

Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Monday, 8th November, 2010

6.00 - 8.35 pm

| Attendees | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Councillors: | Duncan Smith (Chairman), Barbara Driver, Wendy Flynn, Rowena Hay (Vice-Chair), Diggory Seacome, Charles Stewart, Jo Teakle, Jon Walklett and Simon Wheeler |
| Co-optees: | James Harrison and Karl Hemming |
| Also in attendance: | Councillor Penny Hall, Councillor Klara Sudbury and Councillor John Webster (Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development) and Zareen Ahmed, Sarah Didcote, Richard Gibson, Sonia Phillips and Martin Stacy (Officers) |

Minutes

1. APOLOGIES

Cabinet Member Sport and Culture had given his apologies.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

3. AGREEMENT OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2010

The minutes of the last meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2010 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

None received.

5. MATTERS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

No matters referred to committee.

6. CABINET MEMBER BRIEFING

Cabinet Member Sport and Culture had given his apologies.

Cabinet Member Housing and Safety started with an update from Cheltenham Borough Homes. They were in the process of submitting a planning application for the garage sites and works in Brighton Road were progressing well, with the expectation that the site would be cleared by the start of next week (w/c 15 November). There had been no objections to the St. Pauls proposals and as such it would not be taken to the Planning Committee.

She had attended the Cheltenham Strategic Partnership meeting last Monday and had been particularly interested in some presentations concerning alcohol misuse. A pilot at Cardiff Accident and Emergency, where issues related to alcohol were reported direct to A&E rather than the Police had proved cost effective and a good model.

At the Gloucestershire Safer and Stronger Partnership meeting, they had debated the future of the partnership, given the plans to merge it with the Criminal Justice Department which would result in a more strategic view.

The figures relating to Supporting People were still unclear and this was crucial to future plans. Given the delay, the Partnership Board meeting had been moved from the 12th to the 30th of November.

She looked forward to being in a position to offer more information at the next meeting of the committee.

7. HEALTH, COMMUNITY AND CARE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chairman introduced Councillor Penny Hall as the elected representative of CBC on the Gloucestershire County Council, Health, Community and Care Scrutiny Committee (HCCOSC).

Councillor Hall had joined the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2006, as a retired Nurse with experience and knowledge of healthcare provision.

The agenda of the committee changed in November 2009 (to include adult social care, libraries and information, equalities, customer services and lifelong learning), as did the name, to HCCOSC.

The committee focused on health issues from a public perspective and worked with other agencies to improve local health services.

The committee included 8 County Councillors and 6 District Councillors and met 6 times a year at District Councils across the County, enabling members of the community to attend.

The committee had the power to refer matters (except from Acute Trusts) to the Secretary of State for Health and had last done so in 2006 when radical changes to the Mental Health Service provision for over 65's were proposed.

Since formed, the committee had received presentations on a variety of issues including;

- The Healthy Gloucestershire Strategy
- Children's Services
- Annual Report of the Director of Public Health
- The Independence Trust
- The Public Protection Bureau
- Putting People 1st
- World Class Commissioning
- And the Prison Healthcare Trust

Given the broad remit of the HCCOSC, areas of work over the last year had included;

- Continued monitoring of Gloucestershire PCT, including, A&E performance (the target was 95% of attendees through A&E within 4 hours), ambulance response times, cancer waiting times and smoking cessations.
- Monitoring the effects of Wingmoor Farm landfill site was a long term matter for the committee, particularly scrutinising the health impact of the site.
- Links with other Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees in the South West, developing a regional joint protocol for specialised health services provided to a small number of people over a large geographical area. This included complex burns care, treatment for morbid obesity and cancer in children.
- Following proposals earlier this year by the Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust for 200 bed closures, the committee called for a review and detailed public and stakeholder consultation. The beds were saved and the Trust, along with members of the HCCOSC had developed a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy as a result.
- To learn more about Community and Adult care, members of HCCOSC had visited an 80 bed care home run by St. Johns Trust who specialised in Nursing and Specialist Dementia. They also visited a unit of 75 retirement homes in Tewkesbury, run by Hanover House.
- Visits had also been made to the Gloucestershire Archives, the new Gloucester Library and a drop in centre for those with learning difficulties. The centre in Gloucester was the third in Gloucestershire as part of a pilot and within 3 weeks had over 40 people registered to use it.

