

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AND ENVIRONMENT
CAPITAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE BOUGES/VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL
ON 11 JULY 2013**

Present: Councillors N Arculus (Vice Chairman), J Peach, L Serluca,
C Harper, JA Fox, N Thulbourn, Cllr Forbes

Also Present: Ellie Jaggard, Youth Council
Councillor Holdich, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for
Education, Skills and University
Sean Hanson, Partnership Director, Serco
Paul Richards, Operations Director, Serco
Cllr Sandford, Group Leader of the Liberal Democrats
Cllr Harrington, Group Leader of Peterborough Independent Forum

Officers Present: Simon Machen, Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering
Services
Mark Speed, Transport Infrastructure Planning Manager
Lewis Banks, Transport Officer (Accessibility & Sustainability)
Ruth Lea, Lawyer
Ricky Fuller, Head of Strategic Client Services
Paul Robertson, Waste Partnership Officer
Richard Pearn, Waste Partnership Manager
Helen Turner, Lawyer
Paulina Ford, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Allen, Councillor Maqbool and Councillor Martin. Councillor Serluca, Councillor Harper and Councillor Forbes were in attendance as substitutes.

2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

There were no declarations of interest or whipping declarations.

The Chair advised the Committee that due to unforeseen personal circumstances the officer presenting item 5 on the agenda Environment Capital Update Report had been unable to attend the meeting to present her report. The Chair asked the Committee if they would agree to defer the item until the next meeting in September. The Committee agreed in favour of this request.

Councillor Peach advised the Chair that he would have to leave the meeting early to attend another meeting.

3. Call in of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions

The Committee had been asked to consider a Call-In request that had been made in relation to the decision made by Cabinet and published on 1 July 2013, regarding Passenger Transport - Subsidised Service Provision - JUL13/CAB/059.

The request to Call-In this decision was made on 4 July 2013 by Councillor Shearman and supported by Councillor Sylvester. The decision for Call-In was based on the following grounds:

- (i) The decision does not follow the principles of good decision making set out in Article 12 of the Council's Constitution specifically that the decision maker did not:
 - a) Realistically consider all alternatives and, where reasonably possible, consider the views of the public.
 - b) Act for a proper purpose and in the interests of the public.

The reasons put forward by the Councillors were:

- a)
 - i. There appears to be no consideration given to the re-routing of bus routes to ensure vulnerable communities do not lose their bus routes.(e.g. in the Ravensthorpe area and also along Garton End Road)
 - ii. Contact has been made with us by a number of members of the public stating they had no idea that their bus route (particularly 406) was vulnerable to these reductions in service.
- b) It is not in the interests of vulnerable members of the public – particularly the elderly – to have their bus route (particularly route 406) WITHDRAWN. This route in particular provides a lifeline for many of these residents and to walk to the nearest retained route is for these people both unrealistic and uncaring.

After considering the request to call-in and all relevant advice, the Committee were required to decide either to:

- (a) not agree to the request to call-in, when the decision shall take effect;
- (b) refer the decision back to the decision maker for reconsideration, setting out its concerns; or
- (c) refer the matter to full Council.

The Chairman read out the procedure for the meeting.

Councillor Shearman and Councillor Sylvester each addressed the Committee stating why they had called the decision in.

Councillor Shearman made the following points:

- Did not believe that the decision made considered all alternatives or considered the views of the public.
- There was a great strength of feeling from members of the public against the decision.
- When the cuts to bus services were decided upon alternative services should have been provided.
- Had discussions taken place with Stagecoach to mitigate the impact of the service cuts?
- Were the public consulted, were Age Concern consulted and people with disabilities.
- Was the decision taken in the interest of the elderly, infirm and disabled?
- The decision maker had failed to recognise that there were small communities that would now become isolated.
- The decision was unrealistic and uncaring.

Councillor Sylvester made the following points:

- Councillor Sylvester had been part of the Cross-Party Cabinet Advisory Group which was tasked with the role of reducing the cost of subsidised transport. Members were informed

that the Group worked to a very tight timescale to make recommendations but had not suggested discontinuing the Local Link service. After considering the Equality Impact Assessment it was decided that a reduced Local Link Service should still be provided. Any gaps in the service could be filled by such services as Dial a Ride.

