further 10 per cent contingency given the critical inflationary period being experienced. The Your Fund Surrey Programme Manager confirmed that projects were monitored throughout their build.
19. A Member asked if YFS was exclusively for capital projects and queried if any element of revenue was permitted. The Head of Community, Partnerships & Engagement confirmed that YFS was capital money and so no revenue could be considered.
20. A Member queried if there was scope for the Cabinet Member to increase funds beyond £5,000 through the Member Community Allowance. The Cabinet member for Communities and Community Safety said that was a discussion for the next budget round however the smaller projects fund would allow for more flexibility within the existing fund.

21. A Vice Chairman noted that in Annex A, the 'Division' heading should read 'districts and boroughs' and suggested a future breakdown by division, district and borough. The Executive Director of Customer and Communities confirmed that this information had been collated and was available on the Member portal.

Resolved:

The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Welcomes the accelerated pace of Your Fund Surrey (YFS) approvals over recent months albeit the totals are somewhat short of original estimates.
2. Strongly supports the introduction (within the YFS Framework) of the new regime designed to encourage smaller capital bids by providing an allocation of £50,000 (over two years) to each Member for this purpose, with encouragement to spend on Greener Futures initiatives should they wish.
3. Urges consideration of the possibility of increasing this Member allocation up to £100,00 to facilitate larger but not complex community projects.
4. Commends the efforts of the Community Link Officers (CLOs) to raise awareness of YFS in the more deprived areas but other actions may be necessary to secure successful funding for community projects in Surrey deciles one and two. The Committee regards this as a high priority

50/22 SCRUTINY OF 2023/24 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY TO 2027/28 [Item 6]

Witnesses:

David Lewis, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Denise Turner-Stewart, Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety

Kevin Deanus, Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience

Natalie Bramhall, Cabinet Member for Property and Waste

Dan Quinn, Chief Fire Officer

Marie Snelling, Executive Director of Customer and Communities

Katie Stewart, Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

Lucy Monie, Director of Highways and Transport

Carolyn McKenzie, Director of Environment

Rachel Wigley, Director of Finance- Insight and Performance

Nicola O'Connor, Strategic Finance Business Partner

Tony Orzieri, Strategic Finance Business Partner
Nicola Kilvington, Director of Corporate Strategy and Policy
Louise Lawson, Strategic Finance Business Partner
Steve Ruddy, Head of Trading Standards
Sarah Bogunovic, Head of Customer Strategy

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member asked where interest and depreciation costs were located in the budget. A Strategic Finance Business Partner explained that interest payable costs sat within the central income and expenditure budget which is treated as a separate Directorate budget and that capital borrowing costs form part of the calculation of the budget envelopes.
2. A Member, in referencing outcomes from the 2021 research noted in paragraph 8, asked what changes had taken place to facilitate resident's requests for a more active role around what happens in their localities. The Director of Corporate Strategy and Policy said that involving and informing residents to address the findings from the research included the 'Make it Happen' campaign where opportunities to get involved locally were shared, online engagement tools to allow residents to find out what was happening in their area in addition to efforts to look at priority neighbourhoods and locality working.
3. A Member asked if the research completed in 2021 would be compared against the research conducted in November 2022 so that the effects of the work undertaken could be evidenced. The Director of Corporate Strategy and Policy explained that there was not a direct comparison available as the qualitative element of the research conducted in 2021 had not been repeated in November 2022 due to the costs involved. However, the quantitative element of the research was currently taking place and would be compared to the 2021 data.
4. A Member queried Surrey County Councils current intention on increasing Council Tax through the Adults Social Care precept. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources said that the draft budget had been set against assumptions made regarding the possible funding formula and levels of efficiencies required. Final decisions would be made following the Local Government Finance Settlement, expected on 21 December 2022; however the Leader of the Council had been clear that the Council did not anticipate taking the full amount of Council tax and Adults Social Care precept permissible without a referendum.
5. A Member asked what lobbying could take place to encourage more of the business rates paid in Surrey to stay in Surrey. A Strategic Finance Business Partner said the review of business rate retention

formed part of the fair funding reforms which had seen delays in terms of implementation. The Member asked that income from business rates to the County be included in recommendations suggested by the CEHSC.

6. A Vice Chairman, in reference to the four options to close the draft budget gap noted on page 48, asked for the options to be ranked in order of most to least likely. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources said that implementation of a small increase in Council Tax or Adult Social Care precept would be most likely to close the £14.4 million gap, followed by the identification of additional efficiencies and lastly the use of reserves, however this was not an appropriate method for funding ongoing expenditure pressures within the budget.
7. A Member asked if uncollected Council Tax had been considered to close the £14.4 million budget gap. The Director of Finance - Insight and Performance confirmed that while this might not be a method of closing the remaining gap for the 2023/24 budget, the County Treasurers Group had undertaken to draw together revenue and benefit managers from across the county to learn from each other and look at improving overall collection rates and outstanding debt.
8. A Vice Chairman asked if a robust impact analysis was being developed to consider the effect on residents of the difficulties around maintaining existing services and increased demand. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources said that the draft budget had been set on basis that services remain unchanged. A Strategic Finance Business Partner explained that equality impact assessments were conducted annually between the draft budget and final budget and would be set out as part of the Final Budget papers to Cabinet and Full Council. The Director of Corporate Strategy and Policy added that proposals were also subject to a cumulative Equality Impact Assessment with service users involved which were also used to identify mitigations for those with protected characteristics, the cumulative impact assessments would be published with the final budget papers.

Environment, Transport and Infrastructure

9. The Chairman suggested there was a strong case for the Members allocation to be increased by the full rate of highways inflation or a set sum. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure explained that the Ringway Highways maintenance contract was linked to the Building Construction Information Service Index which considered specific activity and estimated the inflation appropriate to that activity. Work was continuing with the contractor to try to continue to deliver as much and as efficiently as possible. *The Cabinet Member for Highways and Community Resilience added that discussions with the Portfolio Holder for Finance*

regarding the sources of any additional money would have to take place. The Chairman said that Members would expect acknowledgement of this element of the capital budget when the final budget was presented to Council.

10. A Member was concerned at the 27 per cent increase on resurfacing costs from Ringway and asked if a ceiling to the maximum amount had been negotiated. The Director of Highways and Transport explained that the percentage increase was linked to the Building Construction Information Service Index and not set by Ringway. The price of bitumen and oil had increased due to inflation and access; however work was consistent to ensure accurate payments against the framework in addition to revisiting prices directly with Ringway each month.
11. A Member noted that the highways maintenance capital fund of £71.3 million for 2023/24 drops to £29.5 million in subsequent years with the local highway scheme drops from £11.8 million to £1 million in subsequent years and asked for the reason of these reductions. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure said that the figures included time limited projects and reflected agreed acceleration of capital spending into 2022/23 and 2023/24 from future years and did not represent an overall reduction in capital investment.
12. A Member queried if roads would go back to deteriorating following use of the catch-up amount which was implemented to repair their slow deterioration. The Director of Highways and Transport confirmed that this was not the intention. Asset models were run to determine road condition with the previous level of investment based on several factors to maintain a steady state to which the recent acceleration and money over the last two years had contributed. The modelling and level of investment would be revisited to determine the future condition of roads.
13. A Member queried the real scope for making efficiencies to the services provided given the unknowns. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure agreed that delivering efficiencies became more challenging each year however work continued to develop and improve assets and to drive efficiencies in specific areas, such as energy savings, working practices and particularly around the new highways contract and the current and new waste contracts.
14. A Vice Chairman queried how the Council planned to fund the future of a sustainable bus network in Surrey and was this plan included in the budget. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure explained that this was subject to a current consultation with lobbying planned for further funding and work currently underway to consider the current market and a new

enhanced partnership with bus operators. The Director of Highways and Transport confirmed that there were no efficiencies set against the bus network and the bus budget included an increase of £2.1 million in response to the pandemic to help support transport ambitions.

15. A Vice Chairman queried if there was another round of government funding expected imminently. The Director of Highways and Transport said that the government had been considering several options including lower fares for a temporary period, however it was not known when the next bidding round would be available.
16. A Member said that specific figures would be useful regarding the bus network and questioned how much SCC was spending on supporting bus services in total and how was that figure expected to compare to next year. A Strategic Finance Business Partner confirmed the bus budget for 2022/23 was £9.6 million which included an additional £2.1 million added during the pandemic in response to changes to passenger numbers. The 2023/24 draft budget included an inflationary uplift for the current year and next year of approximately £1.65 million in addition to an uplift for a young persons travel scheme of approximately £0.45 million to take the total to approximately £11.7 million. Once adjusted for government grants the 2023/34 draft budget is £12.7 million. A Member asked if the figures related to supporting bus services and exclude the approximately £10 million SCC pays the bus companies to accept free or concessionary bus passes. A Strategic Finance Business Partner confirmed that the figures exclude concessionary fares.
17. A Member, in reference to the current bus consultation asked if the routes proposed as on demand services were commercial services supported by SCC subsidy or entirely owned and run by SCC. The Director of Highways and Transport explained that the Mole Valley on demand pilot had been funded by a Rural Mobility Fund government grant. All future funding options were being investigated and included commercial and full or part subsidy.
18. A Member questioned if sufficient emphasis was being given to greener future activity given that only ten per cent? of SCC's capital budget was being spent on anything climate related. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure said that greener future elements were included in most capital schemes across the ETI capital programme, and that all capital spend business cases were considered in respect of their carbon or environment impact. Slide 23 of the report pack showed that, except for two, most of the capital pipeline included greener futures elements contributing to carbon reduction. A Strategic Finance Business Partner added that the budget and the budget pipeline both included schemes in response to or contributed to carbon

reduction over the five-year period totalling approximately £480 million.

19. A Member asked if there was any intention to invest in the laboratory at Merrow. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure confirmed that improvement to the depot were intended. The Director Transport and Highways explained that a business case was planned to identify ways to improve the Merrow depot.
20. A Member queried how, when looking to the medium term, it was expected that Electric Vehicle (EV) on street chargepoints would contribute to the budget. The Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure explained there was a current procurement of a provider for EV chargepoints across the county, the award for which would be recommended to Cabinet in December, and transition to the use of EV chargepoints contributed to the expectation that the Council would develop its own asset base around the new ways of residents being able to travel. An income was expected however additional impact on roads and network would have to be considered.

Jan Mason left the meeting at 12.02pm

Surrey Fire & Rescue Service

21. A Member asked how staff retention was being managed, particularly those staff that wanted to stay within the service but were not able to continue with the physical aspects required of the role. The Chief Fire Officer said that capability processes were being used to identify opportunities of redeployment for staff who reach a point where they are unable to maintain a high level of operational fitness.
22. A Member asked how the Council could improve the retention of firefighters attracted to higher salaries in London. The Chief Fire Officer explained that exit and pre exit interviews were being conducted alongside a significant cultural review to provide baseline information within the service to better understand the drivers around people choosing to leave and consider career pathways and options to transfer to positions within the organisation. In addition, discussions were taking place with trade union partners around steps to assist staff retention.

Carbon budget

23. A Member was concerned that the Carbon budget was only now being put together given the climate emergency.

Resolved:

The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Broadly supports, based on the information provided, the budget proposals for those areas that fall within its remit, noting the assurance that all the savings/efficiencies identified will not lead to deterioration in the services provided to residents (subject to the Local Government Finance Settlement anticipated on 21 December 2022).
2. Recommends an uplift in the Highways Capital Programme to reflect the very high inflation specifically facing the service and its contractors – specifically in the Members’ Highways allocation.
3. Will continue to closely monitor performance throughout the year to be satisfied that expectations derived from the budget will be met in practice.
4. Asks the relevant Cabinet Members/Services that a briefing note highlighting any impact on the Council’s budget, which could impact the areas under this Select Committee’s remit, be circulated to the Committee Members following the Local Government Finance Settlement.
5. Notes that the Surrey County Council currently receives only ten per cent of Business Rates paid by Surrey Business. The Committee asks Cabinet to re-lobby the Government and all Surrey Members of Parliament (MPs) to increase the amount of Business Rates that come to the County Council.

51/22 SURREY STRATEGY FOR ACCOMMODATION, HOUSING AND HOMES [Item 7]

Witnesses:

Sinead Mooney, Cabinet Member for Children and Families
Michael Coughlin, Executive Director of Prosperity, Partnerships and Growth

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Vice Chairman asked for practical examples to show where the strategy would not infringe on the work of districts and boroughs. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families said that there were opportunities where areas of land owned by multiple partners that did not fall in the district or borough remit. This type of element would benefit districts and boroughs housing waiting lists and housing plan targets without undermining their sovereignty with housing or the planning process.

2. A Member explained that leaders and chief executives of the districts and boroughs had recently met to discuss the approach and how to move forward whilst considering a range of issues. The leaders for the districts and boroughs had expressed their concerns around the aims, objectives and progression of the strategy in a letter to go forward to the housing summit on 8 December 2022. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted the strategy had not yet been written and would include a response to the baseline assessment and feedback provided at a recent housing meeting which had included all the districts and boroughs. The Executive Director of Prosperity, Partnerships and Growth added that the statutory functions of the districts and boroughs would not be affected.
3. A Member reiterated that SCC needed to accept and address the serious concerns expressed by the districts and boroughs for progress to be made. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that the strategy was not a statutory document and that engagement with districts and boroughs would continue on the strategic priorities and benefits.
4. A Member noted the requirement for Surrey County Council to champion good quality housing to help the delivery of better health, social and environmental outcomes across Surrey. The Cabinet Member Children and Families summarised the aim to engage with multiple housing providers and registered social landlords across Surrey to encourage good quality new as well as existing housing. The housing strategy would attempt to address gaps in equalities with the possibility of lobbying central government to open funding opportunities to enable essential improvements to existing housing stock.
5. A Member queried the cost of the consultancy in this phase, the costs expected for phase two and the number of full-time equivalent staff involved. The Executive Director of Prosperity, Partnerships and Growth confirmed the total budget of £80,000 had not yet been fully spent and all costs were expected to be met within this amount with no requirement for any additional full-time equivalent staff.
6. A Vice Charman in referencing chapter 4.1, paragraph 3 and the quote “many participants pointed to a lack of partnership between key players across the county in relation to the provision of housing and accommodation” asked how the case for investment in housing was currently being made and by whom. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families confirmed that the final document would address that significant gap as the strategy was developed and would be followed by a county wide review when the strategy had come into force. The Executive Director of Prosperity, Partnerships and Growth added that SCC would lead the call to action in its

stewardship role to champion housing in Surrey within the context currently played by the districts and boroughs.

7. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted the Committees feedback to engage and consult with the districts and boroughs and reiterated that there had been constructive discussions and feedback arising from recent housing roadshows. The Cabinet Member for Children and Families noted that it was clear from the discussion with the CEHSC that further consideration was required around providing further clarity on the purpose of the strategy.

Resolved: (Stephen Cooksey and John Furey abstained)

The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee:

1. Recognises that the County Council can make a positive contribution to the many and diverse challenges relating to housing and therefore supports the principle of establishing a comprehensive Surrey-wide housing strategy founded on mutual respect and common interests of all partners.
2. Is concerned that, while no individual prospective partner should wield a 'veto' in the process, the County's 11 District and Borough Council Leaders have expressed serious concerns and therefore welcomes the Cabinet Member's i) pledge to reflect on and take further into account the views of the District and Borough Council Leaders, as expressed by Councillor Cooksey, and ii) offer to continue to engage with those Councils.
3. Urges the early development of key performance indicators to determine whether the high ambitions and expectations arising from the Strategy as listed in paragraph 14 of the report are realistic.
4. Requests that recommendation bullet points 2 & 3 above are addressed before a final strategy to Cabinet is presented.

52/22 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 8]

The Select Committee noted the Recommendation Tracker and the Forward Work Programme.

53/22 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING: 8 FEBRUARY 2023 [Item 9]

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 8 February 2022.

Meeting ended at: 1.29pm

Chairman