The white paper 'Equity and excellence liberating the NHS' was published in July and would not only hugely impact the community but also the role of the HCCOSC. It would no longer have its current statutory functions allowing it to scrutinise the NHS.

3 members of the policy team from the Department of Health were invited to meet members of the HCCOSC, of which Councillor Hall was one. She had been grateful of the opportunity to meet them and offer insight into the work of the HCCOSC.

The Chief Executive of NHS Gloucestershire would be tabling a report at the meeting of the HCCOSC tomorrow (9 November 2010) and a formal response to the proposals had been submitted to the Department of Health on behalf of the HCCOSC.

She hoped that members had found it as interesting to hear about the work of the HCCOSC as she did undertaking it. She also took the opportunity to remind members that papers for meetings of the HCCOSC were circulated to them all, inviting them to contact her if there were matters they wished for her to raise.

The Chairman spoke as a County Council representative on the HCCOSC and reiterated the challenges the white paper posed. The committee had been

effective and if its ability to scrutinise the NHS was taken away, it would be a poorer service for it.

He thanked Councillor Hall for her update and looked forward to receiving further updates in the future.

8. ARTS AND CULTURE - COMMUNITY INVESTMENT GRANT REVIEW

The Assistant Director Culture and Wellbeing introduced the report as circulated with the agenda, which summarised the findings and recommendations of the review.

Members of the working group included Councillors Walklett, Teakle and co-optee Karl Hemming and was assisted by the appropriate officers. The group had undertaken a backward looking review of the funding awarded to MAD Youth Council, Cheltenham Festivals and the Everyman Theatre.

All three organisations gave presentations to the working group and all three were found to have met the criteria. The group were not in a position to make specific recommendations regarding future funding levels.

She thanked the members for their time, the large amount of preparation before meetings and their positive approach to the review.

She then invited the members of the group to address the committee.

Councillor Walklett advised that whilst he had his own views, the group were not sure that it was their role to make recommendations about future funding. They did however, make some recommendations to the organisations in relation to certain areas.

Councillor Teakle explained how much she had enjoyed being involved in the review, it had been a great learning opportunity as a Member and as a patron of Cheltenham Festivals and the Everyman Theatre. She wished to be on record as having commended each of the organisations for their great performance.

Co-optee, Karl Hemming, thanked Officers for their support and confirmed that it had involved a large amount of paperwork and preparation in advance of meetings.

There were no questions or comments from members of the committee.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that;

- 1. The findings of the O&S review group as detailed in section 2 of the report be endorsed by the Committee and submitted to Cabinet for their consideration.**
- 2. The representations made in section 3 of the report be endorsed by the Committee for consideration by Cabinet when determining future funding arrangements and levels.**

The Chairman thanked those involved in the review.

9. HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION INITIATIVES

The Head of Service – Stronger Communities introduced the Housing and Communities Manager who operationally managed the homelessness prevention initiatives.

He aimed to highlight the changes to the Housing Benefit (HB) and Local Housing Allowance (LHA) Regulations, and raise awareness of the impact these changes would have on homelessness prevention services.

Section 2 of the report set out the costs associated with homelessness and the focus of CBC on prevention work and how this work relied on £65k of funding from Communities and Local Government (CLG).

Some good news had been the announcement in the Governments Comprehensive Spending Review, that funding would continue to be paid directly to Local Housing Authorities, as part of their Area Based Grants. This, rather than what had been intended, that the funding would be transferred instead to the County Council's Area Based Grant.

Members were referred to Appendix 1. This set out the range of activities funded by the annual £65k Homelessness Implementation Fund, used by the Housing Options Service to support some of the key priorities within the Homelessness Strategy 2008.

Appendix 2 set out the outcomes that had been achieved following the investment. These results illustrated the success of the homelessness prevention work.

Future challenges were set out in Appendix 3, with details of specific changes, when they were to be phased in, along with any risks identified.

