

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 28 January 2021
5.00 - 8.05 pm

Present: Councillors Davies (Chair), Collis (Vice-Chair), Barnett, Hadley, Matthews, O'Reilly, Payne and Summerbell

Executive Councillors: Massey (Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety), Moore (Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre) and Smith (Executive Councillor for Communities)

Officers:

Strategic Director: Suzanne Hemingway

Head of Corporate Strategy: Andrew Limb

Head of Environmental Services: Joel Carré

Head of Legal Practice: Tom Lewis

Community Funding and Development Manager: Jackie Hanson

Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager: Alistair Wilson

Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer: Helen Crowther

Committee Manager: James Goddard

Meeting Producer: Liam Martin

Others Present:

Director of Public Health: Dr Liz Robin

Consultant in Public Health: Dr Tony Jewell

Head of Community Services: Debbie Kaye

Senior Urban Designer: Nadine Black

CDO (Inclusion and Engagement): Ariadne Henry

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

21/1/EnC Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

21/2/EnC Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Councillor Barnett proposed, and Councillor Collis seconded, the nomination of Councillor Davies as Chair.

Unanimously resolved that Councillor Davies be Chair for the ensuing year.

Councillor Barnett proposed, and Councillor Davies seconded, the nomination of Councillor Collis as Vice Chair.

Unanimously resolved that Councillor Collis be Vice Chair for the ensuing year.

21/3/EnC Declarations of Interest

Name	Item	Interest
Councillor Hadley	21/12/EnC	Personal: Works for University of Cambridge Museums, who were a beneficiary of a grant.

21/4/EnC Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 1 October 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21/5/EnC Public Questions

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Raised the following points:
 - i. Queried why agenda item 9 'Market Square Project: Consultation Draft Vision and Concept Design' had been withdrawn.
 - ii. Referred to questions circulated before committee, these had not been answered.
 - iii. Asked where was the Draft Vision?
 - iv. Believed the City Council had not consulted people about the Market Square proposals.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Traders were recognised as part of the process.
 - a. Were included in the feasibility study.

- b. Were consulted in workshops eg January 2020.
- ii. The intention is to keep the market in the Market Square so this option was not widely consulted upon.
- iii. Some wording was used in workshops which (with hindsight) could have been better chosen. Such as asking attendees to keep discussions confidential.
- iv. The intention was to consult on the plan of the Market Square more widely.
- v. A report would be brought to March 2021 committee.

Supplementary question. Re-iterated:

- i. Request for earlier questions to be answered.
- ii. Traders had not been consulted.
- iii. Concept designs were unrealistic.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. Undertook to respond to questions after today's committee.
- ii. Would discuss with officers what could be updated to better undertake future workshops.

2. Raised the following points:

- i. The market was an ancient footprint on a modern city.
- ii. It was fragile and needed to be supported ie businesses helped to survive, particularly during lockdown due to Covid.
- iii. Asked councillors to liaise with traders to show support during work on the Market Square.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. Would advise (Ward) Councillors that market traders wanted to speak to them.
- ii. Accepted somethings could be handled better such as the closure of the Market Square.
- iii. Councillors and traders wanted the same thing.

21/6/EnC ROD Addressing the Implications for Businesses and the City Centre in the Context of the Coronavirus Restrictions

Public Question

A member of the public asked a question as set out below.

1. Raised the following points:

- i. Queried why there had been no consultation on the Market Square vision.
- ii. Queried if proposals were suitable for the area.
- iii. Referred to the petition on the Market Square.
- iv. Expressed concern that workshop participants were not allowed to discuss what they heard outside of workshops due to 'Chatham House rules'.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The use of 'Chatham House rules' in workshops would be reviewed in future.
- ii. History of Market Square project (funding):
 - a. A bid for funding was made to the Combined Authority Board.
 - b. The project to upgrade the market started.
 - c. The Combined Authority Board did not want to support a long term project, preferring shorter term ones such as installing seating for restaurants on the pavement.
 - d. The City Council changed its funding bid and was successful.
- iii. The project is to upgrade the Market Square so it has improved facilities to host a market seven days a week.
- iv. Communications about the market would be reviewed in future.
- v. The concept design would be consulted upon later in 2021.

Supplementary question:

- i. Were traders equal partners with the City Council on plans for the market?
- ii. What support would be offered to the market and traders?
- iii. The project appeared to have changed without input from the public.

The Executive Councillor responded:

- i. The Council could have been more careful in its language. The language used in future communications would be reviewed to avoid misunderstandings and ensure communications were clearer.
- ii. Re-iterated the proposal is to develop the Market Square to facilitate hosting a market seven days a week, and to have a better area to hold it in.

Matter for Decision

The decision was noted.

21/7/EnC ROD Closure of the City Centre Market

Public Question

Members of the public asked a number of questions, as set out below.

1. Raised the following points:

- i. Would the City Council guarantee continuity of business for the existing market traders throughout the proposed re-development of Cambridge market?
- ii. Continuity of business required an excellent, transparent and direct communication between Council and market traders to create the trust needed to succeed.
- iii. Would the City Council commit to driving this communication throughout the entire process; from requirements to an improved operational market?
- iv. The Change.org petition to re-open the market clearly demonstrated the breadth and depth of support for essential food supplies being traded on the Market Square.
- v. A recurring theme in the comments and stated by the traders to their customers was that communication with the City Council needed to be much more direct, frequent and more open.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The Market Square was closed (for a short period of time) due to public health concerns in lockdown otherwise the aim was to keep it open.
- ii. It was still unconfirmed where the market would trade whilst work was being undertaken on the Market Square.
- iii. Some essential maintenance was required in the Market Square (eg electrics) even if the project did not go ahead.

Supplementary question:

- i. Re-iterated request for better communication to keep traders informed of actions/activities relating to the Market Square.

2. Asked for clarification on how/why the Market Square was closed.

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. She made the decision to close the Market Square as Strategic Director following a meeting with City Council and Public Health Officers.
- ii. She took advice from the Deputy Director of Public Health at a meeting, then followed this up with the Director of Public Health via email. The Strategic Director discussed her proposal with the Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre then took the decision to close the Market Square and made a press release setting out the reasons for doing so.
- iii. The situation had now changed so the Market Square was re-opened.
- iv. The decision had been made in-line with council processes and published on the City Council website.
- v. The decision was made on information (including picture) supplied from City Council and Public Health Officers regarding overcrowding in the Market Square.

Supplementary question:

- i. Reasons for the decision to close the Market Square should be made public.
- ii. There was a suspicion the decision was made on anecdotal evidence not the real situation.

3. Raised the following points:

- i. Referred to the Change.org petition to re-open the market.
- ii. Express shock that only two days notice was given for the Market Square closure.
- iii. Expresses concern:
 - a. At the information traders were given about the reasons for market closure.
 - b. Private organisations facing onto the Market Square (eg Sainsbury's) could remain open whereas market traders could not.
 - c. Lack of communication between the city council and traders about how to operate in lockdown.
- iv. Queried how the relations between City Council Officers, market customers and traders could be improved.

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. Covid levels were rising when the decision was taken to close the Market Square. People were not following social distance regulations so public health advice was to close the Market Square.
- ii. The City Council worked closely with traders and partner organisations.
- iii. Accepted there was a negative impact on traders from the market closure.
- iv. The City Council offered support to traders. Please see agenda item 6 report for details. Traders were encouraged to claim support on offer from various schemes operated by the City Council on behalf of Central Government.
- v. The Market Square was quickly re-opened with the support of Public Health.
- vi. The public had faith in the market, they may choose not to visit at present.
- vii. Traders had developed various ways to support customers who did not visit the market eg making deliveries.

Supplementary question:

- i. Stated it was safe to shop outdoors.
- ii. Disagreed that the market was responsible for increasing Covid infections in the city.
- iii. Took issue with the fencing and marshalling around the market.

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. Agreed the market did not directly cause Covid. Anywhere where people came into close proximity when Covid levels were rising was a concern as infection levels were spreading.
- ii. The Council could not control private premises but could control its own areas eg the Market Square.
- iii. Fencing and marshalling around the Market Square was being reviewed alongside public health advice.

4. Raised the following points:

- i. Had received no response to earlier questions.
- ii. City Covid levels were below the national average.
- iii. It was harder to catch Covid in the open air than in an enclosed space.
- iv. Closing the market forced people to shop indoors in supermarkets etc.
- v. People were not consulted on the market closure.
 - a. There were limited communications between the City Council and traders.
 - b. A transparent consultation process was required in future regarding any possible market closures.
- vi. Marshalling around the market was ineffective.

The Strategic Director noted the comments.

5. Only a limited number of traders were allowed to operate on the market. Queried when others could return.

The Head of Environmental Services responded:

- i. The City Council was working with Cambridge Market Traders Association on how to operate now and in the future, to give traders as much notice as possible.
- ii. Officers were working on a plan to maximise the number of traders who could operate in current lockdown conditions. Not all traders could be accommodated in the Market Square so satellite sites/locations were being considered.

Supplementary question:

- i. Requested better communication with traders on when they could come back.

The Strategic Director responded:

- i. City Council Officers tried to contact all traders by phone before making a press release about closing the market.
- ii. The City Council was meeting with trader representatives to pass on information.
- iii. Actions taken were dependent on advice from Public Health colleagues.
- iv. Communication with traders would be reviewed in future.

6. Raised the following points:

- i. The Market Square felt like a prison. This was unacceptable.
- ii. Took issue with the reasons given for closing the market.
- iii. Requested a statement from the City Council that it was safer to shop outdoors than indoors.
- iv. Re-iterated this was a historic market.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The intention was not to make the Market Square feel like a prison. The City Council was liaising with traders about the fencing and some had been removed.
- ii. The 'demountable' stalls that traders disliked would be replaced. Details would be shared with traders once a prototype had been developed. Details were set out in (former) agenda item 9 report.

Supplementary question:

- i. Took issue with proposal for new market stalls.
- ii. Re-iterated request for a statement from the City Council that it was safer to shop outdoors than indoors

7. Councillor Porrer raised the following points:

- i. Expressed concern about the lack of consultation on the Market Square closure.
- ii. Traders had expressed concern about the lack of communication about support available.
- iii. Referred to Liberal Democrat and Change.org petitions about the market.
- iv. Welcomed more Covid Marshalls but requested they treated the situation carefully as public perception needed to be sensitively managed.
- v. Asked the Executive Councillor to reassure Market Ward Councillors the situation would be resolved as soon as possible.

The Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre responded:

- i. The decision to close the Market Square was taken as an urgent decision due to the perception of public risk, so there was no time to consult people. The process will be reviewed and lessons learnt on how to improve the process in future.
- ii. The Executive Councillor did not specifically release a communication the Market Square was re-opened as she had confidence in officers' actions.
- iii. The Executive Councillor had received a lot of correspondence so was unable to respond to it all.
- iv. She would learn lessons from this experience and work closely with Ward Councillors in future regarding communication.

Matter for Decision

The decision was noted.

21/8/EnC Review of Use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act

Matter for Decision

A Code of Practice introduced in April 2010 recommends that Councillors should review their authority's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and set its general surveillance policy at least once a year. The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety and Environment and Community Scrutiny Committee last considered these matters on the 16 January 2020.

The City Council has not used surveillance or other investigatory powers regulated by RIPA since February 2010.

The Officer's report set out the Council's use of RIPA and the present surveillance policy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety

- i. Reviewed the Council's use of RIPA set out in paragraph 3.5 of the Officer's report.
- ii. Noted and endorsed the steps described in paragraph 3.7 and in Appendix 1 to ensure that surveillance is only authorised in accordance with RIPA.
- iii. Approved the general surveillance policy in Appendix 1 to this report.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The committee made no comments in response to the report from the Officer.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/9/EnC Market Square Project: Consultation Draft Vision and Concept Design

The Council received a written challenge that it failed to follow its legal obligations under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, in relation to a report referred to in Appendix A (Market Square Project Concept Design) of the above agenda item. The basis of the challenge is that this report should have been made available as a background document to the agenda item.

The report referred to in Appendix A of the agenda item relates to an assessment, currently being undertaken by consultants, of how the associated capital and revenue investment needs of the Project could be met; and how the operational management of the outdoor market could be improved through the Project. At the time of agreeing the current agenda item, this outstanding consultancy work was assessed by officers as not being directly material to the Consultation Draft Vision and Concept Design agenda item. The officer's plan was to bring it to the July 2021 Scrutiny Committee, as part of the agenda item reporting back on the concept design consultation and, subject to the outcome, the adoption of the recommended design/ plan to go forward to the detailed design stage of the Project.

In the interests of maintaining openness and transparency, officers have reviewed whether or not to proceed with the current agenda item, and have taken the decision to temporarily withdraw it, pending completion and sign off of the consultant's report referred to in appendix A. Officers aim to bring this item back, together with the additional background report, to Scrutiny Committee on 25th March 2021.

The Council apologises for any inconvenience or disappointment caused by having to make this late deferral decision.

21/10/EnC Developing a Litter Strategy for the City

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report made recommendations on the development of a Litter Strategy for Cambridge City.

The Strategy would comprise of four key parts:

- i. A strategic vision including a set of principles and policies.
- ii. An appraisal of current service issues identifying areas of opportunity and setting out a current position statement.
- iii. A review of current and potential future behavioural change activities, including awareness raising, education and enforcement, to help deliver the Strategy.
- iv. An action plan which sets out a phased programme of activity to deliver the Strategy.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Climate Change, Environment and City Centre

- i. Supported the development of a litter strategy for Cambridge as outlined in the report.
- ii. Approved the terms of reference set out at 4.3 of the Officer's report:
 - a. The programme of work to achieve the Strategy as set out in the Project Initiation Document (appendix A) subject to approval by Business Transformation Board.
 - b. The use of community and stakeholder engagement and
 - c. Research to support the development of the Strategy.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The Strategy would introduce new recycling initiatives.
- ii. There was no data at present on where bins would be located or how often they would be emptied. The intention was to look at where efficiencies could be gained based on consultation feedback.

The Executive Councillor welcomed recommendations on bin locations and litter hot spots from the public.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/11/EnC Public Art Commission and Strategy

The Executive Councillor asked the committee to note the death of a member of the public art panel.

Matter for Decision

In June 2018, Environment and Community Services Scrutiny Committee considered a report that set out the future aspirations for public art in the City, and the need to update the Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), in light of changes to the national planning system and planning regulations, and to support the new Local Plan. The report included the requirement to undertake an evaluation process and have a 'Big conversation'¹ about public art to inform future Policy work.

Following a process of evaluation through 2019/20, the Officer's report sets the direction of travel to develop a Public Art Strategy (Strategy) for Cambridge and makes recommendations on the process and methodology required to ensure that Cambridge continues to be at the forefront of public art commissioning and delivery.

The Officer's report set out the work that has been undertaken so far, and the work to be completed to secure the Strategy and future policy for public art provision in Cambridge.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Supported the use of the draft Manifesto for public art in Cambridge and the process set out in the report for researching and developing new public art policy.
- ii. Approved:
 - a. The process for taking the work forward, including the formation of a cross departmental Working Group.
 - b. The Terms of Reference for the Working Group set out at 4.2.
 - c. The use of consultation and research through events and a public survey, to test the draft manifesto and support the development of Policy.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

¹ Proposed for February to March 2021

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager.

The Streets and Open Spaces Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Officers could revisit the manifesto text to clarify links between public art, health benefits and biodiversity.
- ii. An Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken on artists. Procurement rules can be used to focus on people with the required characteristics such as able to represent the local community.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/12/EnC Community Grants 2021-22

Matter for Decision

This was the annual report for the Community Grants fund for voluntary, community, and not for profit organisations. It provided an overview of the process, eligibility criteria and budget in Section 3 and Appendix 1 detailed the applications received with recommendations for 2021-22 awards.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

- i. Approved the Community Grants to voluntary and community organisations for 2021-22, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report, subject to the budget approval in February 2021 and any further satisfactory information required of applicant organisations.
- ii. Approved the following grants for 2020-21 as detailed in Section 4:
 - a. £15,000 – Cambridge Online (devices and data).
 - b. £10,000 – Cambridge Sustainable Food (hygiene and food supplies).
 - c. £20,000 – Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (Coronavirus Fund donation for City projects).

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Community Funding and Development Manager.

The Community Funding and Development Manager said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. Community grants were not specifically aimed at supporting projects that supported biodiversity. Projects may impact indirectly on environmental policy. Grants were awarded to projects that met assessment criteria. The Community Funding and Development Manager offered to liaise with Councillors about this after the committee.
- ii. Officers actively monitored groups, funding applications and what funding could be given to support projects that would make a difference for residents. The intention was to provide maximum flexibility in awarding grants.
- iii. Officers worked with other teams to provide a joined up signpost on what funding was available so people could be directed to apply to another stream if one was unsuitable.

The Committee resolved by 7 votes to 0 to endorse the recommendations.

Councillor Hadley did not take part in the vote.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/13/EnC Use of the Anti-Poverty Responsive Budget**Matter for Decision**

The Officer's report recommended extending the scope of the council's Anti-Poverty Responsive Budget to include projects delivered by community groups as well as those delivered or managed by council services. This would

represent a change from the criteria agreed when the fund was proposed in a committee report in June 2018.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Agreed that the council's Anti-Poverty Responsive Budget can be used for community-led as well as council-led projects that help deliver the objectives of the Anti-Poverty Strategy.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Head of Corporate Strategy.

The Head of Corporate Strategy said the following in response to Members' questions:

- i. The budget process set out if funding was allocated to support projects or not. The Officer's report set out how it would be used if so.
- ii. The funding, if allocated through the Budget-Setting Report would effectively be held in reserve in case it were needed.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/14/EnC Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on BAME Communities in Cambridge During 2020

Matter for Decision

The Council passed a motion on 16 July 2020 in support of Black Lives Matter. One of the actions identified in the motion was to: "Request from the Director of Public Health a report on the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on BAME communities in Cambridge by the end of 2020, to be reviewed in the Environment and Community scrutiny committee, and shared with BAME

community representatives.” The report from Public Health is attached as Appendix A to the Officer’s report.

In addition, the Officer’s report provided details around how Cambridge City Council has been supporting Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic communities in 2020 during the coronavirus pandemic, especially relating to sharing Public Health messaging through community leaders.

Decision of Executive Councillor for Communities

Noted the content of the Officer’s report and Appendix A.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer’s report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The Committee received a report from the Equality & Anti-Poverty Officer.

The Director of Public Health said the following in response to Members’ questions:

- i. Public Health see vaccination take-up as a key priority in overall control of Covid and are offering support to the NHS that is leading on the vaccination work.
- ii. There is indication of vaccination hesitance for different groups in the community, especially some BAME groups.
- iii. Since the start of the pandemic, Public Health has worked closely with the network of district and city councils across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to develop links with a range of community leaders trusted by different ethnic minority communities. Where there have been updates to Public Health messaging this has been co-produced with residents. For instance, there have been video blogs produced in different languages and read by community leaders.
- iv. Referred the committee to weekly Covid-19 Gold Group updates on the Covid situation in the city. Suggested councillors liaised with the Strategic Director (who sat on Covid Gold Group) and council officers to pass on ‘soft’ data on how best can work together to help engage different communities in the take-up of vaccinations.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendation.

The Executive Councillor approved the recommendation.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillor (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

21/15/EnC Update on the Work of Key External Partnerships

Matter for Decision

The Officer's report provided an update on the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board and Cambridge Community Safety Partnership as a part of the Council's commitment given in its "Principles of Partnership Working".

The rise of the pandemic this year has disrupted some of the planned activity of the partnerships to allow the wider systems to focus on the immediate priorities of responding to the pandemic and planning for future recovery and resilience.

During this time partnership working both with other public agencies and local communities has become more important than ever as new arrangements and ways of working have emerged. This report, however, looks at the business of the partnerships in question and does not look to these wider partnership arrangements, which have been the subject of other papers to members.

Decision of Executive Councillors

- i. The Executive Councillor for Communities agreed to continue to work with the Cambridgeshire Health and Wellbeing Board and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Committees to ensure that public agencies and others can come together to address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge City, and that the concerns of citizens are heard.
- ii. The Executive Councillor for Transport and Community Safety agreed to continue to work with the Community Safety Partnership to ensure that public agencies and others can come together to address the strategic issues affecting Cambridge City, and that the concerns of citizens are heard.

Reason for the Decision

As set out in the Officer's report.

Any Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

Not applicable.

Scrutiny Considerations

The committee made no comments in response to the report from the Head of Corporate Strategy.

The Committee unanimously resolved to endorse the recommendations.

The Executive Councillors approved their recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest Declared by the Executive Councillors (and any Dispensations Granted)

No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillors.

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm

CHAIR