

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday, 15 February 2023 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee Members Present:	Mr N Dixon (Chairman)	Ms L Withington
	Mr H Blathwayt	Mr P Heinrich
	Dr V Holliday	Mr A Varley
	Mr C Cushing	Mrs S Bütikofer
	Mr N Pearce	Mr J Toye
Other Members Present:	Mr T Adams (Observer)	Mr A Brown (Observer)
	Mrs W Fredericks (Observer)	Mr R Kershaw (Observer)
	Mr N Lloyd (Observer)	Mr J Rest (Observer)
Officers in Attendance:	Democratic Services and Governance Officer - Scrutiny (DSGOS), Democratic Services Manager (DSM), Director for Place & Climate Change (DFPCC), Director for Communities (DFC), Development Management and Major Projects Manager (DM), Economic Growth Manager (EGM), Assistant Director for Planning (ADP), Director for Resources / S151 Officer (DFR) and Planning Support Manager (PSM)	
Also in attendance:	Serco Contract Manager (SCM)	

126 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr S Penfold, Cllr N Housden, Cllr E Spagnola and Cllr P Fisher.

127 SUBSTITUTES

Cllr J Toye and Cllr N Pearce.

128 PUBLIC QUESTIONS & STATEMENTS

None received.

129 MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held on 25th January 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

130 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

131 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

132 PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None received.

133 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER

None received.

134 RESPONSES OF THE COUNCIL OR THE CABINET TO THE COMMITTEE'S REPORTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

The DSGOS informed Members that at the meeting held on 6th February 2023, Cabinet accepted the Committee's recommendations in relation to the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

135 WASTE CONTRACT: SERCO BRIEFING - TARGET OPERATING MODEL UPDATE

The SCM introduced the item and informed Members that the number of missed collections continued to decline with steady improvement seen week on week, except for the Christmas period when disruptions were expected. He added that Christmas issues were primarily related to collection crews not being contracted to work weekends, though this was being discussed as part of ongoing contract negotiations. It was noted that following the catch-up weeks, collections had returned to pre-Christmas levels, but improvement was still needed to reach the desired level of performance. The SCM stated that at present weekly missed collections stood at approximately 120, though it was hoped that this could be reduced to the pre-changeover performance below 100. He added that support vehicles remained in place and would stay until the service was stable, with further performance measures including weekly debriefs and potential sanctions being considered for continued poor performance. It was noted that supervisors were also assisting crews to address repeat missed collections.

Questions and Discussion

- i. Cllr J Toye asked if there were many bins that were consistently missed, to which the SCM replied that there had been repeat misses, but additional measures put in place with supervisors had significantly reduced this number.
- ii. Cllr V Holliday asked how recently the issues had been addressed, as she had been advised of repeat misses up to two weeks prior to the meeting. The SCM replied that the new processes had been implemented following the Christmas catch-up period, though some missed collections were still in the process of being addressed. He added that over the coming weeks missed collections could be expected to continue to fall as improvement measures took effect. Cllr V Holliday noted that total missed bin numbers had varied from 77 to 186, which appeared significant. The SCM replied that the most recent figure was 132, whilst the DFC noted that some degree of missed bins could be expected as these were counted as bins not collected on their scheduled day, though the significant majority would be resolved the following day. He added that there were some concerns about missed collections not being resolved within the rectification period, but the level of response was improving and was within the parameters of expected

performance.