Section 4 of the report, detailed initial ideas for managing the potential risks identified in the report and Appendix 3. This would include open and honest discussions with private landlords, communicating with current tenants and assisting those tenants that want, or need to, to move.

The following responses were given to questions from members of the committee;

- The £5,300 referred to as the cost per year to the public purse of each household becoming homeless related to many different agencies being involved.
- The 7 families in 5 bedroom homes would no doubt want to stay in the larger property and the Housing Options Services Team would look at how, this may include debt management, etc. But some would need to move, perhaps to a large 4 bedroom property.
- Current tenants would not be affected by the change in regulations until April 2012, however they would affect new tenants from the 1 April 2011.
- Cuts to housing benefits were not being imposed by CBC and Officers shared members concerns that the changes would result in pockets of low income families in areas with cheaper rental properties.

- It was important to note that there was also a cost associated with moving from one property to the next, this was an upfront cost which many would not be able to afford.
- Competition from students and those up to 35 years old renting a single room (which had been extended from 25 years old) would increase pressure on those currently occupying one bedroom self-contained accommodation.
- Unlike boroughs in London, Cheltenham did not have a huge undersupply of properties and could access 30% of all properties regardless of rents.

Councillor Walklett noted that the University of Gloucestershire had ceased some of its larger courses for the next 2-3 years and as such there would be far reduced numbers of students coming to the town during that period, which he hoped would allay some fears.

The Chairman thanked both Officers for their attendance.

10. REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S WORK WITH BLACK AND MINORITY ETHNIC COMMUNITIES

The BME Capacity Worker introduced the discussion paper as circulated with the agenda. Also in attendance was the Policy and Partnerships Manager.

Ultimately she wanted the committee to consider whether a similar approach could be developed with other communities in Cheltenham (older people, carers, etc). Before seeking the views of the committee she talked through some of the highlights relating to the work with BME communities contained within the paper.

She provided a brief overview of the work, explaining that the post had been filled in 2007 and was tasked with identifying and engaging with minority communities. Her role was then to build their capacity so that they became more actively involved with their local community, bringing them from isolation to engagement.

The work responded to priorities within the Corporate Strategy and some highlights included;

Engagement and Participation: the main challenge was that the communities were small and dispersed, each with their own priorities and needs. Working relationships had been established with a diverse range of communities and the emphasis this year had been bringing those communities together. The most successful example of this had been the Community Ambassador pilot set out in 3.4 of the report. Some exciting news was that this pilot, now renamed the Cheltenham Ambassadors for People and Services (CHAMPS) project had been short-listed for an award from the Institute of Community Cohesion, the result of which would be announced on 2 December 2010.

Health and Wellbeing: A healthy mind, healthy body programme had introduced BME communities to various agencies and topics included support for carers, services for older people and understanding dementia. An emotional health and wellbeing event was being planned in partnership with the council's

Play, Sport and Development and Healthy Living Officers. The event would be held at Leisure@ in December.

Enhance provision of arts and culture: A partnership with the Literature Festival and the Everyman Theatre bought about a new play about barriers to communication, called 'You People', which was showcased at the Literature Festival in October. In February 2011 the BME groups would work with the Everyman Theatre to produce, promote and deliver International Week and the Everyman's studio would be the venue for stage and screen performances.

Safer and Stronger: A new community group called 'Sahara – Saheli' which meant supportive friends had been established and this was unique as it brought together women from Gujarati and Bangladeshi communities. To celebrate Inter-Faith Week, an event was being organised in partnership with the University and Cheltenham Inter-Faith. The event would be community-led and bring together Cheltenham's diverse faiths.

Partnership working had been demonstrated throughout, with partners having given their time and money.

This work had enabled BME communities to become more visible and cohesive and more involved in the decision making process (e.g. budget consultation). The trust, rapport and confidence that had been built had also allowed individuals and groups that would not naturally come together, to work as a collective.

The work with BME communities was at a mature stage but would continue, focussing on strengthening current and developing new structures in order that they became more self-sustaining.

