

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
STRONG AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD IN THE  
BOURGES & VIERSEN ROOMS, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH  
ON  
WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY 2016**

Present: Councillors: L Forbes (Chairman), C Ash (Vice Chairman) L Ayres, P Faustino, R Bisby, S Martin, and J R Fox

Officers in

Attendance:	Wendi Ogle-Welbourn	Corporate Director, People and Communities
	Adrian Chapman	Service Director for Adult Services and Communities
	Gary Goose	Head of Community Services
	Belinda Child	Head of Housing and Health Improvement
	Hayley Thornhill	Intelligence Manager
	Ian Phillips	Social Inclusions Manager
	Alison Stuart	Assistant Director Legal & Democratic Services
	Kim Sawyer	Director of Governance
	Paulina Ford	Senior Democratic Services Officer
<b>Also Present:</b>	Councillor North	Cabinet Member for Communities & Environment Capital
	Councillor Hiller	Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing & Economic Development
	Supt Melanie Dales	
	Chief Inspector Robin Sissons	Head of Community & Safety Services
	Cllr Murphy	
	Cllr Sandford	
	Cllr Jamil	

**Chairman's Announcement**

The Chairman informed the Committee that a request had been received from Cllr Hiller and Cllr Sandford to alter the order of the agenda to allow them to be in attendance for items that they wish to present to. The following changes to the agenda were therefore proposed:

Items 1, 2 and 3 to remain the same.

Item 4 (which was item 5) would become Selective Licensing – Outcome of Consultations

Item 5 (which was item 6) would become Communities Strategy Task and Finish Group Report

Item 6. (which was item 7) would become Joint Community Enforcement Team.

Item 7. (which was item 4) would become Call-In of any Cabinet, Cabinet member or Key Officer Decisions

Items 8, 9, and 10 would remain as the original agenda.

The Committee agreed unanimously to the change of order.

## 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Iqbal. Councillor Ayres was in attendance as substitute.

## 2. Declarations of Interest and Whipping Declarations

### Item 4 – Selective Licensing – Outcome of Consultations

Councillor Ayres declared that she was a trustee for Peterborough Cathedral Preservation Trust.

## 3. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 November 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2015 were approved as an accurate record.

## 4. Selective Licensing – Outcome of Consultations

The report was introduced by the Head of Community Services which provided the Committee with the final proposals for a Selective Licensing Scheme for the private rented housing sector within Peterborough following public consultation. As the consultation did not close until 14 January 2016 the full consultation report could not be issued with the agenda and was therefore tabled at the meeting providing the Committee with the final consultation results. The consultation had been a positive exercise with over 1500 individual responses having been received, with 146 detailed emails asking questions of the scheme. 40,000 households had been written to comprising households who would be directly affected by the proposed scheme as well as those in surrounding areas. 60 percent of the respondents were in favour of the scheme and 34 to 35 percent were not in favour of the scheme. Landlords were generally not in favour of the scheme but other members of the public and those who lived in the area were. Following consultation the scheme had varied from that which was originally proposed.

Questions and comments were raised around the following areas:

- Members asked if the scheme could be city wide. *Members were informed that the authority were precluded by law to make it a city wide scheme. Other authorities had tried and failed.*
- Could the scheme assist with anti-social behaviour? *Members were informed that the scheme alone would not address anti-social behaviour but there would be a requirement for tenancy agreements to be in place that would make it clear what the responsibilities were for the tenant and what the responsibilities were of the landlord. Awareness and training sessions were being put in place for both landlords and tenants through the City College to ensure people understood what their obligations were.*
- Members sought assurance that the fees would be fair and affordable and were concerned that landlords may raise their rental charges to accommodate the fees. *Members were informed that the proposed scheme offered the single biggest discount to landlords nationally for landlords that were members of an accredited scheme or whose property was let through an agent who was a member of an accredited national body. The fee would be a one off £50 fee for the five year licence.*
- Assurance was also sought that the fees would be self-contained and that there would not be any profit from the scheme. *Members were assured that the law around the introduction of the scheme was clear that any money generated from the scheme could only be used to operate the scheme. It could not go to support other council services. There would be a full audit trail through the councils accounting systems.*
- How effective will the scheme be in identifying bad landlords and how long would it take before the scheme was implemented and a difference could be seen. *Members were*

*advised that the expectation was that there would be an immediate impact on bad landlords from day one but that it could take 18 months for the communities to see a difference on the streets in the city.*

- *Will there be a standard tenancy agreement. Members were informed that accredited organisations such as those listed in the report and accredited landlords would have access to standardised documents such as tenancy agreements.*
- *Members were concerned that if the scheme was introduced in certain areas of the city that the bad landlords would just move to other areas of the city. Members were advised that this would be monitored regularly and if the scheme needed to be expanded then further approval would be sought from the Secretary of State.*
- *Concern was raised regarding those landlords who were currently good landlords feeling aggrieved that they would be paying for a scheme that was effectively in place to get rid of the bad landlords. They might decide to sell their properties and this might increase the number of homelessness. Members were advised that some landlords had not understood that it was a one off fee of £50 per property for five years and once explained they were generally happy with this. The fee was also tax deductible. The homelessness situation will be closely monitored by the homelessness team.*
- *For those landlords who were not accredited and had to pay the £600 standard fee would there be facilities in place to make staged payments. Members were informed that this was unlikely as the reason for the scheme was for all landlords to become accredited and therefore only have to pay the £50 fee, this in turn would improve standards across the city.*
- *Members commented that some people were forced to rent properties from bad landlords for various reasons e.g. they were on benefits, or had been in rent arrears in the past. How would this scheme help those people. Members were informed that the Housing Needs Team currently worked with tenants who had those sort of challenges to help secure accommodation in the private rented sector. This scheme would ensure that the team had a range of accredited landlords and properties that were properly managed and could help place people into accommodation where the rent was suitable.*
- *Members noted that within the consultation responses one landlord had queried that if the tenancy agreements were to be translated into another language would they uphold in court. Members were informed that the tenancy agreements would only be in English.*
- *Members further noted that one of the consultation responses had stated that Manchester City Council who had a similar scheme in place were not going to renew the scheme. Members sought further clarification. Members were informed that the scheme was a five year scheme and it was not the intention to have the scheme as a long term policy and it would be reviewed after five years. The scheme would be put in place to address some long term issues and once those had been stabilised it may no longer be required. This may have been the situation in Manchester.*
- *Members noted that the Cathedral Grounds were included within the scheme and asked if this could be removed. Members were advised that there was an issue with one or two individual areas which people felt were not appropriate to be included within the scheme however this would place the scheme in some difficulty if individual boundaries were changed. The evidence base for the scheme was based on lower super output areas from the Office of National Statistics which covered around 600 houses and populations of approximately 1500 people. It would be difficult to start changing individual areas without causing a precedence and subjecting other areas to change.*

The Committee commented that whilst the scheme was not perfect they recognised that it was far better than the scheme previously submitted and therefore agreed to support it.

The Chairman thanked the officers for an informative report.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee noted the outcome of the consultation and final proposals for the Selective Licensing Scheme and agreed to endorse the Selective Licensing Scheme with the following recommendations:

1. That all monies received from the Selective Licencing Scheme are accounted for and recorded in a transparent way so that the public can access the information.
2. That the views from all consultation responses be taken into consideration when implementing the Selective Licensing Scheme.

## **5. Community Strategy Task and Finish Group Report**

The report was introduced by Councillor Ash, Chairman of the Task and Finish Group. Councillor Ash advised the Committee that the Task and Finish Group was set up to look at the development of a Community Strategy which would set the Council's commitment to communities, including supporting voluntary and community activity, consultation, co-production and volunteering. The Committee were informed that the Strategy was a starting point and was work in progress. The strategy was written as an overarching framework document and set out a vision which would have other strategies feeding into the framework.

Questions and comments were raised around the following areas:

- Members voiced concerns regarding the use of volunteers to deliver services and felt that some services should be provided by full time paid professionals.
- Members commented that the council had a responsibility to provide services and even if community groups delivered services on the council's behalf would the responsibility for the service still lie with the council. Would the volunteers be covered by the same public liability insurance or would the community groups have to arrange it themselves. *Members were assured that services that the council had a statutory responsibility to carry out would not be carried out by volunteers. Volunteers were one of the tools to help deliver the services differently and there were a number of voluntary organisations that already did this.*
- Members were concerned that the existing volunteers would become overloaded with extra work. Were there any plans in place to recruit new volunteers? *Members were informed that more work would be done with the Council for Voluntary Services to recruit more volunteers. More work would also be done to support volunteers and provide a framework for them to try and encourage more volunteers.*
- How would the strategy be communicated to volunteers and in particular new volunteers to ensure the strategy worked. *Members were informed that the strategy was just a framework for a vision and the detail was still to be developed.*
- The Service Director for Adult Services and Communities provided further clarity regarding volunteers and working with voluntary organisations and stated that the strategy was not about the council having an army of volunteers to call on to deliver services. The strategy was about the council as an enabling and commissioning authority supporting organisations in the city who relied on volunteers to deliver their services.
- Councillor Ash requested that if the Committee were minded to approve the strategy that it should continue to monitor and review progress in delivering the Building Blocks within the strategy and identify areas where further work and engagement may be required.
- Members referred to the case study for Hampton Parish Council where the Parish Council used funds raised through the precept to employ a Lengthsman to clear rubbish from the area. Members were concerned that only the richer areas of the city or areas that had Parish Councils would be able to afford to hire extra help to keep their areas clean or to provide other services. *Members were advised that areas of the city without Parish Councils would be supported by other means.*
- Members were concerned that Parish Councils would have to use their funds to pick up the bills for services that were no longer being provided by the council.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee commented on the Community Strategy and agreed to endorse the Strategy and recommend it to Cabinet for approval.

The Committee further agreed to the following recommendations as set out within the Task and Finish Groups report:

1. That the Community Strategy should act as an overarching strategy framework that cuts across multiple services and business areas.
2. That further more detailed strategies should be developed that underpin the individual building blocks.
3. That the Task and Finish group who supported this piece of work is concluded.
4. The Committee agreed to recommend that further consultation on the strategy should take place.

## CRIME AND DISORDER SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR ITEM 6 ONLY

### 6. Joint Community Enforcement Team

The Service Director for Adult Services and Communities introduced the report which provided the Committee with information on the concept, rationale and proposed development of a city-wide multi-agency joint enforcement team.

Questions and comments were raised around the following areas:

- Members felt the scheme would give reassurance to members of the public and therefore make them feel safer. Members were however concerned that council employed staff carrying out the duties would not have powers of arrest and therefore sought clarification as to how the law would be enforced. *Members were informed that there would be radio contact in place with police officers should immediate contact with them be required. The intention was also to equip officers with body cameras which would provide evidence should it be required. Chief Inspector Sissons added that it would be a one team ethos and police officers and council officers would be briefed together and would be on the same airwaves on the radios. This would mean that when a police officer or officer put someone through checks then everyone else would be able to hear this. Therefore if there was a council officer in a difficult situation a police officer would attend the incident.*
- Members noted that council officers would not have powers of arrest and therefore sought clarification on how council officers would deal with situations when dealing with law enforcement issues. *Chief Inspector Sissons responded that it was important to understand that most people were law abiding citizens and if stopped and issued with a ticket e.g. if cycling in a no cycling area, then they would generally comply. On the rare occasions that this was not the case then a police officer would be in attendance to assist.*
- How long will it take to upskill council officers to take on the additional tasks? *Members were informed that Cabinet approval would be sought in February and a programme of mobilisation would start after approval had been given. It was planned that officers would be out on patrol having been trained from April 2016. Bespoke training would be offered but officers would not be allowed on to the streets until fully trained. Police officers would not need much training but council officers would be trained in such things as issuing tickets, conflict resolution, voice commands, use of body cameras etc. Training would be provided from within existing resources within the police force and prisons.*
- Members sought clarification as to whether the new working arrangements had been put in place just to improve the city centre or would it be used to outlying areas as well. Had similar schemes in other authorities been looked at. *Members were informed that it was not just about the city centre but was a city wide response. Response would be*

*intelligence led and officers would be located in areas where the need was. The scheme was being put in place for the benefit of the city. The idea of the scheme had been considered four to five years ago following a similar scheme which had been put in place in Glasgow.*

- Cross Keys organise a monthly walkabout. Will the council officers who have the additional powers be included on these walkabouts? *Members were informed that they would be.*
- Members commented that it would be important to communicate the new scheme properly to members of the public so that they understood what powers the council officers had and the difference between those and the powers of police officers. *Members were advised that if the scheme were approved there would be an official launch with media coverage. A communication would also go into community newsletters and out to Parish Councils and councillors.*

The Chairman suggested to the Committee that as there was a Call-in item of the City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement Cabinet decision as the next item on the agenda that any recommendations for this item should be reserved until after the outcome of the Call-in. All members of the Committee unanimously agreed to this.

## **7. Call in of any Cabinet, Cabinet Member or Key Officer Decisions**

The purpose of the item was for the Committee to consider the Call-In request that had been made in relation to the decision made by Cabinet on 7 December and republished on 31 December 2015 regarding City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement – DEC15/CAB/106.

The request to Call-In this decision was made on 6 January 2016 by Councillor Sandford and supported by Councillors Murphy, Shaheed and Jamil. The decision for Call-In was based on the following grounds:

- Criteria 3. Decision is Key but it has not been dealt with in accordance with the Council's Constitution.
- Criteria 4. Decision does not follow principles of good decision-making set out in Article 11 of the Council's Constitution.
  - (a) Realistically consider all alternatives and, where reasonably possible, consider the views of the public.
  - (c) Take account of all relevant matters, both in general and specific, and ignore any irrelevant matters.
  - (f) Follow procedures correctly and be fair.
  - (i) Take appropriate professional advice from officers.

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 Call-in and then invited the Councillors supporting the request for Call-in to address the Committee on their reasons for calling the decision in.

Councillor Murphy made the following points:

- It had been suggested to the Leader of the Council that the decision be withdrawn until the whole topic had been discussed at the relevant scrutiny committee.
- The Call-in request was about whether the decision had been made in accordance with good practice with due consideration to transparency.
- The Call-in request was not about whether or not there should be a reconfiguration of services or about council officers acting as police officers, it was about how the decision was taken and if it was taken with full consultation, some consultation or any consultation.
- Did the process take into account that it was a Key Decision which affected every resident of Peterborough.
- Key Decisions should be published on the Forward Plan. The decision as listed focused only on the city centre but had become through the reissue of the Decision Notice a city wide decision. This was never published as a Key Decision.
- The only public debate was at Cabinet before Christmas.
- It was noted that the Cabinet Decision notice originally issued was for the city centre only and a further notice reissued on New Year's Eve was changed to city wide which was a significant change.
- There had been confusion as to whether the decision affected the whole city or only the city centre, however the Leader of the Council had since confirmed that the decision affected the whole city. It should therefore have been a Key Decision and full consultation should have taken place.
- A transcription of the minutes of the Cabinet meeting clearly showed that the decision before Cabinet was for the city centre only.
- Key Decisions and significant decisions should be properly consulted on with a plan, options and recommendations, the public needed to know what was being proposed.
- At a recent meeting of the Scrutiny Commission for Rural Communities members had thought that the scheme was for the reintroduction of street wardens which clearly demonstrated that Councillors did not understand what was being proposed.
- No consultations had been held with ward councillors affected by the scheme.
- What consultation had been undertaken with council staff?
- Changing the decision to city wide was contrary to the constitution in that it should have become a Key Decision and therefore request that the Committee up hold the Call-in and recommend that the decision be referred back to Full Council.

Councillor Sandford made the following points:

- This was an issue of massive public concern.
- Cabinet did not follow proper process when making the decision. The paper Cabinet considered was about city centre enforcement and the decision that was published stated this.
- The officer at the Cabinet meeting introduced the item as a proposal for city centre enforcement, however later on in the debate at Cabinet it was mentioned that it could be city wide. At the end of the Cabinet meeting the Chairman asked Cabinet members if they agreed with the recommendation but did not clarify the recommendation which was not good decision making.
- The republished decision was still headed city centre enforcement.
- The decision would have a significant impact on the way anti-social behaviour enforcement happened which was an improvement, however having council officers going out in a uniform with certain powers was clearly a massive change and therefore it should be a Key Decision.

- There was no consultation and in considering the report presented to Cabinet the decision made was beyond the remit of the report presented.
- Republishing the decision to change it was not following procedures in a correct way.
- The professional advice that Cabinet received within the report related to city centre enforcement.
- The decision making process was incorrect in that there was no consultation and it had not been considered at scrutiny therefore the Call-in should be upheld.

Councillor Jamil made the following points:

- There were merits in the proposed scheme but concern at how the decision had been made.
- The decision should have been made in the same way the selective licensing decision was made.
- The principle and process of the way the decision has been made was flawed and therefore the Call-in should be up held.

Questions and Comments to Councillors Sandford, Murphy and Jamil from Members of the Committee:

- Was the Call in based on the fact they felt it should have been a Key Decision. *Councillor Murphy responded that the Call-in was not wholly based on the fact that it should have been a Key Decision. The proposed scheme was a significant change in the way the service worked and therefore should have been consulted on. The Call-in was also about the process and the way the decision was made. Cabinet may have felt they were making a decision on a city wide scheme but they should have spelt out what the decision was they were taking. Councillor Sandford added that whilst it should have been a Key Decision the most important issue was the process in which the decision was taken which was not a good process.*

There being no further questions from the Committee Councillor North Cabinet Member for Communities and Environment Capital, Adrian Chapman, Service Director for Adult Services & Communities and Kim Sawyer, Director of Governance were invited to respond in answer to the Call-In request:

The Director of Governance gave an outline of the process taken to make the decision and events leading up to the Call-in making the following points:

- The report brought before Cabinet was entitled City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement.
- During the course of debate at the Cabinet meeting it became clear that there was potential to move the enforcement service wider and address matters across the whole city and not just the city centre.
- When the debate came before Cabinet it was not restricted to the recommendation within the report. The debate was about how the scheme could be extended across the city.
- The transcript of the Cabinet meeting shows that Councillor Holdich opened the meeting and referred to discussing a scheme that would work across the city as a whole.
- Annette Joyce presenting the report at Cabinet also referred to the scheme addressing issues across the city and not just the city centre. Therefore a city wide scheme.
- It was therefore clear that the proposals were for a city wide enforcement scheme.
- The decision was however incorrectly published after the Cabinet meeting as it referred to the city centre as the recommendation was taken as written in the Cabinet report. The discussion had not been captured regarding the city wide



scheme which had been the essence of the debate throughout the Cabinet meeting. Therefore when Councillor Holdich concluded the debate and asked for agreement on the recommendation which throughout the meeting had been about a city wide scheme it was clear that he was referring to a city wide scheme.

- When the mistake in the publication of the decision was realised, it became clear that Members had lost the right to call in that decision. The view was therefore taken immediately to republish the decision. Councillor Sandford was contacted immediately to arrange an appropriate time for the decision to be republished to allow for any possible Call-in and public debate.
- There had been transparency regarding the error that was made and steps were taken to rectify the error.
- The Director of Governance advised that she had taken the decision that the decision was not a Key Decision and still maintained her decision. The reason being that the scheme would be a phased approach to enforcement. The first phase being the decision before Cabinet in December which was non key.
- A Key Decision was a decision which would involve either spending money greater than £500K or making savings of more than £500K or have a significant impact on two or more wards. There were no savings or expenditure for this decision and no significant impact on two or more wards. The scheme relied on existing powers already in place. If enforcement powers were being transferred to or from the police then this would need to go to Cabinet as a Key Decision but at this stage this was not the case. The current scheme was about moving internal teams around to provide a better service.
- The Call-in meeting had provided proper public debate.
- Recommendations made to Cabinet did not mean that they were bound by the recommendation within a report, Cabinet were entitled to change or amend the recommendation and provide alternative recommendations.
- The title on the republished decision remained the same as this was the title on the report presented to Cabinet and therefore could not be changed.

#### Questions and Comments from Members of the Committee:

- Members commented that from the transcript of the meeting and the report presented in the response to the Call-in that it was not clear what the Cabinet thought they were making a decision on. Members sought further clarification. *The Director of Governance referred Members back to the transcript of the meeting which showed that the report was introduced by Councillor Holdich who had stated that he wanted to do something about anti-social behaviour in the city centre but that the proposed system could work across the city as a whole. Annette Joyce then went on to say that the proposition could address the issue of anti-social behaviour city wide. The debate that followed at the Cabinet meeting demonstrated that the discussion was about a proposition for a city wide scheme.*
- Members sought clarification on why the decision was not classed as having a significant impact in legal terms. *The Director of Governance advised that when considering if there was a significant impact she had considered if the decision would be doing something outside of the use of ordinary powers. However the decision was about using existing powers and existing teams but using them in a more innovative way and therefore there was no significant impact.*
- Members referred to the Call-in notice and felt that the basis of the Call-in was brought about by the fact that the scheme was being proposed because of changes within the police force. Had this been discussed at Cabinet. *Members were informed that this had not been mentioned at Cabinet as it was entirely unrelated and therefore had not featured in the report. The discussion at Cabinet had been about the concept of the anti-social behaviour enforcement scheme.*
- Why was the decision not brought before scrutiny prior to being presented to Cabinet? *The Director of Governance responded that historically this had been the normal process*

*for non-key decisions. Further decisions regarding the scheme may be Key Decisions and would therefore be brought before scrutiny.*

- Members felt that there should have been a public consultation on the proposals as it would affect the whole of the city. A report had appeared in the Peterborough Telegraph on the scheme which had caused concern and misunderstanding with members of the public. *Members were informed that the article in the Peterborough Telegraph had not been about the proposed scheme but about a restructure in neighbourhood policing and was an entirely separate police operational matter.*
- What was the cost to implementing the proposed scheme? *Members were informed that the decision was regarding the concept and therefore there were no costs involved.*

Further comments made by the Committee during debate included:

- The decision made was regarding the concept only and therefore was not a Key Decision.
- The administrative error was regretful and there was a need to make sure it did not happen again.
- Cabinet meetings were held in public and therefore this had been a transparent decision.
- Further details regarding the scheme should be brought before scrutiny when the next decision is made.
- There had been an emphasis in the Call-in on the policing aspect which was not relevant to this decision.
- Some Members were still unclear as to whether it should have been a Key Decision or not and felt that as it would be a city wide scheme that it should have been a Key Decision.
- Some Members were still unclear as to what had been decided at Cabinet and the transcript did not show a clear recommendation being made.
- Some Members were concerned that one of the officers was taking the blame for the error as the report and recommendation clearly stated that it was a city centre scheme.

After debating the request to Call-in the decision Councillor Martin put forward a recommendation that the Committee refer the matter back to the decision maker for reconsideration as he felt it should have been a Key Decision.

The Chairman put the recommendation to a vote and the Committee voted against the recommendation (3 in favour, 4 against) therefore the recommendation was defeated.

The Chairman therefore informed the Cabinet Member and officers that the decision could be implemented immediately.

## **ACTION**

The request for Call-in of the decision made by Cabinet on 7 December and republished on 31 December 2015 regarding City Centre Anti-Social Behaviour Enforcement – DEC15/CAB/106, was considered by the Strong and Supportive Communities Scrutiny Committee. Following discussion and questions raised on each of the reasons stated on the request for call-in, the Committee did **not** agree to the call-in of this decision on any of 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 the decision would take immediate effect.

## **Item 6: Joint Community Enforcement Team**

The Chairman then referred back to item 6 on the agenda: Joint Community Enforcement Team and asked Members if they wished to endorse the proposed direction of travel for the Joint Community Enforcement Team to Cabinet for approval.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee agreed to recommend the Joint Community Enforcement Team to Cabinet for approval and asked that proper communication of the Team be made to members of the public.

## **8. Forward Plan of Executive Decisions**

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

### **ACTION AGREED**

The Committee noted the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

## **9. Work Programme**

Members considered the Committees Work Programme for 2015/16 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

### **ACTION AGREED**

Members noted the work programme for 2015/2016.

## **10. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chairman advised the Committee that the next meeting was scheduled for 10 March 2016.

*The meeting began at 7.00pm and ended at 9.49pm*

CHAIRMAN