- The Advisory Group had realistically considered all alternatives and the effect it would have on the public.
- Cabinet had not realistically considered alternatives.
- On board bus surveys had been carried out late at night.
- Buses 406 and 407 were the most used.
- Cabinet had not acted in the interest of the public.
- The public had not been consulted and public views had not been considered.

Additional speakers in support of the call-in were then invited to speak:

Councillor Harrington addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Members of the public who use the buses had not been consulted.
- Members of the public who used the services would be best placed to advise on which services could be cut.
- Early engagement with the bus users should have taken place.
- Cutting bus services did not fit in with the Environment Capital sustainable transport vision and did not encourage young people to use the buses.
- Requested the Committee to ask Cabinet to reconsider their decision.

Councillor John Fox addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Councillor Fox stated that he was a member of the Diversity Group, Disability Forum and ward Councillor for Werrington that had four sheltered housing complexes. All major decisions required an Equality Impact Assessment to be completed but it appeared that this was not completed for the Werrington area.
- The residents of the sheltered housing complexes would be greatly affected by the bus service cuts.
- Recommendation to have the decision referred back to Full Council for debate.

Members of the Public in support of the Call-In were then invited to speak:

Phil Green, Representing Local Link drivers addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Disappointed with Cabinet decision as no drivers or passengers had been consulted.
- Most people on the Local Link service were vulnerable people.
- Local Link services covered the routes that Stagecoach had withdrawn previously.
- Local Link services should not be replaced with another subsidised service.
- Local Link bus drivers could be put out of work.
- Request to have the decision referred back to Full Council for consideration.

Barry Proctor resident of Grimshaw Road addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Obvious that Cabinet who had made the decision did not know the area in which the 406 bus route covered.
- Most of the people living in the area of the 406 bus route were elderly and disabled.
- Would be difficult for most people to get to other bus stops if the 406 bus route were taken off.
- Some elderly residents would not be able to go to town or their doctors if bus service was cut.

- Stagecoach passenger numbers during 2011/2012 were 240k per annum. Local Link passenger numbers during 2011/2012 were 360K per annum. Local Link was therefore the most used at that time. Since then people had got older and more disabled.

David Lennox resident of Grimshaw Road addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Appreciated that the Local Authority has had their budget cut by Government but had heard that the Government were going to make additional funds available in January for public transport. Why therefore was the bus service being cut now if more funding would be made available in January.

Lynn Stratton resident of Newborough addressed the Committee and made the following point:

- Residents of Newborough would be unable to walk to other bus stops from their village as the A47 was at the end of the main road.

Angela Smith a resident from Fengate addressed the Committee and made the following point:

- There has been no mention of the residents and workers from the Fengate area where there were many employers. The cut in bus services would affect them. None of the employees or employers knew anything about the service cuts which meant they had not been consulted.

Questions and Comments from Members of the Commission in response to the Councillors statements:

- Councillor Judy Fox agreed with the Call-in and comments from those supporting the call-in.
- Members sought clarification on the purpose of the Cabinet Advisory Group that had been set up. *Councillor Sylvester advised that the group was a cross party group. The group had been presented with a remit to look at what the current bus service budget was and were asked to consider what could be done to reduce the service to fit the budget of £600K. The group had found the task difficult and were unable to make a recommendation which was in line with the £600K. A recommendation had therefore been put forward from the group of a budget of £780K to reduce the impact on vulnerable people.*
- Councillor Sandford confirmed that the group had agreed that there should be a reduction in the Local Link service but that the evening services should be retained and there would be a reduced day time service to three buses. The Cabinet decision to reduce the budget had been made prior to the Equality Impact Assessment being carried out. The group had considered the Equality Impact Assessment and found that in doing this to protect the vulnerable groups the relevant services could not be provided within a budget of £600K and therefore the recommendation was to increase it to £780K.

As advised at the beginning of the meeting Councillor Peach left the meeting at this point.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University made a statement in answer to the Call-In request which included the following:

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Education, Skills and University advised the Committee that Cabinet had not taken the decision without professional advice. The evidence provided within the report had shown that there were no exceptional grounds to uphold the Call-in request. A range of alternatives had been considered within the bus service review and Equality Impact Assessments had been carried out. A public consultation

had been carried out and public opinion had been taken into consideration. The Equality Impact Assessment had shown that the removal of the 406 bus service would have an effect on the elderly but this would be mitigated by the provision of a Demand Response Service. It was therefore concluded that by making the decision Cabinet had acted in the interest of the public by taking a difficult decision to safeguard as many services as possible within the budgetary constraints. The Demand Response Service would be developed to ensure it provided the service required for those most in need.

The Transport Infrastructure Planning Manager then took questions from the Committee in response to the Call-in request:

- Members wanted to know what had been done to make members of the public aware of the proposals to reduce the bus services. *Members were advised that the following consultation exercises had been undertaken whereby the public were asked to give their views and Councillors were given numerous opportunities to represent the public:*

1. *The Medium Term Financial Strategy Consultation Document outlined the services at risk because of the reduction in the budget to £600,000 for passenger transport subsidised services.*

Outcome: *Medium Term Financial Strategy budget of £600,000 for passenger transport subsidised services was approved at Full Council on the 6 March 2013.*

2. *The Medium Term Financial Strategy Consultation covered a wide range of organisations, special interest groups and meetings including a joint Neighbourhood Committee and Scrutiny Committees.*

Outcome: *The Medium Term Financial Strategy was approved on the 6 March 2013.*

3. *All City Council Councillors were written to, and offered a bespoke session, to discuss which services within Peterborough, and specifically their ward, were at risk as part of this review of subsidised services.*

Outcome: *Meetings held with all Councillors who requested a bespoke session.*

4. *The Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities requested and received a presentation on services that operated in rural Peterborough and which subsidised services were at risk on the 26 March 2013.*

Outcome: *Minutes of a Meeting of the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities on the 26 March 2013 outline the outcome of this meeting.*

5. *Transport Forum (open to the public) and organised by Peterborough Environment City Trust was held at the John Clare Theatre on the 19 February 2013. Officers gave a presentation and a discussion took place regarding the subsidised passenger transport review.*

Outcome: *An open discussion took place discussing the positive contribution that subsidised services made to Peterborough and a general consensus was that reducing the budget available to passenger transport services was undesirable.*

6. *A Cross Party Advisory Group was set up by the Cabinet Member to discuss the review and to make recommendations regarding which subsidised services should continue to receive funding within the agreed budgetary provision of £600,000. The group met on the following dates:*

- *13 May 2013*

- 20 May 2013
- 21 May 2013
- 29 May 2013

Outcome: The group held a series of meetings and considered the following issues and information:

- *Equality Impact Assessments for all service options*
- *Bus Service Review for Local Link services*
- *Current and projected costs to retain current provision of services*
- *Presentations from:*
 - Stagecoach (all their subsidised services)*
 - Atkins (Equality Impact Assessments and Bus Service Review for Local Link services)*
 - Centrebus (Kimes 9)*
 - Support and advice from Passenger Focus*

The group recommended areas where savings could be made. However, they requested that Cabinet be informed that this decision was difficult as they recognised the importance and benefits associated with all of the services subsidised by the Council.

