STRATEGY AND RESOURCES: MINUTES

Date: 2 November 2021

Time: 10.00a.m. to 12.45p.m.

Venue: Multi-Function Room, New Shire Hall, Alconbury Weald

Present: Councillors Count, Criswell, Dupré, Goldsack, Howitt, Hoy, McDonald, McGuire, Meschini (Vice-Chair), Murphy, Nethsingha (Chair), Sanderson, J Schumann, S Tierney (substituting for Councillor Boden) and G Wilson

24. Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest

Apologies were received from Councillor Boden.

Councillor Criswell declared a non-statutory disclosable interest in Minute No.27 as a member of his family had let land to the tenant of Mill Farmhouse.

25. Minutes – 21st September 2021 and Action Log

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st September 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair. In relation to the action log, one Member expressed her disappointment that she had needed to ask for an update at the Committee on the progress of the secondary school at Wisbech rather than Members being told what was going on.

26. Petitions and Public Questions

No petitions or public questions were received.

27. Integrated Finance Monitoring Report for the period ending 31 August 2021

The Committee received a report detailing the performance of the Council for the 2021/22 financial year. The overall revenue budget position was showing an underspend of -£1.452m at year-end whilst the Capital Programme was showing a -£1.2m underspend. The increase in the revenue underspend was due to the reducing pressures on Adult Social Care budgets. Attention was drawn to the detail behind the specific recommendations in the report.

The Chair requested more detail regarding the reasons for the underspend in Adult Social Care. The Assistant Director Finance reported that the underspend was predominantly in the older people's group. One of the reasons for this underspend was that the Council had set a cautious budget last year, and not all the growth predicted had occurred as expected. The Government had also extended the Infection Control and Testing Grant removing the need for the Council to use its own funding. There were also the obvious sad effects of the pandemic in relation to deaths in this group and people not moving into care homes at the same rate. It was difficult to confirm how much of this would be a permanent change but at least some of it was expected to be so there was a proposed re-baselining of the Older People's budget to take account of these changes.

Speaking as the Chair of Adults and Health Committee, Councillor Howitt confirmed that it was difficult to identify what the pressures and costs would be in relation to this budget, as they changed every month. However, officers were monitoring the situation carefully.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

Taxation Counter-Fraud Initiative, and Business Rates Pool Dividend

- queried how the investment in the Taxation Counter-Fraud Initiative would work and to what extent the savings had been factored into budgeting. It was noted that the funding would be for staff who would be based in the billing authorities, as well as an IT system to assist the review. It would focus on people fraudulently claiming benefits such as the single person's discount or other Council Tax relief to which they were not entitled. The initiative relied on the billing authorities to identify fraud and they were confident that there was the potential for increased income. Members were reminded that this was a saving built into 2022/23 budget from the previous business plan.

- highlighted the need to ensure the correct split of investment between the County and the billing authorities and queried whether all the District Councils would commit resources. It was noted that the split was based on how much income each authority was expected to receive. The Council would only proceed with the initiative if the District Councils committed as they had to do the work.

Mill Farmhouse

- queried whether the additional prudential borrowing of £450k was a one off. Although the Committee was in favour of meeting its tenancy obligations, it was a considerable amount of funding for one property. The Assistant Director Finance reported that he would ask the relevant officer to provide the Committee with a response. Attention was drawn to the fact that the property was based in the Fens and was suffering from subsidence. Action Required.

- expressed concern about the considerable cost associated with one property when the average build rate for a good property was £2,000 per square metre. It was a significant amount of money to spend on one property when the Council had 32,000 acres and over 200 tenants. Some other Members expressed similar concerns.

- queried bearing in mind the borrowing was for this financial year and the next financial year whether this decision could be deferred to the December meeting to enable the County Farms Working Group (CFWG) to give this issue further consideration. The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) reminded the Committee that it had obligations to the tenant. It was noted that the CFWG had raised several questions which had been responded to. The Council was under planning obligations to do a like for like replacement. The CFO's preference was that the Committee should proceed with a delegation to consult the CFWG. Another Member reminded the Committee that there had been a similar case a few years ago with a pressure to act quickly. It was therefore suggested that the consultation should involve the Chair and any decision to proceed should be based on a good business case. The Chair suggested that there also needed to be an update report on the costs at the next meeting. Action Required. Another Member drew attention to the fact that the spend for this financial year was only £58k. Councillor Count proposed, with the support of the Committee, an amendment to recommendation b) to add the words "and agree that any expenditure before the next meeting of Strategy and Resources Committee be in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair".

- expressed disappointment that Mill Farmhouse had not been considered by a Service Committee before being reported to Strategy and Resources Committee. It was suggested that there should be a Sub-Committee of a Service Committee to consider such issues. Another Member commented that if Strategy and Resources Committee was responsible for specific areas this should be reflected in its agenda plan. The Chair reported that the Joint Administration would take into account those comments.

Adult Social Care

- queried how the reduction in older people's costs related to the table on page 9 of the agenda which showed the trend in service user numbers since May for older people aged 65+ receiving long term services was increasing and for working age adults receiving long term services the trend in average weekly unit cost since May was increasing. The budget assumption was therefore questioned and whether the change in unit cost was significant. Members were informed that the Council was seeing a budget pressure in working age adults particularly in relation to learning disability with increasing need and hours of care driving up unit costs. Members were reminded that the Adult Social Care budget had increased by 10% reflecting significant growth and demand changes such as inflation and minimum wage increases. If the authority was precisely on budget it would expect the number of people and unit cost to be going up. The table therefore did not compare to budgets. The propose re-baselining of the budget would consider the impact of the pandemic. The rate of growth was now what was expected but it was starting for a considerably lower baseline. In response, the Member suggested that the tables should include a column reflecting the budget so that comparisons could be made with the current situation in relation to the number of people and unit cost. The Chair asked officers to consider this proposal. Action Required.

Wisbech Town Centre Access Study

- highlighted the variance in the funding for the Wisbech Town Centre Access Study. It was noted that £10.5m was supposed to have designed, purchased land and deliver three schemes but there clearly was not the funding to do this. It was interesting to note that the costs of this project had spiralled rapidly.

- noted that the report stated that “This scheme is fully funded by contributions from the Combined Authority”. It was clarified that the money was coming from the Combined Authority so the words “This scheme is fully funded” was not correct. This was because the scheme had been reprofiled to purchase the land and cover full design before the Combined Authority then looked for money from the Government to deliver the scheme. It was important for the Council to recognise how important the scheme was to Wisbech and draw a line as to when it should intervene for the scheme to be delivered in a timely manner. It was acknowledged that the Council needed to reflect on what its role was in partnership with the Combined Authority.

- expressed disappointment at the delay in the Wisbech Town Centre Access Study schemes and the fact that insufficient thought had been given to considering the time such projects needed to come to fruition. It was suggested that this was incorrect thinking and more time needed to be given to investing in the future.

2021-22 capital programme variations budget

- queried the reasons for the -£25m variation in the Place and Economy Capital Programme. It was noted that this variation reflected unforeseen events and slippage.

Transfers between Services throughout the year

- questioned the process for virements. It was noted that there was a Scheme of Delegation for virements but any revenue virement above £175k needed to be made by the Committee. Members were reminded that the Council did not generally move money around different Service budgets in order to maintain transparency. The transfer of Quarter 1 mileage savings was unusual as it related to a general saving in the business plan, which had been placed centrally in a dedicated budget. There were other virements relating to a transfer of function or where re-baselining had been agreed in July.

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) Approve the earmarking of £464k from income the Council expects to receive this year from the Cambridgeshire business rates pool dividend to contribute to the Council Tax Compliance and Counter-Fraud Initiative as set out in 5.1;

b) Approve additional prudential borrowing of £450k across 2021/22 and 2022/23 for the Mill Farmhouse scheme as set out in section 6.6 and agree that any expenditure before the next meeting of Strategy and Resources Committee be in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair;

c) Note the additional £0.4m contributions due in 2021/22 for the March Future High Street project as set out in section 6.7;

d) Note the additional £0.3m contributions due in 2021/22 for the St Neots Future High Street project as set out in section 6.8; and

e) Note and comment on the Finance Monitoring Report for Corporate Services (Appendix 3).

28. Gas Supply Contract Renewal

The Council's current contract for the supply of mains gas procured through the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation (ESPO) expired on 31 March 2023. As ESPO purchased gas up to18 months in advance to achieve best value, it had asked the Council to renew its contract for the next supply period from April 2023 to March 2027 by the end of November. The value of the contract was difficult to predict as gas prices were volatile and gas usage also varied a lot. The final prices would depend on ESPO securing the best price on the wholesale market. It was important to note that historically ESPO had provided a good service to the Council. There was a large variation in gas usage from one year to another as it depended on the weather. However, it was expected that Council's usage would decline steeply as it came off gas onto renewable heating at more of its sites.

The Chair of Environment and Green Investment Committee, Councillor Dupré, expressed her support to renew the contract but stated that it was also right that the Council should continue to discuss with ESPO how it could encourage a transition to green fuels. She acknowledged that the Council's gas usage had been reducing and reported that projects already in place were expected to reduce the Council's gas usage by over a third saving 357 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent emissions per year. Given the successful performance of the Council's in-house energy team, it could be even lower by the end of the contract period.

She drew attention to the option of switching to a green gas tariff where the supplier buys certificates issued to producers of biomethane such as that from anaerobic digesters. However, there were issues associated with this which were highlighted in the report. It was important to note that burning gas still released carbon into the atmosphere even if it was green gas. The biological material source of the biomethane would have absorbed carbon more slowly while it was growing than the rate of carbon emitted while it was being burnt. It was also difficult to know how sustainably the biological material had been sourced. A framework for land use across Cambridgeshire developed in conjunction with local partners would help evaluate appropriate land use. In the meantime, there was a question mark regarding the sustainability of biofuels. The cost of the green gas option was currently around 30% more than the standard tariff to reduce the Council's carbon footprint by very little comparatively. The extra cost, based on recent prices and usage, would be £1,218 per tonne of CO_2 saved compared to the recommended figure advised by the Government of £245 per tonne. It was therefore important to explore with ESPO genuinely more sustainable fuel options.

One Member queried the figures in the report. It was suggested that burning biomethane was cleaner so there was a 4% reduction in CO_2. However, if it was agreed that purchasing biomethane was a green fuel then the CO_2 tonnage saved was the entire amount. The figure for reducing CO_2 in the atmosphere would therefore be £53.65 per tonne, which was £190 less than the guide price. The importance of reducing gas usage was acknowledged and the need to avoid using green gas as an excuse to diffuse the current programme. It took a year to grow a crop before it was taken to the processing plant and was obviously a lot quicker to burn. However, over the years of the contract all the fossil fuel used would come out of the ground and go straight into the atmosphere whilst the whole amount going into the atmosphere from green fuel was zero. It was therefore not clear why the Council was not opting for green gas at £53.65 per tonne to avoid the release of 1,197 tonnes worth of CO_2 per year in the atmosphere. The Chair commented that it was difficult to know how much would be saved as the cost of either option was unclear.

The Assistant Director, Climate Change and Energy Services (CC&ES) reminded the Committee that there was global crisis with carbon emissions cumulatively gathering into the atmosphere so wherever possible it was important to store and capture carbon. It was important to recognise that over time it would get better, but it was not possible to have a perfect solution from day one. This contract did not prevent the Council from stopping natural gas consumption which was its priority. It was also important to recognise the quality of the biomass or the waste in relation to the sustainability of green gas. Whilst stopping fossil fuels was the best option from a purist point of view, there was an interim period to manage. Although green gas had its challenges, it was ultimately slightly better in terms of carbon emissions and therefore important to explore and identify the best mechanism moving forward. Members were informed that the price of the green gas option changed each year so ESPO needed to be notified on a yearly basis.

One Member commented that the Chair and Vice-Chair had asked hard questions about this contract, which was why the third recommendation had been included. The Council had to be forensic in pursuing its climate change ambitions on what would make a difference based on available evidence.

Attention was drawn to the growing of maize which was one of the prolific crops in East Cambridgeshire. This was due to its dual purpose for corn and biomethane, so it was difficult to identify whether it was green. It was therefore important that the Council had some joined-up thinking on what constituted the definition of green. Another Member drew attention to the fact that the Assistant Director, (CC&ES) had stated that green gas was the best option. The Chair reminded the Committee that it was being asked to decide regarding a contract rather than the sustainability of green gas.

In response, the Assistant Director, (CC&ES) reported that more work was needed to identify what constituted a green gas as there were pros and cons as to whether something was sustainable or not. It was acknowledged that certificates regulated biomethane as a renewable gas, there was also the use of local waste, and there was the land use challenge, but it was still important to investigate the right way forward. One Member asked whether the option in the report was the best option for the environment. In response, the Assistant Director, (CC&ES) explained that the burning of biomass emitted CO_2 but using green gas was better. However, it was suggested that Members receive a report at a future meeting on the pros and cons of green gas as it was important to understand what 'green wash' looked like. Action Required.

One Member commented that multiple crops feeding into anaerobic digestion all had a different profile in terms of fertiliser usage. The situation was therefore complex, as the technology and science were still developing. Certificates were a step in the right direction but not the complete answer.

The downside risk on the Council of the price increasing was raised. The scope for the Council to modify its use of gas was also raised. It was noted that in relation to the volatility of the price of gas, ESPO provided quarterly updates on the state of the energy market to enable inflation forecasts to be provided to the Finance Team once a year. Although the price was likely to fluctuate the risk would be the same whoever was the supplier. It was noted that if the Council moved to electricity it would then incur higher electricity costs, so the Council needed to also look at energy efficiency measures. Members were informed that the main way the Council could reduce gas usage was continuing with its Low Carbon Heating Programme.

Another Member expressed concern about the impact of gas price rises on household bills of people living in the County. This was followed by a Member highlighting the importance of focusing on economic realities.

One Member welcomed the notification of changes to the draft report which had been presented at Spokes but expressed disappointment that Spokes had not been notified of a change to recommendation a) and the paragraph relating to it. It was noted that the Conservative Leader had asked the other Spokes whether they could receive any updates to draft reports following Spokes in the form of track changes. Members were informed that the change to the recommendation reflected the fact that ESPO had agreed to extend the signing of the contract to the end of November to enable the Strategy and Resources Committee to consider it first.

The same Member drew attention to the fact that the Council had issued a press release on 25 October confirming that it had already agreed the contract, he therefore asked the Chair to investigate. A different Member commented that the press release had been misleading as it had stated that the gas used by the Council was the best option for the environment when it was not the best. Another Member queried whether it was right to express disappointment of an officer when the actions at the Spokes meeting had been acted upon. It was suggested that the disappointment expressed related to the process rather than the officer.

Councillor Count proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Hoy, to instruct ESPO to purchase green gas with immediate effect. On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

It was resolved by a majority to:

a) agree to renew the mains gas supply contract using the ESPO framework for the supply period 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2027;

b) agree that expenditure on gas supplies may exceed £500,000 during the contract period as set out in Section 2.8 of the report; and

c) discuss with ESPO how the Council could encourage a transition to greener fuels.

29. Business Planning Update for 2022-27

The Committee received a report continuing the process of setting a business plan and financial strategy for 2022-27. Attention was drawn to financial uncertainties relating primarily to the impact of the pandemic, the likely significant increases, and changes in the pattern of demand for services, the disruption of income streams, inflation, the workforce, rising population, and central government reform. In light of this, six overarching themes had been identified to help develop the Business Plan. The revised budget gap for 2022-23 had gone down from £23.4m reported at the last meeting to £19.5m. However, there was a widening gap in future years. Members noted the pressures within the remit of the Committee relating primarily to IT, which amounted to £1.3m. Since publication of the agenda, the budget and comprehensive spending review had been announced. It was hoped that there would be a three-year planning process with local allocations scheduled to be announced on 6 December. In conclusion, Members noted the next steps for business planning set out in the high-level timeline.

Individual Members raised the following issues in relation to the report:

- highlighted the various announcements made by government in relation to Adult Social Care and queried whether there were any preliminary assessments as to what the impact would be for Council. Members were reminded that Section 2.5 of the report set out the longer-term impact of social care funding reform. Some preparatory funding would be available next year and there was some further funding in the spending review from autumn 2023 onwards.

- noted that £1.6b a year had been announced for local government over the next three years. However, it was currently uncertain as to how it would be distributed. The current methodologies which could be adopted did not recognise the current level of need in Cambridgeshire. Attention was drawn to imminent pressures relating to the increase in employer's contribution to National Insurance, the relaxation of the public sector pay freeze and the increase in the national minimum wage. It was hopeful that the national funding allocation would cover these pressures.

- expressed disappointment that as this stage of the business planning process there was still a large funding gap as this was the lowest budget gap and best reserves position the Council had faced for some time. The government's announcement on the new living wage was welcomed despite the impact on the Council's finances. It was noted that the Government had increased the Council Tax referendum limit which included carried forward Adult Social Care precept up to 5%. It was questioned whether it was disappointing that this limit was not higher. The Chair reported that, given the pressures on families, it would be preferable to have better funding from central government and the Council would continue to make the case to government in order to mitigate increases in Council Tax.

- welcomed the systematic approach being taken to business planning. It was important to keep an open mind as to how to address the budget gap, which included the need to also look at creative partnership approaches. It was noted that the funding uncertainties and volitivities were getting worse. The Council was in a highly volatile and uncertain economic period made worse by inflation and low growth, and the impact of the pandemic and Brexit which had not been the situation in the past. The Institute for Fiscal Studies had stated that local authorities would struggle financially because the allocation from government was a lot less than other government departments. It was suggested that the allocation of some of the £1.6b funding for additional costs might help in the first year but for years two and three it was made worse by other factors such as inflation and wage increases. The CFO reported that the Council's local allocation was linked to different methodologies to distribute funding and a dated national funding formula, which in the past had included the threat of negative Revenue Support Grant of upwards of £7m. He welcomed a three-year funding position but there were major funding gaps which needed resourcing with no significant uplift in funding to cover demand and inflation.

- highlighted the need to think carefully about increasing Council Tax to the limit as so many people were struggling financially, and it was going to get worse. Any increase needed to bear in mind the increase in inflation resulting from the pandemic and other effects from the lockdowns. It was acknowledged that the Council would be under pressure, but it needed to deal with it rather than pass the cost down to these residents. It was noted that a 5% increase in Council Tax only applied in 2022-23 with a cap of 3% in future years. The Joint Administration acknowledged that it would think very carefully about increasing Council Tax but given the financial challenges facing the Council it would be very difficult to balance the budget.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, proposed the removal of the word "endorse" in recommendation b).

It was resolved unanimously to:

a) note the progress made to date and next steps required to develop the business plan for 2022-2027; and

b) comment on the budget and savings proposals that are within the remit of the Committee as part of consideration of the Council's overall Business Plan.

30. Service committee review of the draft 2022-23 capital programme

The Committee received an overview of the draft Business Plan Capital Programme for Corporate Services. Members noted the process for revising the Council's Capital Strategy and the development of the 2022-23 capital programme. Attention was drawn to a table in Section 3.4 setting out the current advisory limit on debt charges, which showed that the Council was near the headroom at the end of the planning period. As a result, work was taking place to ensure the Council was budgeting accurately, seeking all funding sources, and considering the timing and delivery of schemes. Attention was drawn to Section 5.1 detailing the revised draft Capital Programme and Section 5.2 regarding how the programme would be funded. It was noted that the revised draft capital programme for Corporate Services was predominantly across IT, the lending to This Land and the Mill Farmhouse.

One Member queried why Spokes had not been informed of changes to the report since the last meeting and why the Wisbech Secondary School had been removed. The CFO explained that the Committee's role at this meeting was to focus on its service committee responsibilities in relation to Corporate Services. Whilst the role of the Committee was to consider the whole Capital Programme, it was noted that this would be done as usual at its December meeting. The same Member expressed disappointment that the draft report had been changed since the Spokes meeting. He requested that all Spokes should receive notice of any changes using ‘track changes’.

Attention was drawn to the action taken by the Director of Education in response to Department for Education (DfE) delivery of the Wisbech Secondary School. The Committee was informed of the whole background to the scheme leading up to the proposed removal of the school from the Council’s Capital Programme by the Children and Young People Committee (C&YPC). It was noted that the DfE had started a new site search and the project timescales would be extended considerably with no proposed opening date for the new school. It was not clear whether the £400k costs incurred to date could be fully capitalised therefore having a direct impact on the revenue budget. The same Member complained that he had e-mailed officers about this issue, the constitutional nature of the actions taken by the Director of Education, and pupil numbers over ten days ago and received no response. It was noted that the DfE was looking to cram extra provision on the Thomas Clarkson site. He queried which members of the Joint Administration had been consulted on the decision.

The Chair suggested that the Member take up any governance concerns with the Chair of the Audit and Accounts Committee. She reminded the Committee that decision had been taken by the previous administration not to self-deliver the school. It was therefore not appropriate to keep the scheme in the Capital Programme if it was going to be delivered by the DfE. She reminded Members that this issue had been discussed at some length at C&YPC. In response, it was noted that the proposal to take the decision to Audit and Accounts Committee had been voted down by C&YPC, and there had emerged that the Council would not self-deliver the scheme after 6 August 2021. The Chair reported that this was the decision about self-delivery and not the DfE. The Chief Executive added that the Executive Director: People and Communities had been on leave but would be responding to all the questions raised in e-mails by the end of the working week.

Another Member drew attention to the figure of £38m which was the whole cost for the Secondary School and the Social, Emotional Mental Health (SEMH) School. The CFO gave assurance that the SEMH school remained in the Capital Programme so the actual reduction in cost was between £21m (after inflation and cost updates). Disappointment was expressed that the Secondary School had been removed from the Capital Programme as it should have been left in just in case the DfE pulled out. Although the Council was a provider of last resort, this could be in the form of temporary classrooms for example. It was felt that this decision should have come to C&YPC for a full debate and decision regarding who should build the school.

One Member expressed disappointment at the impact of the decision to remove the secondary school from the Capital Programme on the people of Wisbech. The Committee was reminded that it was the Council’s project to which it had temporarily allowed the government to take the lead. It had therefore been kept in the Capital Programme as a safeguard to the people of Wisbech and surrounding areas. The Chair reported that there was currently a good school in Wisbech, all the children in Wisbech had places, and there was capacity at Thomas Clarkson School.

The Chair of Communities, Social Mobility and Inclusion Committee added that the Joint Administration wanted to see Wisbech doing well, and his committee was working hard to achieve that. He reported that a senior member of the government represented Wisbech which would be a good way of highlighting the Council's concern about the delivery of the school.

One Member queried whether the changes to the Capital Programme included the removal of the expansion of Soham Village College. The CFO confirmed that he would investigate. Action Required. Another Member reminded the Committee that at C&YPC another form of entry had been agreed for the Village College and included in the Capital Programme. It was noted that if St Bede's Inter-Church School Trust opened a new secondary free school in Soham then it would have a detrimental impact on the existing schools in the area. Soham Village College would also lose significant funding for repairing and improving its buildings and for teaching. There was concern therefore that funding for the Village College had been taken out of the Capital Programme. The Chair asked for a briefing note to be prepared for all Members on the schools' capital programme and how it related to the Government's Free School Programme and DfE actions in this area. Action Required.

Given the detailed discussion of Soham Village College, Councillor Schumann declared a non-statutory disclosable interest as a Trust Director for Staploe Education Trust.

One Member expressed concern that Independent Living Schemes were not yet included in the Capital Programme. It was hoped that the proposals would be included in the report to the December meeting. The CFO gave assurance that it had progressed through the Capital Programme Board and would be ready for the December meeting.

Councillor Schumann proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Count, to add recommendation d) to refer the draft Capital Programme to Audit and Accounts Committee for its consideration to ensure due process has been followed. On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, proposed the removal of the word "endorse" in recommendation c).

It was resolved by a majority to:

a) agree that the advisory limit on the level of debt charges (and therefore prudential borrowing) should be kept at the levels set out in section 3.4.;

b) note the overview and context provided for the 2022-23 Capital Programme for Corporate Services; and

c) Comment on the draft proposals for Corporate Services' 2022-23 Capital Programme and their development.

31. Strategy and Resources Committee Agenda Plan & Training Plan & Appointments to Outside Bodies & Internal Advisory Groups & Panels

The Committee noted the agenda plan, which included the need to add Strategic Framework and Medium-Term Financial Strategy to the draft Revenue and Capital Business Planning Proposals item, and the Mill Farmhouse to the next meeting.

One Member asked for more information on the no car zones item for the March meeting. Action Required.

It was resolved unanimously to note the Committee Agenda Plan.

Chair