



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 TUESDAY 14 OCTOBER 2014, IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 11.28 AM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr T Butcher, Ms N Glover, Mr P Gomm, Mr S Lambert and Mr W Whyte (Chairman)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms G Badhan, Mrs L Clarke OBE, Mr D Cobby, Ms K Fisher, Ms S Griffin (Secretary), Mr D Hill and Ms K Wager

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Bill Chapple, David Carroll, Dev Dhillon and Bill Bendyshe-Brown.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the Tuesday 2 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising

Full details of the contract for Community Impact Bucks are to be requested.

Action: DSO/Andrew Clarke



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Timeline/scope of the internal review, the review being undertaken by Gate One and the Transport review are to be provided.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/Gill Harding/Andrew Clarke

Forensic analysis report of the RJ contract is to be circulated to Committee Members when approved.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

Details of the savings in the Transportation portfolio and re-investment are to be circulated to Committee Members when available.

Action: Gill Harding/DSO

Four Year plan is to be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman reported the following.

The main bulk of the work of the Committee has been the public transport inquiry.

Some of the members of the ETL Committee attended the Finance Select Committee meeting on the 30 September to give a joint update on the grass cutting contract. A summary will be circulated.

Action: Phil Gomm/DSO

6 FLOODING IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE: LESSONS LEARNED

Karen Fisher, Flood Management Team Leader, David Cobby, Jacobs, Doug Hill, Environment Agency, Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment and Netta Glover, Deputy Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment were welcomed to the meeting.

Members of the Committee were referred to the report in the agenda pack which gives details of the background to the strategy, statutory responsibilities, challenges, issues and work that taken place.

The Flood Management Team sits within the Planning Advisory and Compliance and currently employs three full time officers and a Lead Officers/Senior Flood Management Officer.

The Buckinghamshire Strategic Flood Management Committee (BSFMC) was formed in 2009. The Committee membership includes the Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment and representation from Partners organisations such as Thames Water, the Flood Management Agency and District Councils. Meetings are held every three months and are chaired by a County Councillor.

The Cabinet Member also sits on the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) where decisions are made for flood management capital projects. Buckinghamshire County Council represents Slough Borough Council, Luton Borough Council and Central Bedfordshire Council on this Committee.

Winter Flooding in 2013/14 had a severe impact on the Buckinghamshire area. This was a testing time for the Flood Management Team as there were only two officers in post. Work took place with colleagues such as TfB, the Resilience Team as well as external partners.

The County Council has a statutory requirement to carry out flood investigations. The Flood Team has prepared 18 flood investigation reports on locations of the flooding which were the most severely impacted. Four of the reports have been completed and published. It is hoped that the 14 reports will be completed by the end of the calendar year. An additional report was completed two weeks ago in response to 30 businesses in Chesham being flooded by surface water.

The County Council has a statutory responsibility to hold a register of all assets which impact on flooding (bridges, banks, structures etc). One member of staff has been dedicated to compile the Asset Register.

The final part of the Flood Water Management Act is still to be enacted. In the past week, a new consultation has been released by DEFRA which seems to substantially change the process for two tier Authorities by placing the approval process with the planning process and the Local Planning Authority. The responsibility for the inspection, adoption and maintenance process is unclear. This is a big change in income and resources set aside.

Going forward, the revenue funding from the Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs for 2014/15 could be phased out. Jacobs has been commissioned to look at up to five locations around the county where temporary or demountable defences could be employed during a flood.

There are a number of capital projects in Chesham which are coming to completion (Fullers Hill and Spinney). The Marlow Flood Alleviation Scheme has been added back into the programme for the next six year funding scheme. Work is taking place with the Environment Agency to explore ways of addressing the funding gap of £3 million.

In terms of challenges, if the flooding comes from an ordinary water course or groundwater flooding, the responsibility lies within BCC, not the Environment Agency. If the incident is not related to a highway, which would be the responsibility of TfB, then BCC has no resources to be able to respond in the ground. Discussions have taken place about the development of a 'mutual aid proposal'.

A list of recommendations/action has emerged from the Flood Investigations reports of flooding in winter 2013/14. The County Council does not have a statutory responsibility to deal with the recommendations; however as the recommendations are in the public domain, there is the expectation that they will be dealt with. There is also pressure to complete the recommendations from other Authorities who do not have the resources.

The Cabinet Member reported that she had recently attended a recent meeting of the RFCC in London, during which, the issues about the Marlow Flood Alleviation Scheme were discussed. The Chairman of the RFCC visited Marlow and saw what she described as a 'shovel ready' scheme. There is the concern that if there is a delay with the scheme, this would affect planning permission already granted and that the planning permission process would have to start again and might not be granted.

During discussions, the following questions we asked and points made;

Does the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) include the Great Ouse river catchment area? There is a Thames and a Central Anglian Regional Flood and Coastal Committee. BCC sits on both Committees. The seat on the Anglian RFCC is shared and at

the moment Northamptonshire current represents BCC. Buckinghamshire represents Slough, Luton and Bedfordshire on the Thames RFCC.

The report makes reference is made to Affinity Water. Is this Anglian Water or another company? Affinity Water is a company which just does clean water not foul water in the Misbourne area. Work also takes place with Anglian Water.

In terms of lessons learnt, what is the current position of ownership, consent and riparian management enforcement? An example is the flooding in the Willows, Aylesbury where 80 properties were flooded internally. This was an Environment Agency (EA) failure but it was difficult to 'pin down' the responsible body. What went wrong and how can this be corrected in the future? The Local Authority has powers to carry out enforcement against the landowner on ordinary water courses i.e. when one side of the river bank belongs to AVDC and the other side to the Trust. The EA simply has the powers to maintain the river.

Mr Hill explained that in terms of riparian ownership, in law, the responsibility of repair to a water course rests with the landowner but in practice, this is difficult to enforce. A surgery is being held in the next few weeks to give information about responsibilities and riparian ownership, what can be done collectively to address this problem which is reflected across the entire catchment. A number of lessons have been learnt from the flooding at the Willows i.e. the responsibility for culverts. Close working is taking place with Bucks Highways to try to identify a long term solution. Aylesbury Vale District Council is also carrying out survey work to try and find a solution to overcome flooding issues.

Residents could own land at the river's edge but the Environment Agency is responsible for the water running through. Working together is essential as responsibility was not clear until the flooding on the Willows occurred. Mr Hill said that one of the main issues that emerged from the Section 19 action and flooding in 2013/14 is that there needs to be a joint solution.

80 properties were flooded internally on the Willows, Aylesbury. Are residents able to apply for funding from the repair and renew grant scheme to help with the cost of buying and installing flood measures? Households and businesses affected by winter flooding can apply for a repair and renew grant of up to £5,000 via Aylesbury Vale District Council who were administrating the grant. Only a handful of applications have currently been received. Residents of the Willows have been sent a letters asking if they would be willing to consider applying for the scheme and pooling any funding received i.e. 80 applications at £5000 is £400,000. With £5000, a resident could install floodgates in their own property but flood water could come into their house via air bricks or via other properties. The aim is to try and address flooding in the community. The challenge is that the deadline for claims for Government funding is the end of March 2015. Discussions are taking place with DEFA about the possibility of the money being carried forward if residents agree to the pooled scheme. Residents are being encouraged to pooling of funding from the repair and renew grant and to attend the surgery for information and advice.

The Chairman said that residents should be encouraged to sign up to install joint flood defenses as this would give more security of being able to deal with flooding events.

TfB carried out a ditching campaign to encourage local landowners and farmers to carry out their duty to clear ditches to assist water flow away from land and roads. How has the EA liaised with TfB to check if ditches have been cleared? Mr Hill advised that work has taken place with the National Farmers Union (NFU) to look at the possibility of upstream storage of water. Ditches and drainage is out of the remit of the EA. The main purpose is to ensure maintenance of main rivers. This has to be done at a holistic level. To see the most benefits, work needs to take place with TfB and other larger agencies.

What is the relationship with the Internal Drainage Board in terms of tributaries and feeders? Mr Cobby said that the Internal Drainage Board was involved in a surface management plan study in Buckinghamshire as were the Agency and other Districts.

In Chalfont St Giles there has been flooding from the Misbourne and in Chalfont St Peter there has been raw sewerage on the main road and in the village. Who do Members of the Council contact as these are two entirely different problems? The current helpline has a recorded message. There needs to be a mechanism in place for reporting flooding issues. Members are welcome to contact Flood Management Team or to email the Flood Management Team inbox. In the winter there were difficulties contacting agencies due to the amount of ongoing flooding. One of the challenges was there is no direct workforce to send people out to areas which were flooded. There is TfB but their focus is the highways. The Local Area Technicians carried out a tremendous amount of work during a very difficult period. Issues relating to sewerage should be reported to Thames Water. The EA and Thames Water have 24 hour telephone numbers for the reporting of flooding. Members are encouraged to use this method of reporting as incidents reported are logged.

Gaps in the reporting process were identified following which the team put together a flow diagram of who to contact and the relevant contact numbers depending on the type of flooding. The flow diagram will be circulated to Committee Members by email and hard copy.

Action: Karen Fisher/DSO

If flooding is reported via a recorded telephone message, how can assurance be given this issues reported will be acted on and not just disappear into the ether? The Cabinet Member explained that there is an automated email response which advises the issue will be looked at within 14 days.

During the recent flooding of the telephone exchange in Chalfont St Giles, there appeared to be confusion on resolving this problem. For one week large road tankers were used to pump the water out of the building which was taken to the top of the hill for discharge until it was pointed out that the water was running back down the hill into the telephone exchange. The second problem was the EA wouldn't allow the water which was being pumped out to be discharged into the Misbourne unless it was across the road. The result was a pipe was placed across the road. First of all the water was discharged into the road which caused flooding. A pipe was then added which discharged the water into the Misbourne by the bridge. It took a long time for the flooding to be resolved. Eventually the EA then agreed to discharge the water on the side of the road. Mr Hill said he was not aware of the specifics as he was not part of the decision making process of this incident. During the winter, the EA was part of the Thames Valley LFR focus on how to deal with flooding. There is the need for a multi-agency solution and engagement with residents to come up with a solution.

Mr Cobby said reference has been made to the commissioning of a study being embarked on to look at temporary flood defences and the deployment. Pumping of water is part of temporary flooding deployment. If temporary defences and pumping can be deployed in an area short term to alleviate flooding, what is the best plan for the deployment of assets and have this agreed up front.

It is able having the confidence there are enough resources available, the location of demountable flood defences and the details of the Memorandum of Understanding. The Cabinet Member said that the other issue to be addressed is what happens when the flooding has gone. Sandbags have to be taken to landfill for disposal as they could contain contaminated water. This is an additional cost to the tax payer.

Is it the County Council as the Local Authority Flood Manager responsible for flooding issues? The responsibilities are a little confused. If the flooding is coming from surface water or ground water, the responsibility lies with the lead local Flood Authority but often it is a multiple source i.e. flooding may be coming from a sewer but there could also be infiltration from ground water. The key is working together and making sure there is a strong working relationship in place. There will always be resource issues. BCC is funding the study on demountable defences from its revenue as it this was felt strongly to be something Bucks should do as a county. BCC is going to look at where defences could be put. More detail will be needed i.e. a topographic survey and logistics in terms of storage and implementation.

It is good to hear that partnership working clearly improved. As winter approaches, how can it be ensured that the attitude of 'it is not my responsibility' will be avoided this year? There needs to be clarity on who takes responsibility. The Cabinet Member said that the chart gives clarity of responsibility.

The Chairman referred to page 22 of the report refers to statutory responsibilities, enforcement and consenting. As this area appears to be evolving, it would be helpful for an update on BCC's Flood Strategy to be provided at a future meeting of the Board (to include the responsibility for new developments, consenting on existing watercourses and the planning application process). Ms Fisher said she would be happy to provide an update which could include clarity on sustainable drainage.

Action: Karen Fisher

The EA consented to a 700 house scheme on a known moist spot of Buckingham. The discharge for the site goes on the upstream side of a pinch point in the flood plain which has resulted in a huge amount of water being added to a pinch point. Buckingham now has an additional risk of flooding due to a bad statutory consultee response. The Cabinet Member said discussions should take place on a regular basis. The issue of planning permission and refusals being overturned has been mentioned to the Chairman of the RFCC i.e. a house is brought in good faith perhaps not knowing that 10-15 years ago planning permission was overturned by an inspector. Insurance is also an area that needs to be looked at. There is a now a different type of scheme being put in place.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member, Deputy Cabinet Member, Ms Fisher, Mr Cobby and Mr Hill for attending the meeting.

7 BULKY WASTE STRATEGY AND RE-USE AND RECYCLING CREDIT POLICY

Lesley Clarke OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment and Gurbaksh Badhan, Waste Business Manager, were welcomed to the meeting.

Ms Badhan thanked Committee Members for allowing her to attend the meeting. The purpose of the report being brought to the ETL Select Committee is:

- To present the Committee with information on the Bulky Waste Strategy & Re-use and Recycling Credit Policy project;
- To provide the Committee with an opportunity to review and comment on the options presented; and
- To seek approval for the approach being taken

The main drivers of the project are;

- A review of the existing (and subsequently revised) Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Buckinghamshire identified re-use as a priority area. Bulky waste has been identified as a priority waste stream to target re-use.

- The new Energy from Waste (EfW) facility at Greatmoor will provide the Council with a cost effective and performance efficient route for the treatment of residual waste that is currently landfilled. It will not however, treat bulky waste in its original form without some form of pre-treatment. Therefore under the EfW era, bulky waste is to be managed as ad hoc waste under the contract and will incur higher costs for its management compared to standard residual waste (i.e. black bag waste).

In terms of HWRC bulky waste re-use items, in 2013/14, approximately 1,250 tonnes of waste items destined for landfill were re-used, of which, about 220 tonnes were from bulky waste. This is a saving of £125,000 per annum to the County Council.

The Cabinet Member referred to the shops located at the Household Waste Recycling Centres in Aston Clinton and High Heavens, where funds raised from unwanted items which are suitable for re-use, are being used to support South Bucks Hospice to build and run a new hospice. The disposal of mattresses is a cause for concern. Talks are taking place with the bed manufacturer, Hypnos, about the possibility of working with them to recycle mattress springs. There is a bid in the MTP to purchase a shredder for bulky waste. The officer added that step changes in the management of the material stream going forward have been considered.

In 2013/14, approximately 1250 tonnes of waste items destined for landfill were re-used, of which about 220 tonnes were from bulky waste.

Bulky waste is also collected by District Councils. Householders are charged a collection fee. There is no set window for collection. The drawbacks of this service are items 'vanish' before the collection is made and some of the items are weathered and not suitable for re-use. BCC meet the disposal costs so are keen to look at other avenues for disposal.

Several third party sector organisations have indicated they would like to be involved in diverting bulky waste for re-use and recycling. There have been various discussions through the re-use forum from which the challenges faced have been highlighted i.e. the lack of storage space and capacity. A money incentive has been looked at i.e. the re-use credit policy.

A recent tonnage value review has shown that re-use credit is not viable there is not enough money in the system to pay a re-user credit to a third sector provider. A possibility being discussed is using District Councils depots, HWRCs or a central point as a buffer which third party sector organisations can go to and help themselves to items which can be re-cycled. Items that cannot be re-cycled would go to landfill.

Appendix 1 of the report gives details of the Waste Resource Action Programme (WRAP) bulky waste options model 2013. The benefits, challenges and delivery of the options have been discussed with District Councils and third party sector organisations.

Appendix 2a indicates the four stages of change needed for the provision of bulky waste collection services; householder requesting collection, collection from households, destinations of collected bulky waste and arrangements for the re-use of bulky waste received at HWRC's.

One of the challenges around the collection of bulky waste is district councils have different contractual obligations and different end dates and therefore might not be in a position to move at the same speed or support the direction we are moving. Discussions are ongoing.

During the update, the following questions were asked.

In the Buckingham area, the default position is generally to call a charity shop about the disposal of items for items that can be re-used. There does however, need to be clarity of what is of value, what can be re-used and what is waste.

In terms of the charities that are on the Forum, is there involvement from charities from the north of Buckinghamshire as one issue in the north is the lack of re-sale opportunity and items going to a charity that no-one in that part of the county has heard of. Is there an opportunity to look at how the north of the county might feel more engaged in the service? A countywide approach has been taken on what charities were willing to engage and what they were willing to discuss. Local charities have also been invited to the forum. It has been found that third party organisations are happy to participate in discussions but some do not have the resource level to be able to offer a cross county wide solution. This can be taken back to the Forum.

Action: Gurbash Badhan

The Cabinet Member said that as the Local Authority do not provide a collection date and time some items left on the kerbside are found to be damaged when collected. The possibility of collecting items from inside the house is being discussed so the items would be in good condition.

Work is also taking place with Supported Living organisations who help young people coming out of care who are moving into provided accommodation. The accommodation is very often unfurnished and in its role as Corporate Parent, the County Council is looking at the possibility of supplying unwanted refurbished items such as fridges etc.

How is the sale/trade of items at Household Recycling Centres monitored off site i.e. washing machines and cookers? There are two different ways of re-sale; there are traders who are prepared to pay for an item knowing it is not PAT tested. The item is sold as seen and they have to refurbish it via an authorised list. To be included on the authorised list, traders have to undergo checks and balances via BCC supplier FCC Environment. The second way is the item undergoes a test and is taken off site for repair and is returned for resale.

Would it not be feasible to have a storage unit facility at the Household Recycling Centres? Most of the HWRCs are almost a victim of their own success in terms of capacity. One part of the options considered was using HWRC facilities as a central storage solution but capacity remains an issue.

Aylesbury Vale District Council no longer provides a bulky waste collection service; therefore the pressure automatically goes to third party sector organisations or items are being fly tipped in brooks etc and are causing flooding. How do you see the project progressing if the County Council is unable to get partner agencies to be collecting agents? Aylesbury Vale has engaged with the County Council very proactively and is looking to reintroduce the bulky waste service from April 2015. The depot where the materials are taken has been under refurbishment but AVDC now believe they are in a different position and are able to work more closely with the County Council to try and deliver a system to allow third sector parties to take bulky waste items to the depot.

How are unwanted electrical items dealt with? Does the County Council PAT test electrical items or is this done elsewhere by a third party? PAT testing is carried out elsewhere. The Cabinet Member explained that all items that can be resold are PAT and have a three month guarantee. All items able to resell but test and re-furbished. Some bicycles are refurbished in the prison for which there is a charge of £3 per bicycle. The Police also give the County Council some stolen bicycles if the owner cannot be found.

In terms of clarity from a legal point of view, if the Local Authority collects bulky waste, do they have the statutory duty to dispose of it? The County Council has a statutory to dispose of any bulky waste is it presented with.

Do the District Councils present bulky waste to the County Council and does the County Council charge for District Councils for this service? Yes District Councils present

the County Council with bulky waste which is then sent to landfill. District Councils are able to collect bulky waste and they are legally able to charge for collection but they cannot charge for disposal. In terms of the County Council's duty as a statutory body, it cannot charge for disposal as the item is a household waste item under the controlled waste schedule. It is a legal requirement for the County Council to provide that service.

The Cabinet Member said District Councils are encouraged to bring bulky waste in which is in a fit state which can be re-used rather than be sent to landfill.

What do the District Councils current dispose of bulky waste items? If an item is fly tipped, the District Council sends a street cleansing vehicle to collect the item to be taken to Wapseys Wood in the north of the county and in the south to Calvert or to Newton Longville. If it is a designated collection by the householder, the item will be collected by a dedicated vehicle which will call at several properties and the items will be taken to landfill.

Does the County Council pay the landfill charge? Yes the County Council pays the landfill charge as it's a statutory duty.

How is the landfill charge calculated? There are only certain items of waste that can be taken to landfill. Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment item (WEEE) are stored up at the respective Council's depots from which collection is organised. Landfill tax is set by the Government. The gate fee is procured through contracts. The Landfill Tax and gate fee are added together to give the cost.

Is there a facility to breakdown and recycle the component parts of items which cannot be re-furnished or resold? There is not currently this facility or capacity in the system. In the legal framework, if an item has been discarded it is technically waste; if an item has been donated, it is a reuse item.

What is the total cost of bulky landfill tax to the County Council per annum and is this broken down into an amount per District Council? If a customer is diverted and directed to household waste sites, we will re-use what we can. Items can come to site which are no always of value and could still end up in the residual bins at the household waste and be sent to landfill. It can be difficult to ascertain the true amount of tonnage as this depends on the method of collection i.e. street cleansing vehicle or designated collection vehicle. The tax element is paid by County Council via the household waste sites. The figures for landfill tax costs for the County Council and District Councils is to be circulated to Committee members.

Action Gurbaksh Badhan/DSO

There is a step change in service coming through nationally for bulky waste with the move away from landfill to EfW. Some items at the end of their life need to be pre-treated before they can be sent to landfill.

Before the decision is made of the process which is going to be undertaken in Buckinghamshire, it is important to look at how other rural counties dispose of bulky waste items as this is not unique to Buckinghamshire. Benchmarking is being undertaken. It is emerging that a lot of Councils are at different stages. In areas which are moving in EFW, a change is being seen in how bulky waste is being managed.

The Chairman said this is a policy in progress which the Committee can't approve or comment on in detail.

The Committee agrees that the principle of trying to find better use of bulky waste seems to be going in the right direction to which there are no objections. It would be good to see more work on the opportunities to breaking waste down rather into recycling schemes rather than landfill.

The Chairman thanked Ms Badhan and the Cabinet Member for the update.

8 PUBLIC TRANSPORT INQUIRY UPDATE

The Chairman reminded members of the Committee that the public transport inquiry is a strategic high level look at the public transport picture in the county which includes a review of the current situation and looking at areas where change and opportunity might present itself.

The review is a timely reminder to make sure there is an impact in the 2015/16 budget review and Future Shape reorganisation of the County Council as well of the opportunities that exist to look at a step change in public transport delivery.

The key findings from the inquiry are detailed in the Executive Summary.

‘Public Transport has a vital role to play in enabling people to get to work, access services, support the local economy and help reduce social isolation. This is a timely inquiry as the Council is undertaking a restructuring of its services to meet the financial challenges ahead. Our report seeks to inform the Council’s strategic approach to public transport policy and delivery and to deliver the best possible overall value for money’

‘The Council needs to articulate a clear, long term vision for a total transport approach for public transport provision, rather than considering historic services in isolation. Our recommendations are designed to help the Council achieve a strategic and joined-up approach to future commissioning of public transportation’.

The Chairman gave thanks to everyone who took part in the inquiry, particularly those listed in appendix 1 of the report who gave their thoughts and observations to the Committee.

Members of the Committee were asked for their comments, observations and endorsements of the draft report before it is presented to Cabinet on the 10 November 2014.

The following comments were made;

- There is a lot of detail in the report. Tribute is paid to the Chairman of the Environment Select Committee, the Policy Officer and the Democratic Services Officer for organisation and marshalling of the inquiry sessions.
- The report is concise and considered. It looks at an integrated transport solution going forward.
- Witnesses gave the Committee some good ideas for future services which have been included in the report. It is hoped that the relevant Cabinet Members will take the ideas into account which includes Home to School Transport and public transport
- The residents of Buckinghamshire want change within the transport network. Thanks are given to all those involved in the inquiry.

The Chairman said a lot of knowledge has been gained from the inquiry which will help the Cabinet Member and the team look at public transport in more detail. The ETL Committee has an important role in terms of challenging and monitoring how this might develop going forward.

Members of the Committee ENDORSED the report.

9 COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Members of the Committee NOTED the work programme.

The following is to be added to the work programme;

- An update on flooding
- An update on the recommendations made to Cabinet by the ETL Select Committee on the Ringway Jacobs contract.

An informal meeting of the Committee will be arranged in December to discuss proposed work programme topics and inquiry areas for 2015.

Action: Policy Officer

10 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is due to take place on Tuesday 18 November 2014 in Mezzanine 2, County Offices, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

Meeting dates for 2015

3 February	21 July
17 March	8 September
14 April	6 October
19 May	17 November
23 June	

CHAIRMAN