- *Members wanted to know if Age Concern had been consulted on the proposals. Members were informed that Age Concern were on the list of consultees.*
- *How many Councillors took up the offer of a bespoke session? The Officer advised that he could not remember the exact number but he estimated that it was approximately 19 councillors.*
- *Why were the Cabinet Advisory Group recommendations rejected by Cabinet? Members were informed that the recommendations were rejected because they had not met the budgetary requirements set out by Full Council.*
- *Councillor Sandford commented that part of the purpose of the Peterborough Local Transport Plan was to improve and extensively promote the councils Community Link and Local Link bus services. How therefore did the Cabinet decision comply with council policy? Members were informed that the budget cuts had to be understood in the wider context that all service areas were affected.*
- *The proposed Demand Response Service replacing the 406 and 407 bus services would not be suitable for people travelling to work along those bus routes. Members were informed that there was a proposal to introduce a new type of Demand Response Service to ensure that buses were available at peak times AM and PM for people to get to work and school.*
- *Members had noted that the Local Link service 406 had reported the highest passenger usage for 2012/2013 of 192,116 passengers.*
- *The Officer advised the Committee that there were alternative transport options already in place for people unable to walk the extra distance to other commercial service bus stops. They were the Demand Response Service and the high end services e.g. Community Link and Rural Dial a Ride. Those services were designed specifically for people who had mobility and disability issues who could not access normal public transport.*
- *Had officers advertised the proposed changes on the bus service routes to be affected or in the local press and at the bus stops? The Officer advised Members that it had been publicised on the local radio, in the press and on TV.*
- *Members were concerned that school children would be affected and wanted to ensure that they would be able to get to and from school. Members were advised that Atkins had completed the Equality Impact Assessments and where impacts had been identified the council were able to mitigate those circumstances by the recommendation in the decision.*

- Councillor Harrington was concerned that Parish Councils had not been consulted. *Members were informed that Parish Councils had been consulted as part of the budget setting process.*

As there was no further debate the Committee took a vote to decide on whether they should:

- (a) not agree to the request to call-in, when the decision shall take effect;
- (b) refer the decision back to the decision maker for reconsideration, setting out its concerns;
- or
- (c) refer the matter to full Council.

The Committee (Councillors Arculus, Serluca, Harper, JA Fox, Thulbourn and Forbes) voted unanimously in favour of agreeing to the request to Call-In the decision. The Committee felt that not sufficient consideration had been given to the cut in Passenger Transport Subsidised Services within the £600K budget and the impact it would have on vulnerable members of the public.

The Committee then debated whether the decision should be referred back to the decision maker; Cabinet for reconsideration or to Full Council. After a short discussion the Committee voted in favour of the decision being referred back to Cabinet. (4 in favour, 3 against) Councillors JA Fox, Thulbourn, and Forbes voted against a referral back to Cabinet. Councillors Arculus, Harper and Serluca voted in favour of the decision being referred back to Cabinet. As the vote was 3 in favour and 3 against the Chair had the casting vote and voted in favour of referring back to Cabinet.

ACTION AGREED

The request for Call-in of the decision made by Cabinet and published on 1 July 2013, regarding Passenger Transport - Subsidised Service Provision - JUL13/CAB/059 was considered by the Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee. Following discussion and questions raised on each of the reasons stated on the request for Call-In, the Committee did agree to the Call-In of this decision on the reasons stated.

It was therefore recommended that Under the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules in the Council's Constitution (Part 4, Section 8, and paragraph 13), implementation of this decision remains suspended until further notice.

The Sustainable Growth and Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee therefore Recommends that Cabinet:

1. Reconsiders the results of the consultation undertaken with regard to the decision to discontinue Passenger Transport Subsidised Services;

And in doing this:

2. Undertakes further consultation to fully assess and understand the impact of discontinuing these services on vulnerable members of the public in particular with relation to the Local Link service before making the decision.

At this point Councillor Forbes left the meeting.

4. Peterborough Serco Strategic Partnership Performance

The Partnership Director introduced the report which provided the Committee with an update on the performance of the Peterborough Serco Strategic Partnership contract. The report covered the period 2012 to end of March 2013. Members were informed that performance

had improved since last reporting to the Committee in July 2012. The report covered the following areas of operation:

- Operations
 - Service delivery and improvements
 - Service Improvement Plans
- Growth
- Transformation
- Procurement