The following responses were given to questions from members of the committee;

- Carers Gloucestershire were invited to all events with new BME Groups, which often identified those with a responsibility for caring for family members.
- The Everyman Theatre had in post a well respected Outreach Director and she could see no reason why they would be unwilling or unable to arrange a play by a group with learning difficulties or a deaf group of performers.
- Race equality legislation placed a duty on the Council but events did not need to be specifically targeted. The paper did propose whether this should be extended.
- The BME community in Cheltenham were certainly starting to feel integrated to the wider community and whilst they may not feel fully integrated they were making their presence known. The level of integration very much depended on which community you were looking at, the Hindu community for example, had been in Cheltenham for almost 50 years, this was not the case for all groups. The aim was to work with those who were not integrated and build confidence.
- The aim of Inter-Faith week was to bring people together and this was the first opportunity there had been to do this as relationships had needed to be developed and nurtured. She was unconvinced that it was

faith keeping people apart and felt that cohesion would take less time in Cheltenham than it had in some larger cities, given its size.

- There had been an influx of eastern Europeans a few years ago, but there were no groups dramatically growing in numbers at the moment and it was all fairly settled.

In response to the question posed to the Committee within the paper, as to whether a similar approach could be developed with other communities in Cheltenham, the answer was a resounding yes, especially carers.

Councillor Driver urged Councillors that knew of BME individuals within their wards, who were not engaged in the community, to refer them to Zareen.

The Chairman thanked the Officers for attending and wished the BME Officer luck for the upcoming awards, for which her nomination was most deserved. This was echoed by other members of the committee.

11. BUDGET CONSULTATION

The Chairman introduced this late addition to the agenda.

The Group Accountant introduced the report and appendices which had been circulated at the start of the meeting.

During summer 2010 additional budget consultation was undertaken. This consultation consisted of 21 road shows in various venues across the town.

Residents were asked to use sticky dots to identify services they thought should be 'protected', 'reduced' and 'stopped' and during this process over 21,000 sticky dots were used. Residents found it easier to mark services to protect and reduce but much more difficult to mark those to stop. Officers and Members had been able to answer most of the questions raised by residents. "Back office" costs had been included in all of the costs shown as it was impossible to run services without them.

This was not a scientific exercise but did engage the public. The two A3 appendices showed the results from this consultation, ranked in order, one in chart form and one in a table with figures.

At this point Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development noted that Cabinet had agreed a budget strategy on the 26 October 2010 and were expecting a draft budget for consideration by the 14 or 21 December 2010. The date depended on when the settlement details were received from Government.

The gap had been £2.6million, was now £2.75million and was heading towards £3million and there were two components to this, the long term structural gap was a result of the council tax cap and the financial crisis, both of which had a great impact.

It was hoped that this could be addressed in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) through commissioning, shared services, establishing Trusts and Charities and working with other organisations.

It was important to note that the current budget deficit was not just a result of the financial crisis. The services CBC provided were not being sufficiently funded by central government or council tax and this had been the case for some time.

Members made the following comments;

- The suggestion was that members could have predicted the results of the public consultation, those front facing services which everyone benefited from would be saved (waste collection, etc).
- It was a good exercise, from which CBC got some good PR, but there was room for improvement. Some Officers weren't asking if the 'residents' lived in Cheltenham.
- It would be beneficial to include last year's figures, in order to allow identification of loss of income, etc. The budget should be broken down into needs and wants.
- The true value of certain things should be included, where residents get more for their money as CBC facilitates things and as such the value increases.
- Residents were sending a clear message and how were CBC going to address that. Whilst the amounts involved were very small, it would be unwise to ignore the public.
- The clear message was that residents didn't necessarily want services stopped but rather, that they be done differently.

The Chairman invited members to highlight specific areas for consideration by the Cabinet Member.

The following suggestions were made by individual members of the committee;

- If some of the money spent on public toilets went as a contribution to others, such as retailers, pubs and restaurants. This would negate the need to provide them and generate a saving.
- Cabinet needed to take a holistic view of back office services and look at whether things could be done differently.
- There were some difficult decisions for Cabinet which could lead to job losses and the suggestion was, start by looking at non-statutory services, specifically Pest Control.
- There was a Council in the South West which had closed it's public toilets and instead created a directory of toilets that people could use.
- Services like Food Standards and Pest Control could be done better/differently, perhaps with other local authorities.
- Moving from bi-annual elections would save £160k every election year.
- Cultural Management should not be dismissed because it had not worked in the past, with the Town Hall, Leisure@, etc, there was scope, that could not be ignored.
- The Strategic Partnerships did not add value and CBC should disengage now.
- Twinning should be delivered by the community rather than the local authority. If it was important to residents they could take responsibility.

