

PLACE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Wednesday, 25 September 2024 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 1.25 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Liam Walker - in the Chair

Councillor Robin Bennett - Deputy Chair
Councillor Felix Bloomfield
Councillor Charlie Hicks
Councillor Nigel Simpson
Councillor Bethia Thomas

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury, Deputy Leader of the Council with Responsibility for Climate Change, Environment & Future Generations
Councillor Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management
Councillor Judy Roberts, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Development Strategy

Officers: Paul Fermer, Director of Environment and Highways
Robin Rogers, Director of Economy and Place
Teresa Kirkham, Head of Environment and Circular Economy
Evie Kingsmill, Evidence Manager at the Environment Agency
Jake Morley, Government and Stakeholder Engagement Manager with Thames Water
John Backley, Technical Services Manager for South Oxfordshire District Council and the Vale of the White Horse District Council
Terry Coupar, Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue
Sean Rooney, Head of Highway Maintenance
Paul Wilson, Operations manager (Highways Operations)
Clare Mills, Operational manager for Flood Risk Management
Carol Mackay, Resilience Manager
Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer and Director of Community Safety
Joseph Kay, Oxfordshire Transport Strategy Team Leader
Ben Smith, Strategic Transport Manager
Richard Doney, Scrutiny Officer

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except

insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

28/24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS
(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies were received from Cllrs Enright and Pressel.

Apologies were also received from Cllr Dr Ley, Cabinet Member for Public Health, Inequalities and Community Safety for item 6.

29/24 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
(Agenda No. 2)

There were none.

30/24 MINUTES
(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the 24 July 2024 meeting were **AGREED** as a true and accurate record.

31/24 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
(Agenda No. 4)

Robin Tucker spoke about agenda item 7, praising the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) for its thorough and progressive outlook. He emphasised the need for detailed monitoring and action plans to meet targets. Despite early successes, these were only initial steps in transforming Oxfordshire's transport network. Mr Tucker proposed developing a model to evaluate journey modes and the shifts needed to achieve LTCP targets and tackle future challenges.

Danny Yee discussed agenda item 7, stressing the need for a detailed plan to identify and monitor effective measures. He noted that East Oxford's achievements had been undervalued, as they exceeded the county's 2030 targets. Despite this, Mr Yee called for significant infrastructure changes to meet cycling and road safety goals, advocating for a bold reallocation of road space.

32/24 FLOOD EVENT RESPONSE
(Agenda No. 5)

The Committee invited Cllr Dr Pete Sudbury, Deputy Leader of the Council with Responsibility for Climate Change, Environment & Future Generations, Paul Fermer, Director of Environment and Highways, and Teresa Kirkham, Head of Environment and Circular Economy, to present the report.

The Committee was pleased to welcome external stakeholders, namely Evie Kingsmill, Evidence Manager at the Environment Agency (EA), Jake Morley, Government and Stakeholder Engagement Manager with Thames Water (TW), and

John Backley, Technical Services Manager for South Oxfordshire District Council and the Vale of the White Horse District Council. The Committee also welcomed the attendance of Terry Coupar, Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue, Sean Rooney, Head of Highway Maintenance, and Paul Wilson, Operations manager (Highways Operations), Clare Mills, Operational manager for Flood Risk Management, and Carol Mackay, Resilience Manager, to answer the Committee's questions.

The Deputy Leader opened the flood response discussion by highlighting recent heavy rain and flooding. It was emphasised that, while the report covered river flooding, the latest incident was caused by rainfall. The difficulty of managing significant rainfall quickly was emphasised, with a warning of worsening conditions due to climate change. The need for a long-term water management plan in response was stressed.

Cllr Hicks arrived following the introduction from Cllr Sudbury

The Technical Services Manager presented the findings and lessons on the part of his district councils from Storm Henk, outlining future actions for pre- and post-flood events. The challenges were also discussed like communicating with displaced residents and improving community resilience through effective flood protection examples.

The Evidence Manager outlined the EA's role during Storm Henk, covering flood risk management from main rivers, maintaining assets, mapping, and regulating activities. The EA forecasted floods, monitored river levels, alerted the public, ensured operational assets, and supported multi-agency responses. Key lessons learnt from the recent flooding included maintaining good responder relationships, effective coordination, forecasting challenges, resourcing issues, prioritizing flood warnings, the value of community officers in data collection, and high groundwater levels causing potential flooding.

Following the introduction, members raised a number of issues for discussion with internal and external officers including:

- What work, along with the planning department, occurred to create a more preventative than reactive response to flood events?

It was explained that South and Vale had a team of land drainage specialists, who reviewed planning applications to address drainage issues and ensured developers' proposals met Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) requirements, which were legally required. It was the district council's responsibility to ensure new developments managed water properly, and district engineers-imposed planning conditions accordingly. Constructions were inspected with flood modelling used to ensure developers' proposals managed water appropriately.

Members explored provision of sandbags across the county. The Technical Services Manager confirmed that South and Vale District Councils do not provide sandbags for flood defence, stressing the need for property owners to take proactive protective measures. Officers explained that sandbags were seen as

impractical due to resource limitations and that flood guards and barriers were more efficient in keeping floodwater out. Some communities may have had access sandbags through local emergency plans, reflecting a collaborative approach between community preparedness and local authorities.

- Following on from the discussion about the value of sandbags, members questioned what support and funding was available to individuals and communities to protect themselves from flood events.

The Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) introduced several flood recovery grants after Storm Henk, including business rate relief and a community recovery grant which were administered by the city and district councils. Those were now closed to new applications. There was also a Property Flood Resilience grant of up to £5,000 administered by the Council to assist home and business owners to improve the flood resilience of individual properties when repaired after a flood. This was available until the end of November 2024. It was reported that COBRA's Resilience and Emergencies division was considering additional recovery grants for current flooding to aid affected communities.

Parishes and towns that created Community Emergency Plans and lay wholly within the Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks area could also apply for grants from them to enhance community facilities to support the local response to a significant emergency.

- The Oxfordshire Flood Toolkit's main role was to offer safety information and resources and was not there to manage real-time incidents. There was recognition of the need to improve its accessibility for communities and councillors. This involved keeping the information current and effectively promoting it to a broader audience. The Resilience team had information packs which it was keen to distribute to parishes to boost awareness and usage of the toolkit and it was suggested that members could help to publicise this.
- Members impressed upon officers the need for improved communication with councillors regarding flooding incidents. It was highlighted that councillors required more information on what actions to take, whom to contact for assistance, and how to support their residents effectively during flooding events and also needed timely and accurate information to prepare for expected flooding.
- Members explored the process of releasing flood gates, and who was responsible for doing so. It was explained that the local Resilience forum would most likely handle such a situation as part of the multi-agency response. Additionally, it was possible to monitor the Shoothill gauge map online, which was publicly accessible at www.guagemap.co.uk. It was possible to observe spikes in water levels, indicating flood alerts or warnings.
- The frequency of drain clearance was raised and it was explained that the priority had been on ensuring the high-speed road network is maintained, which includes clearing gullies on these roads, as well as areas highlighted as vulnerable to flooding.

Shared ownership complicated maintenance and response efforts given that the Council owned a portion of the drainage network whilst Thames Water also owned a substantial portion.

It was emphasised that, even with frequent maintenance, the existing drainage system was unlikely to be sufficient to handle extreme weather events particularly with the increasing frequency and intensity of heavy rainfall, leading to flooding.

This discussion led to the questions of improving and upgrading various aspects of the drainage and sewage network, including pumping stations.

Thames Water's Government and Stakeholder Engagement Manager addressed the complexity of such upgrades, noting that while they can increase capacity, they must also consider where the additional water will go, emphasising the need for comprehensive planning to manage the water effectively. A wider range of preventative measures were needed to stop surface level watering entering the network.

- The Committee explored Thames Water's role and responsibilities related to post flood clean up and foul water discharge and was told that Thames Water was obliged to manage sewer overflows and ensure the network operated effectively. This included deploying tankers and crews to manage sewer overflows and clean-up efforts for excess liquids and debris.

The importance of multi-agency collaboration was stressed, to address broader water management and infrastructure improvement challenges. Whilst Thames Water used sewer depth monitors in certain areas to alert them when levels were too high, indicating a potential overflow, total monitoring coverage was not possible. There was a reliance on public reporting and reports from other services, such as Fire and Rescue, to manage issues effectively.

The Committee was advised there was no dedicated river dredging programme. Instead, maintenance and repair of watercourses were generally the responsibility of the owner of the land along the river (i.e., the riparian owner). The EA had some permissive powers to do maintenance on behalf of riparian landowners if necessary and had enforcement powers regarding maintenance to prevent flooding risks.

The Committee noted that the Lead Local Flooding Authority was required to compile a report under s.19 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 but that agencies working closely together was key to the timely completion of such reports. The Committee was concerned to hear that some reports were significantly delayed because some partners did not provide the relevant information. The Committee considered it vital that all partners should work together very closely to ensure swift delivery of s.19 reports.

Members also discussed whether The Water Services Regulation Authority (OFWAT) could take action regarding potential breaches of s.94 of the Water Industry Act 1991 which required sewage companies to maintain their sewers, ensuring that drain the affected area effectively. The Committee asked if the

Council had been in touch with OFWAT regarding any breaches of s.94 duties by sewage companies, given that enforcement by OFWAT could potentially lead to funding for infrastructure improvements.

Whilst officers agreed that it was a mechanism that had value and was worth exploring, collaborative work with partners, such as TW and landowners, was the priority to prevent flooding events and ensure flood preventing measures were implemented.

The Chair expressed the Committee's thanks to all those who had attended from all relevant teams and agencies.

The Committee resolved to **AGREE** recommendations to Cabinet under the following headings:

- That the Council should investigate how best to retrofit sustainable drainage systems, as well as other flood prevention measures, to Council maintained properties and streets.
- That the Council should improve communications to Members, raising awareness of the flooding Toolkit as well as active flood measures.
- That the Council should improve social media communication for residents during flooding and other emergencies.
- That the Council should commit to working closely with partners to ensure that s.19 reports are completed swiftly.
- That the Council should investigate the role and responsibilities of OFWAT and the potential for invoking s.94 measures.
- That the Council should promote the benefits of creating of community emergency plans by parish councils and support the Resilience team to do that.

33/24 OXFORDSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE IMPROVEMENT (Agenda No. 6)

Rob MacDougall, Chief Fire Officer and Director of Community Safety, was invited to present a report on Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service improvement.

The Chief Fire Officer introduced the significant improvement plan, highlighting it as a major change and addressing both His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) recommendations and broader service improvements. The Fire Improvement Board had been established and had its first meeting, with HMICFRS showing support for the approach. The recommendation was for the Committee to endorse the Fire Improvement Board as the method to track improvements and to agree that the Chief Fire Officer should report annually on progress.

Following the Chief Fire Officer's introduction, members raised a number of questions and concerns about the report, including the following:

- The scale of false alarms was highlighted by members as an area of concern. The Committee was advised that a consultation with the public about false alarms had been completed, and a new policy had been adopted to address this issue, the implementation of the new policy was delayed. This was to allow for broader engagement with the business community. The policy aimed to reduce the number of unwanted fire signals and is expected to have an immediate impact upon its implementation next month.
- The service received internal support from Oxfordshire County Council's IT and digital services and collaborated with external partners through the National Fire Chiefs Council to explore national data and digital solutions, aiming to enhance digital capabilities and boost efficiency and response times.
- The Committee was advised that the service was focused on improved communication around feedback processes. The introduction of an independent reporting line was highlighted as a measure to provide staff with a confidential way to raise issues.

Members expressed their concerns that since the previous report the service had seen a downgrade of all criteria to either adequate or required improvement. Members were assured that the grades in the report reflected a change in the grading system by the HMICFRS, which affected the overall assessment.

It was explained that if any areas for improvement were identified in the report, the service would automatically receive an "adequate" rating instead of "good." This change in grading criteria contributed to the shift in grades observed.

The impact of a significant pay dispute, which nearly led to industrial action, was acknowledged as having affected the service's capacity to focus on certain areas, potentially influencing the grades received.

The service was taking steps to address these issues, including improving communication around feedback processes and introducing an independent reporting line for staff to raise concerns, aiming to rebuild confidence in the feedback system and address the concerns highlighted by the HMICFRS.

- The proportion of staff reporting that they had experienced bullying and harassment was also highlighted by members. The need to address this issue was pressed by members who were curious as to what the service was doing to rectify this.

It was acknowledged that some staff had experienced bullying and harassment. It was demonstrated that the service was actively addressing these issues by focusing on resetting behaviours and values across the organization. This included introducing an independent reporting line for staff to raise concerns confidentially, aiming to improve the feedback process and ensure issues are addressed appropriately. Incidents of bullying and harassment were being

investigated thoroughly, with a commitment to taking robust action where necessary.

The service was also engaging in conversations across the organisation about standards, values, and behaviours, with a key focus on improving the culture and ensuring a supportive environment for all staff.

- Members questioned the diversity of the service and the general make-up of the Oxfordshire Fire and rescue service., including what changes had occurred to the service and whether there was a national trend behind recent changes or whether these changes were more unique to Oxfordshire demographics and trends.

During the discussion, it was highlighted that the Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service is actively striving to enhance diversity within the service. Whilst some progress has been made, such as an increase in operational female firefighters and a slight rise in firefighters from minority groups, it was noted that there was still substantial work required to improve diversity further.

It was also acknowledged that the service predominantly relied on on-call firefighters, which outnumbered whole-time firefighters, presenting challenges in retaining and recruiting personnel from diverse backgrounds. To tackle these issues, targeted recruitment and development strategies were being implemented to ensure a more diverse workforce.

- Members questioned whether the promotion process, which only 41% thought was fair with too many people in temporary promotions, affected the retention rate of the service. Questions were raised to what was being done to improve the promotion process and make the process more transparent.

The Chief Fire Officer explained that there were challenges with temporary promotions, with a number of part-time firefighters, and a commitment to running promotional processes more regularly to reduce their number.

The service was working on improving transparency and fairness in the promotion process, including explaining the process more clearly and involving individuals from outside the organisation on interview panels.

- It was noted that the number of home safety checks being carried out across Oxfordshire was substantially lower than the national figure. It was questioned whether this was policy, or if the service simply did not have the resources to carry out the requisite home safety checks.

It was explained that the Service was focusing on targeting the most vulnerable individuals for these checks.

While the overall number of checks had decreased, this approach ensured that resources are used more effectively to reach those in greatest need. The service was working on improving the precision of targeting vulnerable individuals through better engagement and understanding of community needs.

This strategy aimed to ensure that those who can benefit most from home safety checks received them, while acknowledging that some individuals could access safety information through other means.

The Committee resolved to request the following **ACTIONS**

- Include the expected and actual benefits and outcomes to new policies in future reports.
- That a representative of the HMICFRS should be invited to attend the annual report of Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service to the Committee.

34/24 LTCP PROGRESS REPORT

(Agenda No. 7)

Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management, and Cllr Judy Roberts, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Development Strategy, had been invited to present the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) progress report. Paul Fermer, Director of Environment and Highways, Joseph Kay, Oxfordshire Transport Strategy Team Leader, and Ben Smith, Strategic Transport Manager, were also present to answer any of the Committee's questions.

The LTCP progress report was introduced as having marked a major shift aimed at changing travel behaviours in the county. Despite difficulties in setting a relevant baseline due to COVID-19's impact on travel, there were positive trends like increased cycling, bus, and rail use, along with fewer road traffic casualties. However, vehicle miles and road emissions rose slightly. The report also mentioned delays in major policy implementations. The Committee was reminded that some of the data pertained to 2022 which made monitoring a challenge. There had also been delays to larger impact schemes owing to external factors.

Following the introduction, members raised a number of queries and questions for the Cabinet Members and Officers, including the following:

- Members noticed that the baseline measurement for the number of car trips had changed, and it was explained that this was because of changes to the way trips were measured and the need for a consistent base. In 2022, there was a 4% increase in car journeys when compared to 2019. In 2024, there was a 2.3% decrease when compared to the new baseline of 2022. Members were concerned that the change of baseline was not sufficiently clear and asked that where data was still unavailable for previous years that it was made clear that it was forecast data.

The Committee suggested that a change of target from a reduction in the number of car trips to reduction in car mileage, as it might provide a better correlation with carbon emissions and align with approaches used by other governments. This suggestion was accepted as logical and worth exploring, especially considering the difficulties in measuring car trips accurately.

- The Committee suggested that greater granularity in the data would be useful. The Committee recognised that the adoption of plans and strategies were examples of policy delivery. However, it considered that a greater distinction should be made in the monitoring report, and when reporting on progress generally, between the policies themselves and the physical infrastructure delivered as outputs of those policies. For instance, whilst multiple policies had been implemented, the relatively slow pace of the resultant infrastructure was of concern to members.
- The aim of mobility hubs was to intercept traffic outside the city to lessen congestion and emissions. They would facilitate a smooth switch from personal vehicles to public or shared transportation like electric buses or trains for the rest of the trip into the city.

This approach focused on transport decisions based on their overall impact on the place, not just individual modes. The goal was an integrated, sustainable, and efficient transport system that benefited the community and environment. Movement and place strategies were being developed to address specific area needs, improving mobility while maintaining the quality of the place.

- Members and officers discussed the School Streets scheme, in the context of its impact to reduce the number of car trips and encourage active travel methods.

It was mentioned that the scheme has been implemented in several schools, leading to a significant reduction in the percentage of children arriving by car and an increase in those cycling. There was a recognition that there was more of a need for children to arrive by private car in some areas but that School Streets were also about safety near school entrances.

The scheme's effectiveness was highlighted through data from Lark Rise Primary School, showing a reduction in car arrivals from 35% to 14% and an increase in cycling from 23% to 41%. This change equated to approximately 80 more children cycling instead of being driven every day.

It was highlighted by members that whilst the number of car trips had decreased, there had been an increase in vehicle miles, suggesting residents are making fewer but longer journeys. Members questioned what this data said about the successes of the LTCP. It was explained to Members that this trend aligned with national trends and was not specific to Oxfordshire.

The rise in road transport emissions for 2022 was expected, following the substantial decrease in 2021 due to COVID-19. Despite this increase, emissions remained lower than pre-COVID levels, primarily thanks to cleaner vehicles in use. There was a recognised need for more qualitative data to better understand the factors driving these trends, highlighting a gap in comprehension regarding certain changes.

- Members considered both the expenditure on and the significance of diverse schemes and surveys to evaluate their cost-benefit.

The pilot countywide travel behaviour survey was described as a European-funded initiative undertaken in partnership with the university, and it incurred no costs. This survey generated highly detailed granular information regarding the behaviours of Oxfordshire commuters, aiding in the development of policy.

The Central Oxfordshire Movement and Place Framework was highlighted as an important project set to revolutionise central Oxfordshire, beginning with Oxford City. This initiative aimed to develop an ambitious vision for the city, considering policies like traffic filters that will greatly diminish through traffic and allow for alternative uses of space. The framework addressed a range of elements, including tourist coach parking, urban greening, and improved connectivity via designated routes.

The Committee was advised that a feasibility study would put forward recommendations on making the city more accessible and sustainable, with a report anticipated in the spring of next year.

- Questions were raised about the significant gap between the numbers cycling in Oxford compared to the rest of the county. Members considered what more could be done to increase the cycling numbers in the districts.

Oxford city's higher rate of cycling was attributed to its much more concentrated geographic area, making cycling a more convenient and practical mode of transport. These same reasons were seen as barriers to cycling in the districts, as well as poorer cycling infrastructure and greater safety concerns.

The need for more qualitative research to understand these barriers and tailor interventions accordingly was discussed. However, there were ongoing efforts to improve cycling infrastructure across the county to encourage more cycling, with the Vision Zero policy acknowledged in relation to this issue.