Also included in the report was performance data against the Key Performance Indicators against which Serco were measured.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Members sought clarification on the data provided on benefits performance which had shown a year on year increase in the number of days to process the claims. *Members were informed that there had been an unexpected significant increase in the activity around benefit claims. Some of this was due to the change in government legislation which had made it easier for people to receive benefits such as automatic claim intervention from the Department of Work and Pensions. Measures to transform the service were being taken to reduce the number of days to process the claims.*
- Members sought clarification of the national indicator NI181? *Members were advised that this was a National Indicator that was an aggregation of new claims and changes in circumstances.*
- Members were concerned about the data for complaints about Customer Service which had highlighted 26 complaints regarding staff attitude / conduct and complaints relating to Revenues and Benefits which had highlighted 72 complaints for delayed / failed service. *Members were advised that there would always be some people who were not satisfied with the service even if provided within the timescale. Complaints regarding the delay and failure of service for revenues and benefits did not necessarily mean that the service provided was not within the required timescale. All complaints still had to be logged even if the service provided had been within the timescale. Customer service attitude was taken very seriously and people who did not have the right attitude were either retrained or let go if the conduct had not improved.*
- Who set the Key Performance Indicators? *Members were advised that the KPI's were set locally by the Council and some were national targets.*
- Members sought clarification on the following statement in the report "*the next year is likely to see the Council and Serco bidding together for a range of opportunities which could include commissioning and delivery of health and social care services*". Members wanted to know if this meant that Peterborough would be approaching other local authorities to operate their health and social care services. Or did it mean the health and social care services within Peterborough City Council would be handed over to Serco to run. *Members were informed that the example mentioned in the report was something that was being worked on with Serco and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group. There were four areas of commissioning that had gone out to tender and Serco were bidding for these. The driver behind this was the financial situation that the council had found itself in and the expectation that this council had the capability and skills that other councils needed. It was very much a partnership approach between the council and Serco and part of the expected growth that Serco could bring to the council. Parking services was another option being considered.*
- Members noted from the report that the KPI for percentage of calls answered in 20 seconds was 61% and were concerned that this meant that the remaining percentage equated to abandoned calls. Members wanted to know if Serco were happy with the 61% target set by the council. *Members were informed that this did not mean that calls not answered within 20 seconds had been abandoned it just meant that they had not been answered within the 20 seconds timeframe. A new telephone system was being*

brought in which would help to improve on the rate of calls answered within 20 seconds. Members were advised that the percentage of first call resolution which was a KPI of 83% was a much more important KPI as this indicated how many first time callers had their issue resolved at the first point of contact. Serco had exceeded this KPI by 3%.

- *Members sought clarification of what “PCI compliance” meant as stated in the report. Members were advised it related to being compliant with how credit card payments were taken over the phone. It was a specific requirement that the customer service operators had to be trained on and operate within.*
- *Members requested an update on the On-Line Claims process which had gone live on 5 March 2013. Members were informed that after consultation with various groups including Age UK and Social Landlords and undertaking Equality Impact Assessments the Benefit Claim system had now become totally digital. The claim form was an on line smart form which had made it much easier for people to complete. 77% of claims were now being completed on line. All feed back received so far had been very positive.*

ACTIONS AGREED

1. The Committee noted the report and requested that a further annual report on the Peterborough Serco Strategic Partnership Performance be brought back to the Committee in July 2014.
2. The Committee also requested that if Serco were to bid for opportunities to commission and deliver health and social care services for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group then the Scrutiny Commission for Health Issues should be informed.

5. New Household Recycling Centre

The Waste Partnership Officer introduced the report which informed the Committee about the planned relocation of the Household Recycling Centre (HRC) from its current location next to the landfill site at Dogsthorpe to a new site in Fengate in the former RSG building. Members were advised that the move was necessary as the lease at Dogsthorpe would expire in October 2014. The council had a statutory obligation to have a Household Recycling Centre and therefore another location had to be found. The proposed new location which was the former RSG building had a number of benefits including a well positioned location, a larger site which was already owned by the council and it had existing planning permission for other waste uses.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- *What provision has been made for people who did not have cars who wanted to transport waste to the new location. Members were advised that it was near a cycle route and there were also a lot of bring sites located across the city which took recycled goods. Some of these also took electrical goods.*
- *Had a survey been conducted to establish how many people attend the current Dogsthorpe site either by walking or cycling? Members were advised that a survey had been conducted over a few days to see what mode of transport people arrived by and no one had arrived by cycle or by walking.*
- *The Waste Partnership Manager advised Members that there were alternative collection services for people who did not have cars like the bulky waste collection service.*

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee noted the report and supported the proposal to relocate the Household Recycling Centre to the former RSG building in Fengate.