Cabinet Member Finance and Community Development was grateful for the positive comments and suggestions from the committee. Whilst the public consultation had shone a light on certain areas, the key would be the strength of the arguments for and against. Politics apart, arguments mattered.

The commissioning agenda would allow for services to be repackaged and done differently and O&S would have a role to play.

The public toilets in Cheltenham were not in good condition, were expensive to run and the long term maintenance costs were excessive. Others had outsourced them, most recently Gloucester City, but the arguments for closing them needed to be balanced against public opinion.

The Chairman confirmed that the detailed budget proposals would be the main focus of the next meeting of the committee (10 January 2010).

12. CHELTENHAM YOUTH CAFE

Councillor Driver introduced herself to the committee and explained that it was her wish to establish a youth café type provision in the centre of Cheltenham. She had provided the committee with briefing notes over the course of the last 12 months, which had outlined progress.

The plan was to establish a charity under the umbrella of another charity rather than a stand alone charity. Cheltenham Community Projects (CCP) and the YMCA were both being considered.

The University of Gloucestershire were putting together a business plan and once a charity was formed they would assist with applications for funding. This along with the promise of continued support as it was relevant to a course some of their students were taking.

The next meeting of the Youth Café Group was scheduled for the 2 December 2010, at which point the group would look to form a Management Committee.

In relation to premises there had been initial discussions about the Montpellier Lodge, but CBC had decided that this was not a viable option. 3 St. Georges Place was now being considered as suitable premises and whilst the Art Gallery and Museum would move there whilst work was ongoing, they wanted to work to integrate the café sooner rather than later.

Councillor Driver explained that she had been overwhelmed by the level of support she had received from CBC, the Youth Service, the Police, the NHS, along with the University. The Rotary Club had also offered support as and when it was required.

The following responses were given to questions by members of the committee;

- It was anticipated that arrangements would be in place to allow for the Youth Café to open when the Art Gallery and Museum vacated the premises, in approximately 18 months. Though the aim was to gradually establish them selves during that time.
- Bewdley Youth Café was being used as the model. It would probably accommodate a maximum of 20 young people and would offer a chill-

out area, computers and another room which could be used for private discussions. It was hoped that eventually the young people would welcome the Police, NHS, etc to hold sessions.

- It would primarily be open evenings and during School holiday's, though the University were developing various options which could generate income during school hours in term time.
- The young people would be invited to form part of the Management Committee and in Bewdley, the young people policed the café themselves.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Driver for a useful update and suggested that the Youth Café would be scheduled on the work plan for approximately 12 months time for a further update.

13. CHELTENHAM FESTIVALS JOINT WORKING GROUP

The Chairman introduced the report which was circulated separately to the agenda.

He explained that the Cheltenham Festivals Joint Working Group (CFJWG) had been formed 18 months prior and members had included Councillors Smith and Hay (previously Rawson) from Social and Community and Councillors Barnes and Surgenor (previously Hutton) from Economy and Business Improvement, Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

The initial meetings were side tracked somewhat by the tender exercise for a new Box Office system at the Town Hall. Given that it had now been resolved, the Chairman was unwilling to go into further detail regarding this.

The terms of reference (item 2.2 of the report) set out the remit of the CFJWG.

The Working Group had met 8 times, 3 of which were joint meetings with CF and the focus was their 3 year business plan, with a view to identifying any risks.

A series of issues were raised with CF in September 2010 (Appendix 2 of the report) and on the 29 October 2010, CF outlined their business plan to the CFJWG. Providing updated information specifically relating to projected growth targets, they discussed financial projections and how the plan would be implemented in detail. The plan forecast a breakeven year in 2011, followed by 2 years of growth. Members challenged various assumptions made by CF but were satisfied that the issues raised were answered satisfactorily. CF were confident that their projections were realistic.