- The discussion went on to emphasise the need for more granular data and enhancements regarding budget expenditures and policies related to the LTCP. Specifically, it addressed the difficulties in measuring specific LTCP targets like car trip reductions and considered a potential shift toward using car mileage as a more accurate metric.

Furthermore, the conversation highlighted the importance of differentiating between policy execution, reporting, and actual on-ground scheme implementation in future reports to better assess their impact on LTCP objectives.

It was also noted that aligning budget allocations with policy priorities is crucial to ensure that financial resources effectively support LTCP goals.

The Director of Environment and Highways recognised the need for future reports to provide more detailed information on successes, spending, and other aspects of budget monitoring.

The Committee made the following requests of the Director of Environment and Highways that, before submission to Cabinet, they should:

1. Edit the report so that the Delivery part (p52) turns from a bullet point lists to a table that has additional columns for:
 - a. Is this a policy document or on-the-ground scheme that been delivered?
 - b. If it is an on-the-ground scheme delivery, have an additional column on what the impact has been of this project on the headline LTCP targets (i.e. car trip/mileage reduction, active travel increase, road safety improvements).
2. Add more schemes to the future schemes (p57) section, including all capital transport schemes. Turn this into a table with additional column to give an estimate of how much this will increase or decrease the headline target metrics (e.g. What is the expected car trip/mileage reduction impact of the WPL? What is the expected car trip/mileage increase of a new bypass due to induced demand?).
3. For ongoing programme delivery (e.g. school streets), give an indication of whether the speed of delivery is on track to meet targets (e.g. is the pace of delivery of school streets on track at current schemes per year?) - and have a RAG rating for these for how on track this is to help meet the targets.
4. Include the Active Travel England Capability Ratings in the monitoring report (and any feedback from ATE on this rating).
5. Include the percentage on-the-ground delivery of LWCIPs for each of the LCWIPs in the monitoring report (e.g., How much of the Abingdon LCWIP currently exists in reality?)
6. Set out how much budget has been spent on different transport infrastructure modes in the last year (or over multiple years if this is an easier measure)? Including all transport capital, revenue, and maintenance spend. (e.g. how much money per capita is spent on active travel?). Categories of spend should include roads, cycle lanes and pavements.

The Committee resolved to **AGREE** recommendations to Cabinet under the following headings:

- That the Council, for the headline LTCP targets on car use reduction, should move from a car trip to car mileage reduction measure, aligning to Wales and Scotland on this (e.g. 20% car mileage reduction by 2030). If required, reach out to the Welsh and/or Scottish governments to learn from them on their data collection and metrics reporting for this measure

35/24 COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION TRACKER

(Agenda No. 8)

The Action and Recommendation tracker was **NOTED** with a request for an update on recommendations in progress.

The Committee the invited Paul Fermer, the Director of Environment and Highways, and Robin Rogers, Director of Economy and Place, to introduce themselves to the Committee explaining their roles and responsibilities.

The Director of Environment and Highways explained that he managed a wide array of duties, including road maintenance, safety, network management, supported transport, and environmental initiatives. His team handled street works coordination, parking enforcement, home school transport, recycling centres, local flood authority tasks, and major transport and infrastructure projects.

The Director of Place and Economy outlined his role, overseeing teams in Place Planning, Climate Action, Innovation Service, Future Economy, and Strategic Planning. He also noted his work in devolution policy and the Future Oxfordshire Partnership.

36/24 COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PLAN

(Agenda No. 9)

There was a discussion about some budgetary implications from the highways and maintenance budget forecast, including the 20% reduction in income received through parking levies. Members were informed that any underspend went back into the central pot to help with wider council pressures.

The Committee **AGREED** to the committee work plan with the addition of a review of cycle and footpath maintenance in February.

The Committee also agreed to the membership of the Transport Working Group, noting the inclusion of Cllr Haywood, who did not sit on the Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

37/24 RESPONSES TO SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

(Agenda No. 10)

The Committee **NOTED** the Cabinet response to the report submitted on Vision Zero.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing