



**Buckinghamshire County Council**  
**Select Committee**  
Environment, Transport and Locality Services

# Minutes

## *ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE*

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2013, IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, AYLESBURY TOWN COUNCIL, CHURCH STREET, AYLESBURY, HP20 2QP, COMMENCING AT 2.00 PM AND CONCLUDING AT 4.25 PM.**

### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr W Bendyshe-Brown, Mr D Carroll (Vice-Chairman), Mr D Dhillon, Mr P Gomm, Mr S Lambert and Mr W Whyte (Chairman)

### **OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr S Armstrong, Mr R Bunce, Mr B Cahill, Mrs L Clarke OBE, Mr K Edwards, Mr T Fooks, Ms L Forsythe, Mrs C Gray, Mr D Inman, Mrs M Keyworth (Secretary), Mr R Reed, Mr D Roberts, Ms K Wager, Mr S Walford and Mr D Watson

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies.

### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Bill Bendyshe-Brown and David Carroll declared an interest because they are Wycombe District Council Members but they confirmed that they have taken no part in discussions regarding Daws Hill at the District Council.

### **3 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION**

The Chairman informed members that the meeting would be in two parts. Item 4 related to statements from Mrs Lesley Clarke, who asked for the decision to be called in and item 5 was for the Cabinet Member to respond. After this the Committee would be able to ask questions to decide whether or not the Decision should be called in. If the call in was agreed, the



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



meeting would move to Item 6 on the agenda and witnesses would be called. Each side would have 30 minutes to make their case and questions may be asked for points of clarity or further evidence. The Committee will then decide whether the call in had merit and the reasons why.

#### **4 CALL IN - DAWES HILL AREA TRAVEL LINK**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mrs Lesley Clarke who, along with Mr Roger Reed and Mr David Watson, requested that the Decision on Daws Lea Area Travel Link be called in.

Mrs Clarke said Daws Hill is the area for which she is responsible as a Councillor for Wycombe District Council and as a County Councillor. The main reasons for the call in were:

- All relevant matters were not taken into account in reaching a decision. Wycombe District Council is working in partnership with the M40CEG (M40 Community Engagement Group) on the feasibility of a new barrier, to include the production of green energy and the Local Member said this had not been considered as part of the thought process. The Local Member said she wanted minimum negative impact on the local environment. The photovoltaic barriers would reduce the amount of energy used and the cost saving could go some way to negating the cost of the barriers.
- The desired outcome for the bus link was to take buses off Daws Lane and a disproportionate amount of money was being spent to solve the rush hour traffic which would only benefit 160-200 people. There were no issues regarding traffic in the evening.
- There was inadequate consultation in relation to the options set out in the Decision and no specific consultation with the Daws Hill Neighbourhood Forum.
- The Decision does not accord with the Council's aims and strategies. There has been no consultation with the people in Daws Lea and Marlewood Close. At the time the decision was taken there was no Equalities Impact Assessment which should have existed alongside the decision. There are other ways to mitigate the noise impact as well as the known air quality issue. Having more buses in the area would add to the situation and something was needed to alleviate this.

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Janet Blake, Cabinet Member for Planning & Transportation. Mrs Blake stated that the Senior Manager, Policy, Planning, Economy & Infrastructure would speak on her behalf. Members expressed concern that the Cabinet Member was not responding herself. The Chairman said it was for the Cabinet Member to decide who would respond. The Senior Manager said he would not be reiterating what was in the decision report but would make a statement on the current position.

During 2012 the County Council undertook transport strategy work to ensure that upcoming development in the South of High Wycombe could be brought forward alongside a supporting transport strategy. The resulting Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy was adopted by BCC in December 2012, this supports the District-adopted RAF Daws Hill development brief, also adopted in Dec 2012 – co-ordinating an agreed position on land-use and transport planning between the two authorities.

The strategy agreed a range of measures to deal with planned growth; most pertinent to this meeting being the inclusion of a new public transport link between Daws Hill and the new park and ride/coachway provision at Handy Cross. During consultation on the Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy (SQTS) it was suggested that an additional route be explored running to the south of Daws Lea, hence the final strategy was adopted with a specific commitment to undertake further work prior to deciding which of two route options should be used to achieve the link.

This decision now confirms which option is to be progressed.

The local member has been kept informed on the progression of this work, and at various points requested that further work be undertaken. This culminated in an Environmental scoping report being undertaken which now takes the evidence base towards the point where it can support a full planning application, considerably surpassing the level of assessment and detail that would normally be deemed appropriate for a policy decision.

Since the SQTS was adopted, various planning applications in the area have been granted by Wycombe District Council on the basis and strength of the supporting transport strategy being implemented. It is therefore important that this decision is finalised so that we can move swiftly towards implementation of the agreed strategy.

The Cabinet Member said the papers set out before the Committee show evidence that several options were considered in the SQTS and Options A and B were considered the best. The Decision was taken on one of the two options.

## **5 CALL IN - CONSIDERATION OF THE REQUEST**

The Committee discussed the information provided to them by the Cabinet Member and the Local Member who requested that the Decision be called in.

A member asked for evidence of the consultation with local residents in relation to the SQTS, as well as evidence that the local member was kept informed. It was noted that whilst there is evidence of consultation with local residents and the local member it had not been presented to this Committee, being part of the SQTS development process during mid-2012. He confirmed that there was evidence that during consultation on the SQTS considered the two options in the report based on the response to that consultation.

A member asked the Local Member whether she had raised the issue of use of the photovoltaic barriers during the process and briefed the process at that time. The Local Member said she hoped that the District Council would have kept transport officers informed on the work of the M40CEG. The previous Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation had pushed for the second option and she hoped that the transport officers would have discussed it.

The same member asked whether the rationale for the decision in October took account of evidence including the draft EIA and whether it was available during the thought process. He also asked whether the type of barrier suggested was considered and whether these were in use anywhere else. The Senior Manager said the Local Member had been supported when requested but that the EIA had not been carried out at that time. There had been no consultation on this policy decision but public consultation had been carried out as part of the strategy and this could be corroborated. Any future planning applications would also include consultation, but none had been carried out specifically in relation to the Decision.

It was noted that the Local Member had referred to a site visit and the Chairman asked whether anything had arisen from that. The Local Member said that from that site visit the Cabinet Member would have seen the reasons to consult in relation to option 2. Residents are unable to sit in their gardens and putting in in excess of 120 buses would increase the problem. There were already noise and air quality issues in the area and the barriers would help reduce the noise and pollution. This had been repeated to the Officer attending, who wrote a response suggesting three options. The second option had been to put in the barrier and the third option had been to do nothing. The Local Member stated that the site visit did not seem to have any impact on the Decision made.

With regard to whether there was adequate consultation the Senior Manager reiterated that consultation took place when the SQTS was being developed and that report is available. However, the Local Member repeated that there had been no consultation with people on

Daws Lea; they had been spoken to after the decision had been made. The Local Member also stated that the SQTS had been scrutinised by Wycombe District Council who produced 20 recommendations and sent them to WDC Cabinet who did not support all because they are not Transport Authority.

A member asked why Option 1 was now being considered when it appeared that the previous Cabinet Member had recommended Option 2. There were known issues in relation to the poor air quality zone along the M40, as well as the fact that the roads in the area are narrow. The Senior Manager said his term of office had overlapped with the Cabinet Members. He stated that the original consultation was open as well in the report. With regard to air quality, there were other officers present who could comment on this, but he believed that the situation would not be improved by taking away a certain amount of treeline if the barriers were implemented. The barriers, if viable, could be put in for whichever option is agreed and it was not a differentiating factor.

**Having discussed the papers presented under this item, Members unanimously agreed to call in the Cabinet Member decision.**

## **6 CALL IN SUBMISSION**

The following witnesses had been called by the Local Member and each witness introduced himself.

Mr Dave Inman, Daws Hill Neighbourhood forum  
Mr Ken Edwards M40CEG  
Mr Stewart Armstrong, Daws Hill Neighbourhood Forum  
Mr Tony Fooks, High Wycombe Society

### **Mr Dave Inman**

Mr Inman is a resident on the south side of Daws Lea which is the most affected areas and attended the Committee to represent his road. He said there was a strong sense of feeling and concern of the residents reflecting the reality of living in Daws Lea.

Mr Inman had taken part in the public consultation on the SQTS but stated there had been no consultation since then. He also stated that he objected to the residents being called the 'Daws Lea Receptors'. He considered that they had been overlooked in the Jacobs Study which had talked about school and wildlife, but not people. The person living in the property to be demolished had been poorly treated badly and this had been exacerbated because the home owner is terminally ill.

There will be severe impact regarding noise and vibration at the front and rear of the properties in the road because of the proposal for in excess of 120 bus movements, but there had no data on this in the Jacobs Study. Children currently play in the front gardens because of the noise, but the bus movements will make it worse. With regard to the traffic impact, the road is on a hill and buses have problems climbing it. This will have a greater impact of it becomes part of the school pick up point.

In conclusion Mr Inman requested that:

- People are consulted and considered
- Residents' quality of life is not made unacceptable. They would not be able to open windows with buses coming along – Human Rights issue.
- Joined up thinking for decision:
  - Cost offset regarding use of barriers
  - Fence replacement

- After being canvassed, some residents on the south side are willing to discuss garden sacrifice re barrier.
- Daws Lea becoming link road for more traffic
- Create a solution consistent with future requirements.

### **Ken Edwards**

Mr Edwards is Chairman of M40CEG (Chilterns Environmental Group), which has been working since 2005 to reduce the impact of traffic noise on communities exposed to noise between Junctions 3 and 8 on the M40. The Group have been working in partnership with the Highways Agency and Wycombe District Council.

The Feasibility Report they produced was accepted and published on the WDC website, including data in relation to the contribution of electric power to the Leisure Centre, via the barriers, attached as appendix 5 of the Feasibility Report.

The presentation included a map showing the areas of high noise on the M40 which included Daws Lea. It was indicative of places identified as important areas deemed to be noise producers. Mr Edwards said a study commissioned between Loudwater and Wheatley had shown that if barriers were placed on the north side of the M40 with the lower part made up of noise buffer material and the upper part of photovoltaic cells set at a 10° angle, this would produce enough power to show a savings on the cost of installing the barriers. He stated the Highways Agency would take the lead to produce the requirements for production of the barriers. The plan would be to install them in 2015/16. The second report showed that Wycombe Leisure Centre would be able to use the electricity generated and would make a 35% saving on electric power. The projected capital recoverable on that stretch of road shows a 3% increase in energy which could increase if the angle of the top of the barriers was increased to 50°. If this was implemented at Handy Cross, further income of £2.5m could be generated by 2027.

The level of noise at Daws Lea of 76db was estimated by WDC and was consistent with noise levels in 2009. With barriers in place it would be reduced to 65.3db and this could be improved if the barriers were extended through the whole area to the houses at Handy Cross and the back of the Leisure Centre. Mr Edwards believed that this should be taken into account during the planning process. He said that the PVNB could generate £2m after costs were recovered and the reduction in electricity demand. These benefits would apply to both options.

Mr Edwards suggested that there would be increased noise if Option 1 was taken forward and this would be centred at the front of the houses. With regard to Option 2 the net impact on pollution was not known but there could be some increase in relation to buses, which could be reduced by the barriers, but this would need more study.

Mr Edwards referred to the high profile work carried out in relation to the impact of HS2 and related this to the situation for residents in the area who would be exposed to high noise levels.

### **Tony Armstrong**

Mr Armstrong is Chairman of Daws Hill Neighbourhood Forum, and has worked on planning applications in connection with the SQTS.

Mr Armstrong suggested that Option 1 had been decided upon mainly due to cost implications and he considered that cost should not be the only driver. The true cost was human impact. DEFRA had measured the noise levels on Daws Lea and it was considered to be appalling, debilitating the constant. There was reduced enjoyment of property by residents. The suggested bus route would have a further impact and he considered it to be unacceptable. He

also suggested that the width of the road, at 5.5m, was too narrow. Bus lanes were 6m and buses would have to use the grass verge.

The increase in cars from residents from the new development would not have a huge impact on congestion and Mr Armstrong suggested they were must moving the problem from one area to another. Residents of Daws Hill Lane would lose the bus service and would need an alternative means of transport. The directness of routes from Daws Hill Lane to Handy Cross was promoted as reason for choice. The Daws Lea route would have more gradient and could cause problems with traffic during extreme weather with snow and ice. There could be more pollution because lower gears would need to be used to negotiate the hill. The area in Option 2 is pretty flat and Mr Armstrong considered it was a more straightforward link.

Mr Armstrong said he was not implying that the noise barrier alone was the solution but suggested that ways needed to be found to mitigate the situation and that cost less. He stated that the business model had been adopted by WDC and the Highways Agency and savings could be generated quickly, as well as the reduction in noise and pollution. It was also noted that residents on the south side of Daws Lea were willing to contribute land from their gardens if necessary.

Mr Armstrong suggested that officers take the opportunity to meet and discuss the noise barriers with a view to seeing if the cost differential could be met.

### **Tony Fooks**

Mr Fooks represents the High Wycombe Society and is also a member of the Executive of the Association of the North Thames Amenity Society in Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire, and Civic Voice which had a direct link to the DCLG. He asked whether the decision had been carried out in line with the NPPF and the Localism Bill. At the earlier consultations he had offered to help in relation to data regarding traffic movement. He also stated that there had been no consultation with the High Wycombe Society.

With regard to the planning application with WDC Mr Armstrong said no care had been taken particularly with the residents of Daws Lea. Data on this area had just been released but had not been used to be able to make a better informed decision. This was not able stopping the decision but helping and progressing it.

### **Mrs Lesley Clarke, Local Member**

The Local Member said the arguments had been strong and well put and she had nothing more to add.

### **Mrs Janet Blake**

Mrs Blake said the decision had been reached on a technical basis and officers were better placed to discuss this matter.

### **Mr Stephen Walford**

The Senior Manager said it was not his role to defend the decision but for the Committee to consider the evidence. If members wished to ask questions he would invite his technical officers to respond on any particular issues.

The Chairman reminded members that this was a call in on a decision that had been taken and appreciated that Senior Manager would respond on behalf of the Cabinet Member, and that any questions could be dealt with by relevant officers.

With regard to the points made the Senior Manager responded as follows:

- The Senior Manager agreed that they should have been more sympathetic with regard to the residents of the property to be demolished, and apologised on behalf of the Team for

the state of affairs. It was a matter of great regret that it has taken so long to get a decision made.

- The Decision should have been made when the SQTS was adopted in December 2012.
- With regard to issues under the Human Rights Act, the Senior Manager considered it was for the Committee to take a view on this.
- Future solutions. The Senior Manager endorsed the challenge to the County Council to establish its position in relation to local growth and have a suitable transport strategy in place. Wycombe is benefitting from being one of the only areas that had done this and any decision can be taken in that context.
- The Feasibility Report was a positive development for local residents and new emerging technology may well improve things greatly and was something that could be used in both options.
- With regard to appalling noise levels, they could work with the Highways Agency to improve the situation.
- It was suggested that an increase of eight buses on the route was unacceptable and the Senior Manager suggested it was up to the Committee to take a view on this.
- The Senior Manager took on board comments regarding M40 barriers.
- With regard to involvement from the High Wycombe Society, it was noted that this had not yet got to the planning application stage and this cannot progress until the decision has been made.
- The Senior Manager disagreed with the suggestion that no information had been provided when it was requested. It was noted that a Senior Management colleague had attended all the Neighbourhood Forum meetings.
- With regard to the view of the previous Cabinet Member, the Senior Manager said he was not sure whether this had been recorded but he could find out if members wished.

However, the previous view had not had an impact on the current recommendation.

The Chairman asked for questions and asked members to focus on what the call in was about and whether they considered the decision had been made correctly. This was not about any decisions in relation to the SQTS but about the option selected to progress the implementation of the Transport Strategy. The following was noted:

- It was clear from statements from residents and members that there had been a breakdown of communication and this has been recognised by officers
- A member stated there did not appear to be any information on the barriers. It was noted that this was emerging technology and was being proto-typed. The Chairman stated that comments on the barriers were not directly linked to the decision but a separate issue. The Senior Manager said that this was not a differentiating factor because if the barriers could be implemented it could relate to either option.
- In answer to a question about whether the County Council is undertaking noise alleviation work it was noted that the noise was specifically from the Highways Agency road in this area. The consultation would sit alongside any work to see if there were implications and whether any suggestions made could be used.
- The Chairman asked whether any planning application would consider processes in relation to mitigation and whether the noise barriers could form part of this. The Senior Manager said this would have a positive impact in relation to both options and would be referred to in any application. The Local Member said this had been mentioned at the site and to implement it they would have to cut down the trees in the relevant area, which were there to baffle the noise. With regard to Option 2 the M40CEG had carried out the feasibility study and asked for it to be considered but there was no take up.
- A member asked whether it was the view of officers that the other Option was not considered because of cost. The Senior Manager said it was but one of the considerations. However, the Cabinet Member said she had not considered it when making the decision. This was not driven by cost but technology, economy and environmental reasons.

- The member asked why there was no data against option 1 in relation to noise and vibration. The Technical Director for Jacobs UK said the purpose of the scope was to consider the full range of impacts and key benefits and provide advice and discuss any issues. This would not be detailed work initially, but to set out the expected impact. The view of technologists was that option 2 would impact on residents because of tree loss, thus making the noise element worse. It was also considered there would be greater impact in relation to buses with Option 2. Currently there was no data on either option because the work has not progressed that far forward. Mr Inman stated that cutting the trees would not make a significant difference. Thirty metres of closely planted trees would reduce noise by about 1.5db and the screening was only two to three trunks deep. Putting buses along a quiet road would increase noise levels by about 3db because it was a different noise source.
- A member asked if sight of the Equalities Impact Assessment prior to making the decision would have made a difference. It was noted that the EIA does not discern any material difference between the two options and would not have made a difference to the decision. The Cabinet Member stated that an EIA had not been asked for and confirmed that it did come out after the decision was made. It was noted that it was not a requirement as part of the key decision process but could be a background paper. The Local member said the EIAs are required to support the budget process and she would have hoped it was part of the decision making process.
- The Chairman asked about the suitability of the street to take buses, in relation to width and junction design. The Ringway Jacobs Officer stated that they ran many bus routes on roads the same width as this road. However, the Local Member said that two buses cannot pass each other.
- A member stated that the SQTS was clear about the Daws Hill development. The realignment of Daws Hill Road was not considered and he asked the Local Member what she thought they would get if the decision was already made in relation to transport. The Local Member said she had spoken to the previous Cabinet Member who felt Option 2 was the better one in relation to the bus link and this would not impact on Daws Lea. She considered that Option 1 would have more impact. Option 2 would future proof the road and with the impact of the extra 750+ houses being built over the next few years the road could be used for cycling and walking and those residents living on the other side of the road will not have to cross a major road. Option 2 has great value and there is a bridle path that leads to the town centre.
- A member referred to the fact that the High Wycombe Society representative had said the consultation process was not carried out properly. The Senior Manager said that a thorough consultation had taken place in relation to the SQTS and there would be further consultation in relation to any planning application, but no additional consultation had taken place specifically in relation to the Decision.
- A member expressed concern that the information from the EIA had not formed part of the decision. The Chairman stated that this was outside the remit of this Committee and was a matter for Regulatory and Audit Committee.
- The Chairman said that whilst there was some support for Option 2 it would cost an extra £2.3m and the gap between the S106 monies would be a problem for the County Council. The Local Member said the photovoltaic cells on the barrier would provide extra income. She considered there were several issues that had not yet been resolved.
- The Chairman asked whether, in response to the Transport Strategy, any options were considered regarding an alternate bus link. The Senior Manager said as part of the decision process no others were considered. Work was done in the context of the two options put forward.
- With regard to noise and barriers, a member said the District Council survey had given a level of 76db. Mr Edwards said that standard planning methodology was used to predict traffic volume and noise.
- The Cabinet Member referred to the Call In Paper and the desired outcome which suggested a third option relating to the re-opening of the SQTS. She stated that the



Decision related only to Options 1 and 2 and not option 3 referred to in the Call In paper. The Chairman confirmed that it was the only the decision that had been made in relation to the two options that was being discussed.

In summary the following was noted:

- The Committee felt there was disquiet regarding the process of decision making in relation to having an Equalities Impact Assessment.
- With regard to Option 2 research had not been tested as well as it could have been.
- There was nothing to contradict the content of the SQTs
- There were lessons to be learned around consultation which had taken place in relation to the SQTs and would take place around any future planning application. But the feeling was that there was a lack of consultation in relation to residents and other agencies in the Daws Hill Area regarding the decision
- Concern was expressed that Option 1 may have been chosen because of the cost impact and not on the impact on the residents of Daws Lea.

The Chairman asked whether the cost was differentiated for Option 2 with regard to the widening of the bus lane in Option 1. He asked whether the cost would increase because of this. The Senior Manager stated that there would be some increase in costs regarding the width of the road. He also reiterated that he did not say that Option 2 was chosen solely on the basis of cost, but that it was a contributory factor.

The Chairman also asked, in relation to any future planning application, whether either option was assessed in relation to habitat. The Senior Manager said he didn't know at this point whether planning permission would be obtained on either option. He said the Council did not set out to make a bad decision. The main concern was about the EIA. He stated the barrier was not part of the decision but the decision was to provide access from A to B. There was no major fault apart from the lack of the EIA.

A member referred to the suggestion that the route on Option 1 would not allow two buses to pass, which would impact on local residents. The Officer stated that this was an existing route and the Bus Company was entitled to put buses down any adopted highway. There were many routes down roads less than 5.5m and as this was a short stretch of road there should be no problem with regard to buses passing. A member said that they were only looking at an increase of eight buses an hour and agreed that buses ran down narrow roads frequently and safety issues could be addressed. The Officer said that the road was 5.5m wide and was enough space for two goods vehicles to pass each other.

The member also stated that the use of the word 'receptors' in relation to the residents was not an appropriate use of language and de-humanised people.

Members supported the call in and asked the Cabinet Member to reconsider the decision. The following points were taken into account in making this decision:

- Option 1 was put forward as a means of ameliorating problems and the decision centred on cost.
- The new Cabinet Member did not take account of the EIA
- Lack of consultation with all involved. However it was noted that even if residents and partners had been consulted the same decision may have been made.
- It was considered that the decision was made without taking into account all the factors in the area.
- Concern about whether costs were properly estimated, bearing in mind the discrepancy between the two options.

Members were informed that Decisions can only be called in once and this Decision can be referred back to the Cabinet Member for consideration, asking her to take into account all the concerns of the Committee.

A member proposed that the Decision be referred back to the Cabinet Member and this was seconded. The Committee voted on the proposal as follows:

For the proposal:	5
Against the proposal	1

**Members agreed to call in the Cabinet Member decision on The Daws Hill Area Travel Link, High Wycombe.**

Having called in the decision members agreed (on a vote of 5:1) that the Cabinet Member should reconsider the decision, taking into account the concerns raised by members, as follows:

- Consultation: Whilst there was a lack of consultation on this Cabinet Member decision, members recognised that extensive consultation had taken place with regard to the Cabinet Member Decision on the Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy which took place in December 2012. There would also be extensive consultation in relation to any future planning application. However, there had been no communication with residents in the Daws Hill Area, in relation to this decision, and how it would impact on residents. The Committee would like to ensure that residents are given the opportunity to have an input in the two options in order to further inform the decision.

**The Committee recommended that the Cabinet Member may wish to reconsider that some form of communication to residents at this stage would be beneficial, on the reasons for the Decision.**

- Review Option 2; The Committee recommended reviewing the estimated costs in relation to Option 2, whilst taking into account the impact on residents.

**The Committee recommended that the Cabinet Member may wish to reconsider reviewing Option 2 in relation to costs and impact on residents.**

- Equalities Impact Assessment: The Committee noted that the Equalities Impact Assessment was not available at the time this Decision was taken.

**The Committee recommended that the Cabinet Member may wish to reconsider the decision taking into account the Equalities Impact Assessment.**

The Cabinet Member will have five working days to reconsider whether or not to amend the decision. Due to the Christmas period, the Chairman of the Select Committee has agreed to extend this time to the end of January.

## **7 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is due to take place at 10.00am on Tuesday 4 February 2014 in Mezzanine 1, County Hall, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

Dates of future meetings:

Tuesday 4 March

Tuesday 8 April

Tuesday 13 May

Tuesday 17 June

Tuesday 2 September

Tuesday 14 October

Tuesday 18 November

## **8 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **RESOLVED**

**That the press and public be excluded for the following item which is exempt by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972 because it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)**

## **9 CONFIDENTIAL BACKGROUND PAPERS**

There was no discussion in relation to this item.

**CHAIRMAN**