

Public Document Pack

NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICES, GERON
ROAD, LETCHWORTH, SG6 3JF
ON TUESDAY, 9TH JUNE, 2026 AT 7.30 PM

MINUTES

Present: *Councillors: Jon Clayden (Chair), Claire Winchester (Vice-Chair), Sadie Billing, David Chalmers, Elizabeth Dennis, Nigel Mason, Caroline McDonnell, Ralph Muncer, Martin Prescott, Paul Ward and Daniel Wright-Mason.*

In Attendance: *Rumi Bose (Churchgate Project Manager), Ian Couper (Director - Resources), Robert Filby (Committee, Member and Scrutiny Officer), Chris Jeffery (Customer and Digital Services Manager), Jeevan Mann (Scrutiny Officer) and Anthony Roche (Chief Executive).*

Also Present: *There were no members of the public present.*

Councillor Ian Albert, as Executive Member for Resources, Councillor Val Bryant, as Leader of the Council, and Councillor Sean Nolan, as Executive Member for Customers.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Audio recording – 01 minutes 56 seconds

There were no apologies for absence received.

2 MINUTES - 24 MARCH 2026

Audio recording – 02 minutes 07 seconds

Councillor Jon Clayden, as Chair, proposed and Councillor Ralph Muncer seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 24 March 2026 were approved as a true record of the proceedings and signed by the Chair.

3 NOTIFICATION OF OTHER BUSINESS

Audio recording – 03 minutes 46 seconds

There was no other business notified.

4 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Audio recording – 03 minutes 51 seconds

(1) The Chair advised that, in accordance with Council Policy, the meeting would be recorded.

- (2) The Chair drew attention to the item on the agenda front pages regarding Declarations of Interest and reminded Members that, in line with the Code of Conduct, any Declarations of Interest needed to be declared immediately prior to the item in question.
- (3) The Chair advised that for the purposes of clarification clause 4.8.23(a) of the Constitution does not apply to this meeting.
- (4) The Chair reminded Members of the adopted North Herts Scrutiny Charter and the need to ensure that the meeting was conducted with independence, initiative and integrity. The full Charter was available to Members via the Scrutiny Intranet pages.

5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Audio recording – 05 minutes 01 seconds

There was no public participation at this meeting.

6 URGENT AND GENERAL EXCEPTION ITEMS

Audio recording – 05 minutes 06 seconds

The Chair noted one urgent item in relation to the Churchgate Regeneration Project – Update & Next Steps. The Chair provided details for its urgency and advised that the full Urgency Notices for both items had been published on the Council website.

7 CALLED-IN ITEMS

Audio recording – 05 minutes 48 seconds

There had been no called-in items.

8 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Audio recording – 05 minutes 53 seconds

No questions had been submitted by Members.

9 INFORMATION NOTE: FULL YEAR PERFORMANCE UPDATE ON 3C'S 25/26

Audio recording – 05 minutes 58 seconds

Councillor Sean Nolan, as Executive Member for Customers, presented the Information Note entitled 'Full Year Update on Comments, Compliments and Complaints (3C's) 25/26' and advised that:

- Overall comments had decreased compared to the previous year.
- Complaints received by the Council and their contractors and details of this were shown at paragraphs 3.5 – 3.7 in the information note.
- The percentage of interactions resulting in a complaint was below 1%.
- 82% of stage 2 complaints had been resolved within 10 days, which met the 80% target.
- Only 15 stage 2 complaints had been deemed as justified, and they had been related to waste.
- Leisure Centre comments, compliments and complaints had dropped 50% compared to the previous year, and had returned to a consistent level since the contract change.
- The Local Government Ombudsman had received 6 complaints over the year as detailed at paragraph 3.12, but none of these had been upheld.

- The Council and their contractors had received 202 compliments as seen in Appendix B to the report.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Daniel Wright-Mason
- Councillor Claire Winchester
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Elizabeth Dennis
- Councillor Paul Ward
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Sadie Billing

In response to questions, the Customer and Digital Services Manager advised that:

- Justified complaints had been higher on the year due to the waste contract change, and staffing issues in the Waste Team around that time.
- Problems experienced with key staff leaving the Waste Team had been resolved.
- The leisure contractor followed timescales used by the Council for complaints, and they provided their complaint data to the Council at the end of each period.
- Auditing on complaint data from the leisure contractor was not currently done, but this could be raised with the Leisure Team to see if it could be implemented.
- Baseline complaint data had been provided by the previous waste contractor before the customer service element of the contract had been transferred to the Council.
- Contacts were monitored both day-to-day and monthly so peaks and troughs could be identified.
- Since the garden waste resubscription period and the waste contract change, complaints had dropped to a stable level.
- Complaints and service requests were distinguished appropriately and captured well by Customer Service Centre (CSC) staff, but data would be provided on this if it was available.
- A drop in complaints received by the waste contractor since the contract change had occurred as complaints now came directly to the Council, unlike the last contract.
- Most complaints were still dealt with by the leisure centre operators as seen in Appendix B to the report.
- Figures related to waste indicated that they were at a normal level currently.
- AI had been deployed on CSC telephone lines to answer basic enquiries, but officers were available to handle more complex enquiries and complaints.
- There were no plans to replace CSC officers with AI as it was a supporting tool.
- Appendix B to the report detailed the number of compliments, but they would be happy to share specifics.
- There were no specific examples of complaints turning into compliments, but the CSC Team prided themselves on their customer service skills.

The Chair advised that data related to Key Performance Indicators relating to waste and customer service were available to view on Ideagen.

Councillors Ralph Muncer and Martin Prescott put on record their thanks to the Shared Service Manager – Waste and the Senior Contracts Officer for their help during the waste contract change.

The Chair thanked Councillor Nolan and the Customer and Digital Services Manager for their presentation.

10 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Audio recording – 25 minutes 06 minutes

Councillor Jon Clayden proposed and Councillor Claire Winchester seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the Press and Public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the following report will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the said Act (as amended).

11 CHURCHGATE REGENERATION PROJECT UPDATE & NEXT STEPS - PART 2

N.B. This item was considered in restriction session and therefore no recording was available.

Details of minutes taken on this item are restricted due to the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of Section 200A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

12 CHURCHGATE REGENERATION PROJECT UPDATE & NEXT STEPS - PART 1

Audio recording – 01 hours 03 minutes 38 seconds

Councillor Val Bryant, as Leader of the Council, presented the report entitled 'Churchgate Regeneration Project Update & Next Steps – Part 1 and advised that:

- Since the consideration of the project at a Full Council meeting in July 2025, they had worked to test the most critical issues of the site such as parking, public realm, the future of the market, governance and long-term sustainability of the town centre.
- The Council was in a stronger position than it was 12 months ago as there was a strong technical and financial evidence base, and a clearer understanding of the site constraints, viability and delivery challenges, market appetite and delivery expectations.
- Soft market engagement recently undertaken had confirmed strong confidence in Hitchin as an attractive town centre regeneration opportunity with long-term potential.
- It was a finely balanced scheme, which required detailed feasibility work and delivery planning, and a proportionate approach to risk before any delivery route was chosen.
- The Council was seeking to appoint specialists with regeneration expertise to work alongside the project team and take it from ambition and planning to delivery and implementation.
- A phased approach would ensure that investment, funding and risk remained proportionate to uncertainty at each stage of the project and reflect the scale and complexity of the opportunity and feedback received from the soft market engagement.
- This would ensure that the project would progress in a measured way by maintaining strategic oversight and decision-making control and reduce uncertainty before any long-term partnership was entered into.
- The recommendations would support the ambition to deliver a viable, high-quality regeneration scheme to support the sustainability and vitality of Hitchin town centre.

The Chair advised that an updated version of this report had been published as a supplementary document.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Claire Winchester
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor David Chalmers
- Councillor Daniel Wright-Mason
- Councillor Elizabeth Dennis

In response to questions, the Churchgate Project Manager advised that:

- Viability testing would not decrease the quality or delivery of the project or affordable housing as the regeneration aimed to produce a high-quality mixed-use development that celebrated the market, public realm and heritage of the area.
- The additional funds would allow testing of design quality, viability, and deliverability together rather than separately, while allowing the Council to have strategic oversight over quality control.

In response to questions, the Chief Executive advised that:

- The Secretary of State would place restrictions on the financial decision-making ability of the Council once a shadow authority was created, which would mean signoff from the shadow authority being required for financial decisions over a certain threshold and the potential need for multiple signoffs on this project.
- If they focused on delivering a viable scheme that made sense to the Council, it should also make sense to a shadow authority.
- However, they could not speak on behalf of a shadow authority that did not yet exist and whose purpose would be to oversee the preparation of the unitary authorities.

In response to questions, the Director – Enterprise advised that:

- Funding for this work would not go towards their current consultants, but to a different development partner or similar company.
- Appointing an external partner for this stage would put them in a better position due to the complexity of the project, and the expertise they would provide on appropriate testing before going out to the market.
- Not procuring an external partner would significantly impact both time and costs spent on the project, and using this funding would get them the right advice to proceed correctly.

In response to questions, Councillor Val Bryant advised that:

- There were detailed month by month plans in place for the project and there was no reason why the project should not be in a good position when Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) took place if they followed this.
- It would be an advantage for them to merge with other authorities such as Stevenage Borough Council as part of LGR as they were looking at bigger regeneration projects.

Councillor Jon Clayden proposed recommendation 2.1 in the report and the amended recommendation 2.2, and these were seconded by Councillor Claire Winchester, as follows:

- (1) That the recommendation to Full Council and to Cabinet is noted, and that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee also note the provided update/next steps of the project.
- (2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommend that Cabinet recommend that Council approves the allocation of additional funds, referencing the Part 2 report.

The following Members took part in the debate:

- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Elizabeth Dennis
- Councillor Paul Ward
- Councillor Martin Prescott
- Councillor Nigel Mason

The following points were made as part of the debate:

- There was a fear that this project had reached a tipping point whereby the Council would continue to commit funding to it past the point of no return.
- The initial estimates for the project had been inadequate, and with turbulence in both the economy and construction industry, the overspend was unacceptable and the administration should evaluate their projects in a phased approach to focus on what was realistic.
- Additional costs were likely to arise in the future, and it would be useful for Members to be provided with more costing information before they reached the pre-development stage.
- They wanted the project to succeed, but not at any cost, therefore, measures should be taken to prevent it from spiralling.
- From experience with previous Council projects, it was important that this additional funding was allocated so that the Council was in the strongest possible position before the planning phase, and to prevent last minute changes from spiralling the project.
- The Churchgate Project Board had given this considerable thought, and they trusted the approach that was being taken.
- There was no reason not to support the recommendations.
- The project should not be stopped considering it was a multimillion-pound investment.
- The project was complicated and expensive, but they understood that the Project Board were doing their best to deliver this.
- They were not telling the Project Board to stop the project but simply telling them to be cautious.
- The Council should always remember that this was taxpayer money being spent, but the proposal was sensible and those living in Hitchin would benefit.

The Chair summarised discussions and outlined that:

- There had been discussion over the risk for the Council versus the risk for a developer in being involved in this project and how to balance that.
- Uncertainties would be present at the later stages of the project around financial decisions and upper bounds when LGR took place.
- The Committee did not want to see a loss of quality on the final scheme because of challenging market conditions or a stop to the project because of LGR.
- Reasons for involving external parties in the project had been discussed at length.

The Chair thanked Members and officers on the Project Board for their contributions.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That the recommendation to Full Council and Cabinet was noted, and that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee also noted the provided update/next steps of the project.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET: That Cabinet recommends that Council approves the allocation of additional funds, referencing the Part 2 report.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS: To ensure that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee are content with the decisions being put forward to Cabinet on 16 June 2026 and to Full Council on 16 July 2026. This report provides an overview of the recent work completed and details how the project team and Project Board propose to move forward – providing the Committee with an opportunity to ask any further details.

N.B. Following the conclusion of the item, there was a break in proceedings at 21.08 and the meeting reconvened at 21.17. During the break, Councillor Martin Prescott left the Chamber and did not return.

13 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION FUNDING

Audio recording – 01 hours 46 minutes 22 seconds

Councillor Ian Albert, as Executive Member for Resources, presented the report entitled 'Funding for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR)' and advised that:

- This report was seeking agreement on how the LGR reserve for the next two financial years would be allocated, and the decision making and reporting mechanisms for this.
- Spending on LGR could be put into three categories, which were county-wide costs, additional staffing costs arising from LGR related work and staff training costs.
- £1 million would be allocated to county-wide costs, with any contribution to this being a fair share contributed by each council, and this would be approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with executive members.
- Up to £200K would be spent on staff training costs, which would be hugely important in the context of LGR.
- The recent delegated decision allocated £450K of the LGR funding to four full-time, two-year, fixed-term posts in HR and IT to address workload pressures.
- However, recruitment was ongoing for these posts, and they would not necessarily need to spend the full allocation.
- Delegated decisions were likely to be published for spending on staff backfill and county-wide costs, but may not be needed for the learning and development allocations as these transactions would be low value and allocated in tranches, but they would be monitored in the quarterly budget reports.
- Proposals for spending would go the Leadership Team for review and prioritisation in the context of the available budget.
- Significant officer time spent on LGR related work would continue.
- Centralised spending would be easier to compartmentalize through workstream leads and project plans.
- Funding for the LGR Reserve was fixed and they might need to reevaluate the allocation as part of the budget setting next year, but currently it was robust.
- Points raised about managing funds effectively on large projects such as LGR would be taken onboard.
- There would be continued opportunities for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Finance, Audit and Risk Committee to review spending on LGR.

The following Members asked questions:

- Councillor Claire Winchester
- Councillor Paul Ward
- Councillor Ralph Muncer
- Councillor Jon Clayden
- Councillor Sadie Billing

In response to questions, the Director – Resources advised that:

- The £200K for additional staff training costs had been set after conversations with the Learning and Development Manager, and most costs had been absorbed within existing budgets so far, meaning it was a realistic figure.
- More spending on new positions would not take place soon as the immediate workload pressures had been addressed.
- Future recruitment would occur as LGR related work grew more intense.
- If additional staff were needed, there would be a need to make timely decisions, and the benefit of wider consultation on spending would have to be considered.
- Risk from potential redundancy costs following LGR due to appointing additional staff was a factor, but the risk of not appointing additional staff was even greater.
- It was speculated that additional staff might be needed beyond LGR.
- The county-wide costs went towards a central pot for the county-wide LGR programme overseen by the Chief Executives Co-ordinating Group, and this appointed additional staff, but also had staff loaned from existing authorities and there were mechanisms in place to ensure the right flows of funding.
- Resources to support mental health and wellbeing in the Council were good, but it was recognised that the HR Team would need additional staff to help transition existing staff to a new unitary authority and beyond.
- There was no contingency built into the LGR Reserve, but there would be an opportunity to review this when the next budget was set, and it was noted that the reserve could increase next year as LGR progressed.
- It was likely that most staff would be transferred across to the new unitary authorities and any severance costs would be for them to handle after April 2028, which had been factored into the LGR submission documents sent to the Government.
- £900K had been promised for each new unitary authority by the Government to support the LGR process, but there were no expectations of further government funding.

In response to questions, Councillor Ian Albert advised that:

- Transparency on decisions around resourcing and prioritisation would continue to be provided through the Council Delivery Plan.
- Directors would look at lower priority areas in consultation with Executive Members and the importance of transparency and ensuring that Members and residents were aware of decisions taken on these was noted.
- They would consider the suggestion to include the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and political Group Leaders in the consultation process when the Chief Executive approved spending on LGR related staffing backfill costs.
- However, it would be important that they worked quickly to recruit, and they had already allocated a significant amount of the £1 million reserved for additional staffing costs.

Councillor Sadie Billing proposed the recommendations as set out in the report and this was seconded by Councillor Nigel Mason.

Councillor Ralph Muncer proposed an amendment to recommendation 2.2 in the report to include that any spend can be approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and political Group Leaders in addition to the Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Resources, and this was seconded by Councillor Elizabeth Dennis.

There was no debate on the amendment.

Following a vote, the amendment was **CARRIED**.

As part of the debate on the substantive motion, the Chair summarised discussions and outlined that they had talked about staff training costs versus county-wide costs, transparency going forwards, and the need for further consultation on decisions.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET:

- (1) That Cabinet approve that up to £1 million of the available funding be allocated to county-wide costs. Any contribution will be based on a fair share from each Council and can be approved by the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Member for Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation and Executive Member for Resources.
- (2) That Cabinet approve that up to £1 million of the available funding be allocated to additional staffing costs, noting that £450k has already been allocated. Any spend can be approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Executive Member for Resources, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and political Group Leaders, except where the Constitution already requires different approval processes.
- (3) That Cabinet approve that up to £200k of the available funding can be spent on additional training costs. Any spend can be approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Resources.
- (4) That any spend is subject to a cap of £1 million in 2026/27 and £2 million overall.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS: This is intended to provide a practical framework for agreeing LGR costs. It aims to allow timely reactions in what will need to be a fast-moving project.

14 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 2025/26

Audio recording – 02 hours 18 minutes 47 seconds

Councillor Claire Winchester, as the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2025/26, presented the report entitled 'Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2025/26' and advised that:

- The Committee had examined 30 items and made 26 recommendations to Cabinet.
- It was recognised that the Committee had worked to improve and refine decisions rather than rehash them.
- They were grateful for the diligent work of Members, including the additional commitment given by Members of the S106 Task and Finish Group.
- Time had been taken to reflect on the work they had been undertaken to ensure an appreciation for cooperative and transparent working that had focused on building mutually respectful relationships with Members, officers and portfolio holders.
- There would be a lot for the Committee to consider with the coming of unitary authorities, and luck was wished to the new Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Members and officers were thanked for the support they had given over the last year and for the opportunity given.

Councillor Jon Clayden proposed the recommendations in the report, and this was seconded by Councillor Ralph Muncer.

Councillor Ralph Muncer put on record his thanks to Councillor Winchester for her time as the Chair of the Committee and for the support she had provided to the S106 Task and Finish Group. He additionally thanked Members, officers and Executive Members for their support over the past year.

Councillor Daniel Wright-Mason put on record his thanks Councillor Winchester and highlighted the effectiveness of cross-party scrutiny within the S106 Task and Finish Group.

The Chair put on record his thanks to Councillor Winchester for her work as the Chair of the Committee last year and for the collaborative relationship they had built. He also put on record his thanks to the Scrutiny Officer and Councillor Ralph Muncer as the Chair of the S106 Task and Finish Group.

Having been proposed and seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED: That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered and provided comments on the draft Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2025/26, attached as Appendix 1, prior to consideration by Full Council.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL: That the Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2025/26, as attached at Appendix 1, be noted.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS: To enable the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider and comment on the report of the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the work of the Committee in the 2025/26 Civic Year prior to consideration by Full Council.

15 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2026/27

Audio recording – 02 hours 23 minutes 24 seconds

The Scrutiny Officer presented the report entitled 'Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme 2026/27' and advised that:

- Members had undertaken scrutiny training on 12 May, and following this, Members had helped to develop the Work Programme for 2026/27, which was attached at Appendix 1 to the report, and included items for the next Committee meeting in September.
- Members were invited to raise items for the Work Programme through various means if they provided reasons for why it should be considered by the Committee as this would help with preparations and ensure that objectives could be met.
- Updates could also be received outside of meetings through methods such as spotlight reviews and site visits.
- Specific questions should be raised by Members ahead of Committee meetings to allow officers and Executive Members to coordinate a response ahead of time.
- The Forward Plan for 15 May was attached at Appendix 2.
- The Decisions and Monitoring Tracker was attached at Appendix 3, and detailed each recommendation made to Cabinet from the last Committee meeting.

Councillor Ralph Muncer suggested that an update on the progress made by Cabinet on the S106 Task and Finish Report should take place at the Committee meeting on 10 November as that would give significant time for officers and Executive Members to give a response and factor in the next stage of the Local Plan Review.

Councillor Daniel Wright-Mason suggested that they should look at the merger of Settle and Paradigm and how this would impact residents, with the potential to invite them to a future Committee meeting to improve their working relationship with the Council going forward.

In response to a question raised by Councillor Claire Winchester, the Scrutiny Officer advised that:

- They usually contacted Hertfordshire Constabulary in November each year regarding a topic that the Committee would like them to present for the Crime and Disorder Matters item in January.
- The Leadership Team would be able to provide steer to the Committee on local issues that they might want Hertfordshire Constabulary to consider.

Councillor Claire Winchester suggested that the Committee should pick just one topic for them to present at the Committee meeting in January.

Councillor Nigel Mason highlighted that the presentation by Hertfordshire Constabulary should focus on impacts, not just data and insights.

Councillor Ralph Muncer highlighted that they should focus the Crime and Disorder Matters on the impact that policing reorganisation would have on local community policing and its priorities.

The Scrutiny Officer highlighted that Members should raise key requirements for the report on Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) Future Plans as soon as possible.

Councillor Elizabeth Dennis advised that:

- It would be hard for the Committee to make requests on the report until they knew the number of unitary authorities and which one the Council would be merged into.
- However, she suggested that the Committee should look at the protections of nature, ecological assets and parks and playgrounds, and potential stewardship models for these.
- The Committee should also reflect on housing and homelessness provisions and outside organisations providing services in tandem with these and the impact that LGR would have on this.
- The roles of community forums should also be looked at, particularly in respect of future neighbourhood governance models.

Councillor Paul Ward suggested that they should look at the impact of LGR on service delivery for residents and projects.

Councillor Ralph Muncer proposed and Councillor Claire Winchester seconded and, following a vote, it was:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Committee prioritised topics for inclusion in the Work Programme attached as Appendix 1 and, where appropriate, determined the high-level form and timing of scrutiny input.
- (2) That the Committee, having considered the most recent iteration of the Forward Plan, as attached at Appendix 2, suggested a list of items to be considered at its meetings in the coming civic year.
- (3) That the Committee, noted the Decisions and Monitoring log, as attached at Appendix 3.

REASONS FOR DECISIONS:

- (1) To allow the Committee to set a work programme which provides focused Member oversight, encourages open debate and seeks to achieve service improvement through effective policy development and meaningful policy and service change.
- (2) The need to observe Constitutional requirements and monitor the Forward Plan for appropriate items to scrutinise remains a key aspect of work programming.

The meeting closed at 10.09 pm

Chair