6. Energy from Waste Facility – Project Update

The Waste Partnership Manager introduced the report which provided the Committee with an update on the progress of the development of the Energy from Waste (EfW) Facility in Fengate. Members were reminded of the background to the project and the key benefits. Members were advised that the site was currently being cleared and prepared ready to commence construction. Steel work to form the skeleton of the building would start in early 2014.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Is the full contract now available for Members to see? *Members were advised that the full contract was now available but before allowing Members to see it a check would have to take place to see if any areas needed to be redacted.*
- Members requested to see the Environmental Impact Assessment. *Members were advised that the facility had just been awarded an Environmental Permit which was the license from the Environmental Agency to operate. All the information from the Environmental Impact Assessment would be part of that document and could be obtained from the Environmental Agency.*
- Was the council still aiming to achieve a recycle and compost rate of 65% plus as part of the waste management strategy? *Members were informed that the aim to achieve 65% of waste recycled and composted was for the year 2020 however over 50% of the target was already being achieved.*
- Was there going to be any pre sorting of the waste before going into the incinerator. *Members were advised that the facility would not have any pre sorting equipment. The pre sorting would have already been completed at the curb side collection through the black bin, green bin, brown bin and food waste bin.*
- Members sought clarification on the cost of landfill charges. *Members were advised that the current price was £72 per tonne tax and approximately £20 per tonne fee to the operator at the facility. Landfill tax used to be £2 per tonne and had risen steadily over the past few years with another rise due on 1 April 2014 which would take it to £80 per tonne in tax.*
- Members sought clarification as to when the feasibility study for the Combined Heat and Power part of the facility would be completed. *Members were advised that the facility would be enabled with Combined Heat and Power from the start and could be connected at any time. The challenge would be when and where to provide this.*
- If it is unknown when and where the electricity and heat would be used will this affect the financial projections that have been put forward for the facility? *Members were advised that when the facility was up and running it would be the third most efficient energy from waste facility in the country. No income from heat sales had been included in the financial modelling.*

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee noted the report.

7. Scrutiny in a Day: Focus on Welfare Reform

The Senior Governance Officer presented the report which set out proposals to hold a cross-Scrutiny Committee event that would focus on the impacts of welfare reform. This event would be held in order to understand and mitigate against the breadth of impact on individuals, families, communities and businesses. Nominations would be sought from each Scrutiny Committee to form a working party to help plan and provide input for the day.

Questions and observations were made around the following areas:

- Councillor Sandford requested that nominations for the working party be sought from the Group Secretaries.
- Members requested that when planning the day consideration should be given to those Members who worked during the daytime.
- Councillors Fox and Arculus nominated themselves to be part of the working party to help plan the event.
- Members sought clarification as to how many members from each committee would be able to take part in the Scrutiny in a Day event. *The Senior Governance Officer advised that all members of each Scrutiny Committee would be invited to take part as the purpose of the event was to hold a cross Scrutiny Committee event to include all Scrutiny Committees and Commissions.*

ACTIONS AGREED

1. The Committee noted the report and supported the recommendation to hold a Scrutiny in a Day event with a focus on Welfare Reform.
2. The Committee also agreed to put forward nominations to the working party.

8. Notice of Intention to Take Key Decisions

The Committee received the latest version of the Council's Notice of Intention to Take Key Decisions, containing key decisions that the Leader of the Council anticipated the Cabinet or individual Cabinet Members would make during the course of the following four months. Members were invited to comment on the Plan and, where appropriate, identify any relevant areas for inclusion in the Committee's work programme.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Committee noted the Notice of Intention to Take Key Decisions and requested the following information:

- Information on the Moy's End Stand Demolition and Reconstruction – KEY/03APR/12

9. Work Programme

Members considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2013/14 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

ACTION AGREED

To confirm the work programme for 2013/14 and the Senior Governance Officer to include any additional items as requested during the meeting.

10. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday, 5 September 2013

The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 10.25pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank