

**MINUTES OF THE GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 7PM, ON
WEDNESDAY 5 SEPTEMBER 2018
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Councillors: C Harper (Chairman), R Brown, G Casey (Vice-Chair), R Ferris, M Farooq, Judy Fox, A Joseph, D King, S Martin, N Sandford,
Parish Councillors: K Lievesley, R Clarke

Also Present: Councillor Peter Hiller - Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning Housing and Economic Development
Councillor John Fox - Representing the Group Leader of the Werrington First Group
Keith McWilliams - Interim Contracts Manager, Skanska

Officers Present: Annette Joyce - Service Director, Environment and Economy
Bridget Slade - Rural Estate Manager
Nicholas Harding - Head of Planning
Richard Kay - Head of Sustainable Growth
Andy Tatt - Head of Peterborough Highway Services
Howard Bright - Head of Growth
Dave Anderson - Interim Project Director
Charlotte Palmer - Group Manager - Transport and Environment
Paulina Ford - Senior Democratic Services Officer
David Beauchamp - Democratic Services Officer

13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Aitkin.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of Interest or whipping declarations

**15. MINUTES OF THE JOINT SCRUTINY OF THE BUDGET AND GROWTH,
ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD
ON**

3.1 18 JUNE 2018 - JOINT SCRUTINY OF THE BUDGET

The minutes of the Joint Scrutiny of the Budget Committee meeting held on 18 June 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3.2 4 JULY 2018 - GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Parish Councillor Keith Lievesley wished to clarify the way in which a point he had made in bullet 4 on page 7 had been recorded in the minutes. His main point was to note that many private companies in Peterborough used to have extensive sports facilities, most of which have now closed. The 'lack of first class cricket' mentioned was merely an example of one of the consequences of the closure of such facilities, not a particular point in its own right.

The Democratic Services Officer informed the committee that the officer presenting the Peterborough Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), Item 7 on the Agenda, had advised that he had incorrectly quoted the name of an unparished area in which neighbourhood forums had been set up. He had quoted Fletton as being one and it is actually Woodston.

The minutes of the Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 4 July 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS

There were no requests for call-in to consider.

5. PETERBOROUGH RURAL (FARMS) ESTATE ACTION PLAN UPDATE

The Rural Estate Manager introduced the report which updated the Scrutiny Committee on progress to date and introduced the Action Plan 18/19, the Tenant Specification and the new entrant Lettings Process. These all accorded with the agreed Strategy for Management of the Estate (2015).

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The Council owned 3,000 acres of land, up to 6 full-time holdings could be made and there would continue to be two holdings for new entrants into farming. This year's new entrants came from 10 year farm business tenancies so these opportunities would not be able to be offered again for this time period. Tenancies would have to stop at 6 or 2 years unless the Council purchased more land.
- There were no current plans to purchase additional land. The value of farmland was volatile and officers would not want to estimate the cost of purchasing additional land in the run up to Brexit.
- Members question the extent to which the rural estates programme achieved its objective of giving people a route into farming when only two new tenants had started in 45 years. Officers responded that the Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 and 1995 Agricultural Tenancies Act allowed for longer term occupation of rural estates. Peterborough had a small estate, a large number of tenants and a long term tenancy. There had not been any smaller tenancies suitable for younger people of around 100-150 acres until this year.
- There were still four lifetime tenants who wanted to maintain their tenancies and the Council would not want to be seen to be encouraging tenants to leave
- An exercise had been done to ensure that continuing to rent the land was more financially prudent than selling it. The rents set by Peterborough City Council for the rural estates were set at commercially comparable levels, except for the new entrants. Yields and rent levels were regularly discussed

with land agents from neighbouring counties and Peterborough was at the higher end of the scale of rent levels and receive proportionally better rents than Cambridgeshire.

- Peterborough City Council was not just an urban authority and contained a large rural area. Farm estates were common for local authorities that contained rural areas and were real businesses.
- Members congratulated officers on the quality of the report and the progress made.
- No one was issued a retirement tenancy anymore except older people on old agreements. Peterborough City Council decided on the terms for the newer agreements and had settled on 10 years for new entrants. This was enough time to build a business and move elsewhere. They could then rent privately or move to a local authority that offered progressive units.
- No tenant would be served notice to quit at the age of 65 until they were in receipt of the state pension
- Members praised the biodiversity found on Peterborough farmland which included barn owls.
- All farmers on the estate were suffering from the consequences of fly-tipping and it was a fact of life for their line of work. There was little that they could do other than report each incident as a crime. Fly-tipping off the public highway on farmers' land was their responsibility to deal with.
- 33 people viewed the estates, 17 sent in applications and wrote a business plan and 8 of these were interviewed. There was good interest and all of these people were local.
- Peterborough was a small area and Norfolk and Cambridgeshire received more applicants for their starter farms.
- The Rural Estates Manager represented Peterborough at the 2018 Open Farms Sunday hosted by Michael Sly to raise awareness among the public about Peterborough's estate and to talk to children about farming.

AGREED ACTIONS:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the Peterborough Rural Estate Action Plan attached at Appendix 1
2. Note the tenant specification attached at Appendix 2
3. Note the new entrant lettings process attached at Appendix 3 20:06

6. PORTFOLIO PROGRESS REPORT FOR CABINET MEMBER FOR GROWTH, PLANNING, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development introduced the report which updated the Scrutiny Committee on the progress of items under the responsibility of the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing and Economic Development. He was accompanied by the Head of Planning, the Head of Sustainable Growth, the Head of Peterborough Highway Services and the Interim Project Director.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Officers were happy to meet with communities to advise them about the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan and the workload required. The

City Council had the resources to do so. The preparatory work and the production of documents must be done by each individual community and not the City Council however.

- There was often a clearer sense of collective identity in rural areas which made the development of neighbourhood plans easier. Urban areas were more diverse with less clear boundaries between areas. An urban plan might need to be produced on the sub-ward level to be successful.
- It was important for officers to meet with communities at an early stage to understand what they wished to achieve and whether a neighbourhood plan was the right way of achieving this.
- Members questioned the report's assertion in section 4.5 that the Group Manager - Environment and Transport was responsible for transport planning as the Combined Authority had assumed responsibility for these matters 12 months ago. Officers responded that Peterborough City Council continued to exercise control in this area until the Combined Authority produced their Local Transport Plan in spring 2019. Consultations were currently underway regarding this across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- Members expressed concern that the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough would implement a review into transport, including Public Transport, without consulting Peterborough City Councillors to influence it and asked officers when the consultation process would take place and when the transport plan would be implemented. Officers responded that Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council currently had their own local transport plans making the report's statement factually correct. The Combined Authority were currently commissioning a report to produce their joint Local Transport Plan (LTP). The report would be released in spring 2019 and there would be a full consultation.
- Members expressed concern that would have no influence on the development of the LTP before the consultation and asked when the consultation period would commence and when the final plan would be produced. Officers responded that they did not currently have a date for the consultation but that officers from both Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils were involved in the LTPs development. When the report had been put together, key dates would be advertised for the consultation which would be well-advertised and all key stakeholders would be invited to contribute.
- Members referred to the transfer of public transport powers to the combined authority and the Mayor's review of public transport and bus services and asked when there would be an opportunity for Peterborough City Councillors to contribute to this review. Officers responded that, as with the LTP, this was still the responsibility of the Council until the strategy was public. No specific dates were available but officers estimated the report would become available in early 2019. Officers from Peterborough were contributing to the document's development.
- In response to members further concerns about the lack of detail about consultation plans, officers emphasised that Peterborough had a veto on the Local Transport Plan and that they were consulting the Combined Authority to provide Peterborough-specific information and ensure the city's interests were represented but they ultimately had the power to decide on these matters. Working group meetings were taking place and preliminary reports would likely be available by the end of 2018, dependent on consultants' ability to work to the timescales.
- Some members stated that they had not been consulted as part of this process.
- Members requested that the Group Manager – Transport and Environment provides a briefing note to members of the committee providing more

information on the timescales for the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan, its consultation process and when this committee specifically will be consulted about this.

- Members stated decisions made in Northamptonshire could also affect the people of Peterborough, not just Cambridgeshire and sought reassurance about levels of communication with external bodies. Officers noted that the changes made to bus services in Northamptonshire happened very quickly and affected commercial routes that were subsidised which limited the ability of officers from Northamptonshire to consult with Peterborough City Council. Discussions did take place to consult with other organisations to achieve the best outcome for the City but Peterborough City Council had little influence over private bus operators.
- The Cabinet Member suggested that ward councillors should contact the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for transport in other authorities if a resident had an issue with service provision from an outside body that would affect the residents of Peterborough. Peterborough City Council had very little influence over private bus operators or other local authorities.
- The Cabinet Member emphasised that the Combined Authority agreement stated that they would produce a Local Transport Plan and this was definitely going to happen. The Cabinet Member emphasised that Peterborough officers were working with those from Cambridgeshire County Council and the Combined Authority to work on a local transport plan that was right for the whole Combined Authority area. The Cabinet Member stated that Peterborough City Council retained the power to veto the whole plan if there was a fundamental disagreement.
- There were two stages to developing a local transport plan:
 - Gathering evidence, looking at supply and demand patterns and understanding the patronage on particular routes and what the issues were
 - Once transport consultants had developed this evidence base it was important to engage with elected members to gain an understanding of ward issues and the practicalities; e.g. the shift patterns of people trying to get to work

This helped to ensure that both qualitative and quantitative insights were taken into account

- Members noted that the report spoke of integrating or replacing the regional swimming pool and athletics track. Members requested additional information about the impact of the proposed university on the Peterborough Regional Pool as the Active Lifestyles Strategy proposed to refurbish it and it would not be advisable to do so if it were to be demolished and replaced a few years later. Officers responded that work needed to be done on the university's master plan and site analysis to see where the buildings needed to go to integrate with the city centre. It was planned for 2,500 students to be studying there by 2021/22 within 3.5ha of land. There would come a point where the Athletics Track and Peterborough Regional Pool would hit capacity constraints as the university expands. Expansion could potentially take place towards the embankment and the River Nene although this was still considered protected green space in the local plan. Officers agreed with members' point that there may come a time when building new swimming and athletics facilities elsewhere might be prudent and this should be taken into account if making an investment in repairing the existing facility.
- Officers suggested that the figure of 12,500 projected students by 2035 was demanding considering the difficulties currently being faced by the higher education sector. If the plan was followed through, there would be a demand

for additional land take. The master planning exercise would examine options for the future growth of the university.

- Member raised the issue of housing targets and allocations, noted that the local plan was in the later stages of development and asked if there were any serious challenges to the number of houses planned or their locations. Officers responded that the site outside Glinton was due to go to appeal in January or February 2019. Five year land supply would likely be a key consideration for its determination. The inspector would consider proposals for alternative allocations to those identified by the Council in the Local Plan.
- Members asked if there was any information available on the locations of these sites. Officers responded that all proposed sites can be viewed via the Peterborough City Council website. All representations received were recorded and published there.
- Members mentioned that they had previously expressed disappointed about the lack of discussion of rural areas within the Tree and Woodland Strategy when it came to this committee on 10 January 2018. Members referred specifically to the limited discussion of hedgerows
- Members raised concerns about the limited discussion of hedgerows to rural areas and their possible links with the Biodiversity Strategy in forming wildlife corridors. Members were disappointed about the briefing note received on the subject and stated that he had not received an invitation to comment on the strategy. The Cabinet Member responded that he would ask the Natural and Historic Environment Manager to contact the councillor to discuss his concerns.
- Nominations from the public for proposals for traffic regulation were being received and had started from before 1 April when the funding for this became available. Officers were collating the suggestions. A consultation period had to be followed. A website had been set up for members of the public to submit their requests.
- Action could be taken immediately by the Council or emergency services if a vehicle displaying an advertisement parked on a roundabout was posing a danger even if there were no residents to consult with.
- Officers stated that additional resources for enforcing the above would always be useful and officers would like to enable overtime for staff to conduct enforcement in the evening as one way of providing this.
- The Cabinet Member added that unless vehicles were collected when the roads were quiet, traffic management orders would be required which could be expensive and disruptive. Problems with vehicles displaying advertising tended to occur on busier roads where the risk of distraction was higher. Traders were aware that the council had the power to conduct enforcement when advertisements were a danger and incident rates had gone down. Knowledge of this needed to be spread to the public via word of mouth and through new media.
- Members raised an example of a vehicle being removed only to be replaced with another suggesting that the problem had not yet fully been tackled. The Cabinet Member emphasised the importance of reporting these vehicles formally via as soon as they were seen.
- Members commented that the report was thorough and showed a high number of successes within the portfolio, such as Fletton Quays, and thanked all those involved for their hard work,

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Note the contents of the report.
2. Request that the Group Manager – Transport and Environment provide a briefing note to members of the committee providing more information on the timescales for the Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan, its consultation process and when this committee specifically will be consulted about this.

7. PROPOSAL FOR TASK AND FINISH GROUP TO REVIEW AIR QUALITY

The Group Manager - Transport and Environment introduced the report which set out a proposal for a cross-party scrutiny task and finish group to be formed to inform the development of the Council's air quality ambitions and make recommendations for specific actions that should be taken the Council and partners to achieve such ambitions.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members suggested that the review of expert data could be contracted out as there were several environmental organisations in the city with one of them having a nationally recognised air quality expert working for them. Members suggested this could speed the process of collecting data and that might be cheaper. Officers responded that there was no budget within the organisation for this type of activity and it would need to be considered where the additional funding for external research would come from. Officers suggested that the task and finish group could agree its priorities then establish how they could achieve these. Officers suggested that neighbouring authorities could be consulted with and external expertise gained in different ways. All options needed to be considered before any spending requirements were established.
- Members responded that this was reassuring and suggested that the points numbered 1 to 6 on the first page of Appendix A did not necessarily need to be completed in that order. Officers stated that it would be a mistake to examine the issue of air quality in detail before the data was available as possible actions needed to be analysed to make sure they were cost effective and appropriate for the city. The points labelled 1-6 were a suggested order but there was some flexibility to establish which of these were most critical for the city.
- Members raised the following points
 - A detailed report on this subject had already been presented to the committee at the meeting on 5 March 2018 on request of a committee member which raised areas of concern. Although thresholds were not being exceeded, the rapid expansion of the city made this an area of concern.
 - This report could be a starting point for the Task and Finish group who could then look at areas in which further information was needed.
 - Members welcomed the initiative of the Leader of the Council in requesting this task and finish group and welcomed the opportunity to participate
- Members questioned whether it was constitutionally acceptable to ask for nominations for members of the group during this meeting as per the reports fourth recommendation. The Senior Democratic Services Officer responded that this was just a request for initial expressions of interest and formal

request for nominees would be sent to the group secretaries as per the usual procedure.

- The Chair asked how long the task and finish group was likely be in operation for. The Senior Democratic Services officer responded that it should usually be no longer than six months in order to be effective but could be up to a year. There was a danger that the group would lose its impetus if it took too long. Timing would be decided at the scoping meeting.

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report an **RESOLVED** to

1. Agree to the formation of a time-limited cross-party scrutiny task and finish group.
2. Agree the Terms of Reference for the proposed task and finish group.
3. Agree that the outcomes of the task and finish group should be presented back to the Committee at the relevant meeting
4. Make any initial nominations from the scrutiny committee members to join the task and finish group

8. SKANSKA ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

The Head of Peterborough Highway Services, accompanied by the Interim Contracts Manager at Skanska and the Group Manager - Transport and Environment, introduced the report which gave the committee the opportunity to review the contractual performance and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the Peterborough Highway Services contract with Skanska.

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- There was general agreement that the statistical tables found in Appendix A were difficult to read. The committee requested that the Group Manager – Transport and Environment would distribute higher quality versions of the tables from the report to members.
- Members expressed concerned that the Queensgate footbridge was not accessible by people with disabilities and asked officers to encourage Queensgate to improve the facilities, including the installation of a 'ski lift'. Officers responded that 'at grade' crossings had been installed to help alleviate these issues and dialogue had taken place with Queensgate, whose ownership had recently changed and this would continue. Officers agreed with members' point that this was a key gateway into the city. Queensgate were a commercial entity which could limit what could be done but there was currently a 'best of both worlds' arrangement with the combination of the footbridge and the at-grade crossings.
- Peterborough was very fortunate to be able to use The 'Dragon' pothole machine which was up to 6-7 times faster at filling potholes than conventional methods now that staff were fully comfortable with it. The machine was capable of edging defective sidings and levelling off high spots. Only two people were required to operate it. It also saved on the costs of traffic management. It was shared with the Cambridgeshire and Oxfordshire

contracts as it would not be affordable just for Peterborough to use. This was a one of the major innovations allowed by the Skanska contract.

- Both rubberised asphalt and plastic asphalt were being trialled. The plastic asphalt trial had been extensively covered in the press. The partnership with Skanska had enabled the plastic asphalt trial to take place. It was currently too early to know the results of this so the trial was only being done in a small area.
- Officers were seeking to accelerate the roll out of L.E.D. lighting to gain the benefits of their improved energy efficiency. This work was on track and due to be completed in March or April 2019. The more difficult areas in the city centre and on parkways that required traffic management had been done first.
- Officers were proud of the 750,000 injury-free work hours achieved and the next target was 1,000,000. These statistics were shared with all Skanska contracts and more widely in the industry as safety was of paramount importance both to operatives and the travelling public. This contract was held up as an exemplar of good practice.
- Members thanked officers for their good work fixing potholes and stated that they had always been patched the day after they were reported. Officers encouraged councillors and members of the public to report potholes as they could be dealt with once they were known about. There could sometimes be a slower response if traffic management was required for example. There were inspectors but they could not monitor everywhere at once. The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in this area were met and exceeded.
- Members stated that the Bishop's Road improvement and cycleway was an improvement but asked why the pedestrian crossing had been relocated by 100m. Officers responded that doing so had helped to reduce congestion as vehicles no longer stacked up at the roundabout. Many people had crossed the road in this location before the crossing was installed. Many surveys had been completed and the work had the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in mind as well as reducing congestion.
- Members asked what was being done to fix broken street lighting, stating that there were lots of problems and they often took a long time to be repaired. Members mentioned that the lights on Rhubarb Bridge had been switched on constantly since February 2018. Members asked if the situation would have improved by Spring 2019, especially after the installation the L.E.D. street which could report themselves when they needed to be repaired
- Officers responded that the repair of the Rhubarb Bridge lights was part of the Junction 18 capacity scheme. Attempts had previously been made to fix the lighting but problems had reoccurred due to the age of the equipment. Street lighting was on an unmetered supply which meant that the Council did not incur any additional cost although this was not ideal. Once the traffic management was in place for the strengthening works, the lights could all be upgraded. There would still be a chance of future failure as the lights had mechanical parts.
- Lighting problems could be caused by issues with cables belonging to the electricity company. These took longer to fix as the Council could not enact repairs. There could also be clashes of responsibility with Highways England who manage the trunk road network and this was the case at Junction 18. Officers were proceeding as quickly as they could to tackle these problems.
- Members welcomed officers' response and stated that if Rhubarb Bridge was to be repaired then the street lights needed to be restored.
- Members stated that Peterborough's Highway Services were second to none and they had always been treated with respect and professionalism when reporting problems. For example, Highway Services had agreed to share the cost of two dropped kerbs with CLF funds.

- Members were excited by the rubberised asphalt trial and asked about the possibility of more innovation in this area, asked where the rubber was obtained from and if abandoned tyres could be used for this purpose as their disposal of abandoned tyres cost the council £1.70 per tyre currently. Officers stated different types of asphalt was currently being trialled to assess their suitability. The possibility of incorporating recycled plastic from waste generated in Peterborough into plastic asphalt was being investigated although a full environmental impact assessment was needed as it might not be environmentally friendly to transport material a long distance to be processed for example.
- Pavements in residential areas outside the city centre were only maintained to keep them safe, not to improve their visual appearance due to budget constraints. Public realm schemes had been done in the city centre and this was the result of grant money received. This has increased the perceived contrasts between city centre and residential pavements.
- There was sometimes a problem with signage and sandbanks not being removed promptly after roadworks and officers asked members to report this when they saw it so they could be removed. This was not necessarily the fault of Skanska and could have been caused by utility companies.
- Members praised the communication, community engagement and the effectiveness of the L.E.D. street light programme, especially in the can-do area.
- Members referred to section 4.11 and asked if service strikes had been caused by worker error or if this was due to limited information about where utilities were and if utility companies and contractors could be asked by the Council for more accurate information.
- Officers responded that this was a key part of operative safety due to the possibility of encountering electrical cables for example. The number of Service Strikes were very low within Peterborough. Utility drawings were received from the utility companies and a 'no dig' policy was in operation which meant no excavation takes place until a checklist was completed, all plans were available and CAT scans had been done. There was always the possibility of unexpected infrastructure encounters however and these were often old cable TV wires located just underneath a slab or through a kerb even though they should be at a required depth. Risk avoidance strategies were employed; for example looking at alternatives to excavating concrete to reduce the risk of a strike.
- Utility drawings were not necessarily always accurate and progress needed to be made in the industry in this area. Cables were often located just below the surface where they should not be and it was sometimes difficult not to hit them. Strikes were sometimes caused by user error and continued vigilance was required. Safety was always a priority.
- Members asked what had happened to plans to use the ash from the 'energy from waste' scheme for road surfaces. Officers responded that this was investigated as ash could be made into a type 1 sub base. Unfortunately it was not commercially viable as it would involve transporting material a long way from Peterborough. Officers had a preference towards using local businesses and this combined with CO2 emissions and the cost material made the plans unviable.
- Members said the residents often didn't understand why considerable amounts of money were being spent on the city centre and not on repairing pavements although members stated that they were aware that the money came from different sources. Members asked what had happened to the plans reported to the committee a few years ago to take up pavement slabs and replace them with tarmac to lower maintenance costs. Officers

responded that this was the slab replacement programme which was a capital scheme. This did still sometimes happen but the main focus was on patching pavements due to limited funding. Grant money was different to revenue money and this explained the discrepancy between the city centre and the rest of the city. Officers were still pursuing capital replacement schemes where feasible as it was more efficient on a large scale.

ACTIONS AGREED

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to

1. Review and comment on it and
2. Request that the Group Manager – Transport and Environment would distribute higher quality versions of the tables from the report to members of the committee.

9. MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which enabled the committee to monitor and track progress of recommendations made to the Executive or Officers at previous meetings

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to consider the responses from Cabinet Members and Officers to recommendations made at previous meetings as attached in Appendix 1 to the report.

10. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which invited members to consider the most recent version of the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and identify any relevant items for inclusion within the Committee's work programme or to request further information.

Members stated that there had been several occasions where updates to the forward plan had to be provided to committee members after agenda publication and asked if this would be the case every time. The Senior Democratic Services officers responded that this was due to the fixed nature of publication dates and there was nothing that could be done about this.

ACTIONS AGREED:

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to consider the current Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

11. WORK PROGRAMME 2018/2018

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny Committee considered the Committee's Work Programme for 2018/19 and discussed possible items for inclusion.

The Senior Democratic Services Officer reminded committee members that there were two new items on the agenda for the meeting on 7 November 2018; Affordable Housing Need and Delivery in Peterborough (deferred from September due to the wait for additional information to be put in the report) and the Annual Corporate Complaints Report 2017/18 (requested by the Head of Customer and Transactional Services) which used to come to the committee yearly but had not come to the committee for some time.

It was clarified that Steve Boyer's successor, Mr Hennessy would be producing the Opportunity Peterborough report on the work programme.

ACTIONS AGREED;

The Growth, Environment and Resources Scrutiny **RESOLVED** to note the latest version of the work programme.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7 November 2018

7.00pm – 8.37pm
CHAIRMAN