A number of key issues were identified that needed to be resolved urgently in order to allow progress (item 3.7 of the report).

The Chairman referred members to the 6 recommendations of the CFJWG, noting that recommendation 5 was put forward as a request from CF rather than a recommendation of the Working Group.

The Chairman invited Councillor Hay to contribute as the other Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny representative on the CFJWG.

Councillor Hay felt it was important to note that CF had received one-off funding to enable the purchase of their box office software. This would have an impact on CBC revenue and she reiterated the need for Cabinet to be clear with CF about the financial implications of this decision.

Having been a Cabinet Member almost 5 years ago, she had quizzed CF on progress over this period. Both sponsorship and ticket sales had grown, but they were still some way from total independence.

She did note that item 5.6 of the report should be amended to clearly reflect recommendation 5.

The Chairman invited members of the committee to ask questions.

Councillor Driver stressed that the Chief Executive of CBC had recently met with the Friends of Montpellier Gardens and would soon be meeting with the Friends of Imperial Gardens. The message had been that, as part of a commissioning approach to services, these groups could be given the opportunity to take responsibility of management of these gardens. She urged Members and Officers involved in discussions about more flexible use of these gardens to involve such groups.

The following responses were given to questions from members of the committee;

- The loss of the box office commission as a result of CF having purchased their own system would have a negative impact of approximately £71k on the Borough Council, though more detailed analysis was required. There was also unknown levels risk associated to this given that they would be competitors. CBC were confident that the INFX software was suitable for both organisations, however CF concluded that their additional needs ruled this out. CBC were not in a position to consider CFs preferred software and as such the CFJWG supported the Cabinet Members' recommendation to purchase INFX as the most cost effective option for the Council.
- CBC were not in a position to tell CF when, how or what festivals to run. The Music Festival would reduce in days but not in the number of events next year and this offered scope for increased revenue. CF had assured the CFJWG that if the Jazz Festival were not to improve, it would be stopped but members could not see why they would not consider merging it with the Music Festival.
- Whilst CF had requested that Cabinet consider delaying any reduction to their grant until 2012, they had not detailed what level of reduction they were expecting past 2011 and nor had they been asked to give that much detail.
- CF forecasts did build in large increases to sponsorship and CF had confirmed that they had some major new sponsors in the pipeline. The whole drive for more flexible use of the Gardens was based on wanting more space for sponsors. CF had commented that they were lucky to have use of the Town Hall but it wasn't working for them as a venue.
- Whilst CF had accepted that there would need to be a reduction in the grant from CBC they had asked that the Council consider that the Arts

Council based their level of funding on the support received by the local authority.

The Chairman moved to consider the recommendations.

Upon a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the recommendations of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Festivals Working Group be endorsed and they be recommended to Cabinet and Cabinet note the comments made at this meeting when considering the following recommendations;

1. **A report be considered by Cabinet which outlines how more flexible and sustainable use of Imperial and Montpellier Gardens can be developed.**
2. **A further review be undertaken of the existing Town Hall catering arrangements to ensure greater flexibility of use by Cheltenham Festivals. The original contract has been extended until August 2012.**
3. **Cabinet ensures that Cheltenham Festivals are clear about the on-going financial impact regarding the use of their newly acquired Tessitura box office system.**
4. **A joint strategic cultural plan for the town be developed as part of the 2011/2012 Corporate and Community Planning process.**
5. **Cabinet consider delaying any reduction to the grant until 2012 as part of the budget setting process, following a request by Cheltenham Festivals.**
6. **The appropriate monitoring arrangements be put in place which can be assessed by Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny at regular intervals in the future as set out in 4.5 of the report.**

14. COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

The Chairman referred members to the committee work plan as circulated with the agenda.

He highlighted that the next meeting of the Committee (10 January 2011) was almost entirely dedicated to the Budget.

The Chairman was looking to members to contribute to the work plan and asked that they email details to the Democracy Officer in order that she could table items at the regular Chair's briefings.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN DETERMINES TO BE URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION

There were no urgent items for discussion.

16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for 10 January 2011.

Duncan Smith
Chairman