- iii. Cllr C Cushing raised concerns that improvements were still required five months after implementation, and asked whether there was an expected completion date to reach pre-changeover levels of performance. The DFC replied that he expected this level of performance now, and continued to push to achieve this, as there was no reason it could not be done within the next few weeks. He added that the desire had been to achieve this within twelve weeks of the changeover, and officers would maintain the necessary level of pressure until this was achieved. Cllr C Cushing asked what additional actions would be taken to achieve this, to which the DFC replied that at their own expense Serco had applied significant additional resource, and possible sanctions as part of the performance improvement plan was a further step that had not previously been utilised.
- iv. Cllr J Rest shared a letter from a resident who had suffered as a result of eight missed bin collections and was seeking assistance. He added that the 48 hour resolution window had been missed twice and it was likely that this was not an issue unique to Fakenham, which usually had a good service. The SCM replied that road changes had caused some issues, and it may be that they required further optimisation to deliver expected service levels. He added that supervisors would be sent to resolve issues with any repeat misses with maps provided to collection crews to help resolve persistent issues.
- v. Cllr S Butikofer asked how performance in North Norfolk compared to other authorities on the contract. The SCM stated that Kings Lynn had a much lower number of missed bins, though the change from their previous operating model had been much smaller than North Norfolk's at only 15-20%. He added that Breckland's missed collection were slightly lower than North Norfolk's, but higher than Kings Lynn's. It was noted that changeover in Breckland had taken place six months prior and King Lynn's four months prior to North Norfolk's, which meant that both had been settling for longer which may partly explain improved performance. Cllr S Butikofer accepted that the other authorities were different and changes had taken place earlier, but asked whether there were any lessons learnt from other District's that could be implemented in North Norfolk. The SCM replied that collections were very different for both Kings Lynn and Breckland, though some process had been brought across and communication had taken place with the Kings Lynn contract manager to help improve processes. He added that workplace relations were different in Kings Lynn to Breckland and North Norfolk, which had a moderate impact on service delivery. Cllr S Butikofer stated that at the last Serco briefing she had been assured that working conditions were the same across all authorities on the contract, and asked whether this was still the case. The SCM replied that they had all been offered the same pay deal at the same time which Kings Lynn had accepted, but both Breckland and North Norfolk had rejected the offer with an updated offer now being considered. It was noted that a further contractual difference required Kings Lynn staff to work catch-up days on Saturday if required, but this had not been agreed elsewhere. The SCM stated that there may be other minor differences for those that had recently joined the service, compared to long-standing staff. He added that in terms of pay, sickness and holiday entitlement, this should be the same across all authorities.
- vi. Cllr H Blathwayt referred to increased service demands throughout the

summer and asked whether officers were confident that the increased workload would not cause a detriment to residents. The DFC stated that an increased service demand was expected in summer, but this should not present a major issue as Serco would take this into account when resourcing the contract. He added that some issues were unavoidable, such as restricted access caused by visitors parking vehicles on narrow streets. Cllr H Blathwayt stated that collections were at their quietest during February and March, and issues seen now would only be exacerbated during busier periods. The DFC replied that maintaining service levels was a contractual requirement and if required, Serco would have to provide additional resource.

- vii. Cllr T Adams stated that he was pleased to see a moderate reduction in the number of missed collections, taking into account those that could not be counted. He added that despite this the current performance levels were still not satisfactory, and more efforts were required to return to pre-changeover service levels. Cllr T Adams asked if any indication of when this would be achieved could be given, as it was possible that performance related deductions may need to be considered. The SCM replied that he had set a target of 60 missed collection per week, which would equate to approximately 50 per 100k which was considered good performance by many authorities. He added that a new reporting system was in development to improve the speed of reporting, and it was hoped that expected performance levels could be achieved by the end of February.
- viii. Cllr N Pearce asked why the same bins were being missed, to which the SCM replied that in some cases missed bins would be allocated to support crews to rectify, however support staff were in some cases unfamiliar with collection areas. He added that this process had now been changed with normal collection crews returning to missed collections themselves. The DFC noted that in most cases missed collections were caused by a lack of knowledge or poor performance, and Serco were actively seeking to address both issues.
- ix. Cllr V Holliday referred to bin returns and noted that she was aware of instances where bins had been left blocking narrow lanes. The DFC replied that it was a contractual requirement for bins to be returned to their collection point or the edge of curtilage, and if this was not the case these could be reported for rectification. He added that assisted bins were treated differently as the bins would be returned to their collection point on the property.
- x. Cllr P Heinrich noted that he had received no complaints with the service in his ward, though he was aware that some residents with assisted collection had to place notices on their property to remind crews. The SCM stated that there had been an increased focus on assisted collections with reminders set on collection vehicles and printed maps for loading staff. He added that the expectation was that no assisted collections should be missed.
- xi. The Chairman referred to the GAP analysis of contractual obligations and sought an update on progress. The DFC stated that officers had agreed a number of items that could be implemented by different means, or discounted if they no longer presented added value to the contract. He added that a delivery timetable had been agreed in principle for the remaining actions, subject to the minor amendment of errors. The DFC stated that overall Serco were close to resolving the gaps left in the contract and a realistic timetable was in place for full implementation by November 2023. It

was suggested in response to the Chairman that a final update on the GAP analysis could be provided nearer that time.

- xii. The Chairman referred to the introduction of battery collections and noted that some Parishes felt that they had not been properly informed of the collection details, and sought clarification. The SCM stated that battery collections had started in February with information shared on social media. He added that batteries could be placed in small bags and collected every week if placed next to bins. It was noted that small electrical item collections would begin shortly with information provided on bin leaflets, though the introduction would be phased across the District to avoid overwhelming collection crews. The Chairman noted that if the promotion of battery collections had been placed solely on social media, this would put many residents who did not use these services or the internet at a disadvantage. The DFC replied that there had been a degree of phasing with battery collections as collection crews had reached their capacity quickly in the first few weeks, but now the service was live communications could be improved to share the information more widely. He added that waste electrical equipment would be the same and had to be rolled-out in stages to ensure that collection crews would not be overwhelmed. It was noted that social media would be used less to promote the waste electrical item collections to provide more control over the phasing.
- xiii. Cllr N Lloyd stated that he was supportive of slow roll-outs of battery and waste electrical item collections to avoid overwhelming the collection crews. He added that he was proud that these collections could be offered as it supported the Council's environmental aims and improved the safety and efficiency of waste processing. On missed collections he stated that he was frustrated with ongoing issues but was confident that they would be resolved in due course, with over 99% of bins collected as expected. The Chairman stated that it was important to ensure that residents were informed of the phased roll-out so that it was properly understood across the District.

RESOLVED

1. To receive and note the briefing.

136 NORTH WALSHAM HIGH STREET HERITAGE ACTION ZONE - PROJECT UPDATE

Cllr R Kershaw – Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth introduced the report and informed Members that a new Project Manager was in place, three new businesses had opened in the market place, and the physical works had progressed despite delays caused by weather and a recently discovered sinkhole. He added that the sinkhole had been filled within 24 hours and contractors had since exceeded the laying rate of paving. Elsewhere work on Church Lane had begun, the wall around Black Swan Loke had been demolished with small buildings removed and works commenced on the Vicarage Road car park.

Questions and Discussion

- i. The Chairman referred to the requested breakdown of the £400k funding uplift and asked if further clarification could be given on how this would be spent. Cllr R Kershaw replied that issues with costing the breakdown were a result of the works being above the procurement threshold, which meant that

the Council had gone out to tender but were yet to receive a response, but the information could be shared once available. It was confirmed, following a question from the Chairman that Cllr Kershaw was aware of the full costs, subject to tenders being received. The Chairman noted that in order to justify the approval of this funding, it was important to understand how the figure had arisen, but it was not clear from the information supplied. Cllr R Kershaw replied that until the tenders were received, the speculative figures could not be provided as they would be unconfirmed and commercially sensitive. The EGM stated that the £228k designated for the market place came as a result of an overspend, therefore whilst this could not be broken down in constituent parts, the results could be drawn from an anticipated quantity surveyors report. He reiterated that to provide any more detail on the Loke works at this stage could prejudice the tender process. The Chairman suggested that the information could be provided as exempt if necessary, to which the EGM replied that the full figures were expected within two weeks and could be provided to the Committee once available. The Chairman suggested that it would be helpful to receive the full information in whichever format necessary as soon as possible. He added that difficulties in gathering tenders had not previously been made clear, but it remained important to understand how the funding request had been established, to which Cllr Kershaw confirmed that the figure requested was based on estimates.

- ii. Cllr C Cushing reiterated that it had been extremely difficult to gain information on the project, and it appeared that the reality was often different to what was reported. He added that he was pleased to see that the report had been split into constituent parts, though it would be helpful to include objectives, project timeframes, key milestones and progress for each. Cllr Cushing referred to the risk register and stated that there was very little information provided on the potential impact of risks and the mitigation actions taken. He added that it was also unnecessary to include two RAG statuses for each element of the project and therefore proposed that the risk register be reviewed by GRAC to consider potential recommendations for improvement. The EGM replied that the risk register contained two RAG statuses to show the risk pre and post-mitigation.
- iii. Cllr V Holliday seconded the proposal to refer the risk register to GRAC for review, given that some risks had fallen significantly following mitigation and she would like some reassurance that these calculations were correct. She added that the Cedars demand risk remained relatively high, and given that an adequate level of demand was the basis for funding the renovations, the level of risk should be given careful consideration. Cllr R Kershaw stated that he would be comfortable with the project and risk register being considered by GRAC. The DSGOS noted that a previous Committee recommendation had requested that the project's governance be reviewed by GRAC, and if approved, reviewing the risk register could form part of this work due for consideration in March.
- iv. Cllr N Pearce noted his concerns that information requested by the Committee had not been provided within the expected timeframes. The DFPCC replied that the issue was a matter of timing, and until the tenders had been received, it was difficult to provide an accurate response beyond the estimates already given. He added that as soon as the information was available, it would be provided at the earliest opportunity. The DFR added that estimates provided within the report were not well presented and this could be improved to help Members better understand how the funding

would be spent.

- v. The Chairman referred to measured term contracts outlined in the report and sought clarification from officers. The DFC replied that this referred to contractors with previously approved rates that the Council could utilise when required without the need for further procurement.
- vi. The Chairman noted that a recommendation to refer the project's risk register to GRAC had been proposed by Cllr C Cushing and seconded by Cllr V Holliday.

RESOLVED

- 1. To receive and note the update.**
- 2. To recommend that GRAC consider the project's risk register as part of its review of NWH SHAZ project governance.**

ACTIONS

- 1. Officers to provide detailed breakdown of costs included in £400k additional funding request once Tenders are confirmed, or if delayed then estimates provided in advance of March meeting.**

137 PLANNING SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN - ACTION PLAN

The DFPCC introduced the report and informed Members that the action plan had been prepared to address issues identified as priorities by the Committee. The PSM gave a presentation on the key points of the PSIP, the associated action plan, consultation responses and objectives. She added that key issues identified included speed of decision making, communication with stakeholders, access to information and the alignment of planning with sustainable growth interests. It was noted that since the Committee's last update on the Strategy two external consultations had taken place, alongside a PAS best practice workshop, with quick wins implemented and vacant posts filled where possible. The PSM stated that the public consultation had received 117 responses over a one month period with the key issues identified as communication improvements, speed of process and enforcement. She added that the Town and Parish Council consultation had received 53 responses with issues identified relating to communication, training, website improvements, enforcement and more regular updates. It was noted that the action plan had been developed using the responses as an evidence base, with actions categorised into people, process or performance.

Questions and Discussion

The Chairman referred to the consultation process and noted that he had not seen reference to developers, architects or agents, though many applications were received from these groups and their views were important. The DFPCC stated that developer forums would be held to facilitate discussions and identify important issues on a regular basis. The Chairman noted that whilst this would form a part of future actions, it would be helpful to understand whether these groups had formed part of the existing consultation, to which the DFPCC noted that these groups were able to respond to the public consultation with several known to have done so. He

added that there was only so much that could be achieved since the last update and that consultation would continue as a rolling programme with all future planning decisions requesting feedback on the service.

The Chairman noted that the consultation responses had highlighted enforcement as an issue, but this did not appear to be extensively covered within the action plan, and asked whether there was more work to be done to address the issue. The DFPCC replied that reviewing the enforcement process had not formed part of the original request made by the Committee, though the consultation response had raised some issues that centred around a lack of understanding of the enforcement process which did have to be addressed through education and better communication with complainants. He added that whilst a very small number of responses had expressed frustration with the length of time required to take enforcement action, there were other steps the Council could take to help speed up the process which would be covered as part of the PSIP. It was noted that two further posts had been recently recruited into the Enforcement Team which would help address the issues identified.

Cllr V Holliday asked whether the 3.8 FTE employees in Enforcement included the recently added staff, which the ADP confirmed as a result of the zero based budgeting exercise.

Cllr C Cushing stated that he had been contacted by an architect to raise issues with feedback on planning applications, who had also noted that the eight week target for decisions was often missed, with routine extensions given which did not appear to be the case at neighbouring authorities. The DFPCC replied that NNDC outperformed neighbouring local authorities for speed of decisions, whilst extensions of time had to be agreed by applicants and were not automatically applied. He added that most delays were the result of officers awaiting a response from statutory consultees that NNDC had no control over, and it was for this reason that the extension provision was provided. It was noted that the Council did use these extensions, but generally no more so than other authorities, but efforts would be made to reduce them. Cllr C Cushing noted that it may be a perception held by applicants, but if this was the case then efforts should be made to challenge these perceptions through evidence and benchmarking data.

Cllr J Rest referred to the first point of Member engagement on the action plan and requested that planning notices be taken down once applications had been decided or withdrawn, as he was aware of notices that had been left for several weeks after a withdrawal. The DFPCC replied that the planning notice system did require improvement, but issues were primarily the result of resource limitations, and priority was given to getting notices up rather than taking them down. Cllr J Rest stated that most Members would be happy to take down notices in their wards if asked. The DFPCC replied that automatic notices should be issued to ward Members if an application was withdrawn, but it may have failed on this occasion and efforts would be made to improve the automation processes. Cllr A Brown noted that there had been issues with some notices which included dates that did not match decision timeframes, which had adverse impact on Parish Council considerations. He added that a better automated system to alert Members of any changes to applications would help to resolve these issues.

Cllr J Toye referred to statutory consultee response times and suggested that it would be interesting to know whether neighbouring authorities had similar issues. The DFPCC replied that statutory consultees were struggling with limited resources, and one measure being taken to address this within the organisation was to re-

establish the Development Team approach to applications that would bring in statutory consultees into application discussions much earlier in the process. He added that the Council may also be able to implement planning performance agreements to determine when each stage should be completed. It was noted that improving communication to help applicants better understand the process would also improve service perceptions. It was confirmed following a suggestion from the Chairman that the next PSIP update could include an overview of Planning performance, benchmarked against other authorities, alongside data on delays caused by statutory consultees or other reasons such as nutrient neutrality, that could be used to form the basis of further improvement actions.

Cllr A Brown stated that the administration had set-out to put customer service at the forefront of the Council and the PSIP was a key part of this work. He added that despite this, the Council remained dependent on responses from statutory consultees that had all suffered from significant cuts. Cllr Brown noted that implementation of the plan would require significant resource and he had concerns that new rules allowing Council's the autonomy to set their own planning fees would come too late to address any resourcing requirements required to fully implement the plan.

The recommendation was proposed by Cllr J Toye and seconded by Cllr P Heinrich in addition to an action to request additional performance information discussed as part of the next PSIP update.

RESOLVED

- 1. That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee supports the Planning Service Improvement Action Plan.**

ACTIONS

- 1. Update on action plan to be added to 23-24 Work Programme, to include breakdown of performance as impacted by delays with statutory consultees.**

138 CAR PARK INCOME DATA MONITORING - OCTOBER 2021 TO SEPTEMBER 2022

Cllr T Adams – Council Leader introduced the report and informed Members that the report now included income from the Council's parking app, and whilst revenue may not match 2022 it would help to support many of the discretionary services provided by the Council. He added that there was more work to do, such as consideration of future management and enforcement options for larger car parks. It was noted that several of the car parks had received investment to ensure surfaces were maintained and ticket machines were up to date, which would continue as and when required.

Questions and Discussion

- Cllr V Holliday asked if the costs associated with each car park were known, as it would be difficult to know where to invest without this information, and suggested that it would be helpful to see net income for each car park. She noted that Weybourne car park appeared to have very low use, and asked whether this was correct given that it was usually a popular destination. Cllr Holliday referred to carbon impact and suggested that it was disingenuous to

suggest that the Council's car parks did not have an impact as they encouraged car usage. The DFC replied that work was underway to determine the management and maintenance costs of each car park with the intention to include this information within future reports. He added that Weybourne figures had been noticed by officers and an investigation was taking place to determine the cause of the reduction. It was noted that in terms of the carbon impact, as a tourism destination that was not served particularly well by public transport, car use was to some extent inevitable across the District and without car parks, visitors would likely park on residential streets. Moreover, it was noted that the content of the report itself did not have a carbon impact, as it was only intended for monitoring with no decision required.

- ii. Cllr C Cushing referred to the Limes car park in Fakenham and noted that there was no income beyond October, and asked if there was any explanation. The DFC replied that it was possible that it may be the result of a reporting error, but the car park was also subject to a permit system for a local business, which could have reduced the number of tickets being purchased.
- iii. Cllr H Blathwayt referred to the Stalham data and asked why the revenue had been so high over the summer period, to which the DFC replied that the data appeared to show that it had been sustained over some months and the income would be investigated. Cllr H Blathwayt asked whether contactless ticket machines would be rolled out across the District, as it was his understanding that they generated higher levels of income. The DFC replied that these had been installed where possible, but they relied on good network coverage, which was not available across all locations, which meant that some would remain cash based for the foreseeable future, though phone/app payment were an alternate option. Cllr H Blathwayt asked whether officers were satisfied that enforcement was effective across all of the Council's car parks. The DFC replied that parking enforcement was undertaken by a third party and whilst there were some perceptions that enforcement was lacking at peak times, officers did pursue the contractor to ensure that their obligations were being met. The Chairman asked whether ANPR had been considered to improve the enforcement process, to which the DFC confirmed that all technology would be considered but local authorities were not permitted to use ANPR.
- iv. Cllr L Withington referred to the impact of free parking spaces for short-term shopping trips and noted that it had a positive impact on Sheringham during the sinkhole issue, and asked whether there had been any investigation into increasing free parking provision. The DFC replied that further free parking provision had not been considered to any significant extent, as it had to be balanced against the value of car park income providing a crucial revenue stream for the Council to fund discretionary services. He added that free parking had been introduced in other town such as North Walsham to support high streets and it was right that this should be considered, where possible.
- v. Cllr J Toyne referred to comments made regarding the potential carbon impacts of car parks and suggested that whilst car parks needed to be retained for local residents, it could be helpful to consider an integrated transport strategy to boost public transport usage and reduce emissions in town centres. Cllr P Heinrich noted that the introduction of the travel hub in

North Walsham had improved the bus service and increased usage numbers. He added that the Hornbeam Road car park had also increased train use now that residents could park elsewhere.

- vi. The Chairman suggested that in order to determine where to invest in car parks in the future, it would be helpful to see net operating figures in future reports to better understand the costs of providing services. The DFC agreed but noted that maintenance works may be unevenly spread with much higher costs in some years than other for matters such as resurfacing works.
- vii. Cllr T Adams stated that air quality testing was undertaken across the District with the worst recorded being Hoveton, though it was suggested that the coastal areas were helped by stronger winds. He added that historical data from 2011 showed that approximately 11% of visitors were using public transport in the District, but more up to date data was required.

RESOLVED

- 1. To receive and note the report.**

ACTIONS

- 1. Future reports to include net income, taking into account management and maintenance costs.**

139 OFFICER DELEGATED DECISIONS - SEPTEMBER 2022 TO JANUARY 2023

Cllr V Holliday noted that there was a significant gap between the dates of decisions and the date they were reported to Cabinet, and asked if there was any explanation. The DSM replied that decision notices were often not received at the time of decision, and they were also reported in groups rather than one at a time which caused a slight reporting delay.

RESOLVED

To receive and note the report and the register of officer decisions taken under delegated powers.

140 THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The DSGOS noted that several property transactions were expected in March, but one item that may be of interest to the Committee was the Solar Port project, as the Reef's energy usage and decarbonisation were both topics previously considered by the Committee.

RESOLVED

To note the Cabinet Work Programme.

141 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

The DSGOS confirmed that the PCC had agreed to attend the March meeting to provide an update on his Policing Plan and any other pertinent issues, and that ambulance response times data had been requested from EEAST. He added that written replies had been received on questions relating to the Reef building work

sign-off, but a response on the enabling land was still required.

RESOLVED

To note the work programme.

142 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 12.33 pm.

Chairman