

## **MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 11 JANUARY 2022 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.45 PM**

### **Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Pauline Helliar-Symons (Chairman), Alison Swaddle (Vice-Chairman), Sam Akhtar, Rachel Burgess, Jim Frewin, Guy Grandison, Norman Jorgensen, Sarah Kerr, Rebecca Margetts, Jackie Rance and Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

### **Other Councillors Present**

Councillors: Parry Batth, Gary Cowan, Lindsay Ferris, Gregor Murray and Shahid Younis

### **Officers Present**

Laura Buck, Green Infrastructure Special Project Manager  
Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist  
Andrew Collins, Specialist Climate Emergency Officer  
Rhian Hayes, Interim Assistant Director, Housing and Place  
Francesca Hobson, Service Manager, Green & Blue Infrastructure  
Steve Moore, Interim Director, Place and Growth  
Will Roper, Customer Insight Analyst and Performance Manager  
Grant Thornton, Category Manager, Economic Prosperity and Place  
Callum Wernham, Specialist, Democratic and Electoral Services

### **13. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Paul Fishwick and Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey.

Lindsay Ferris attended the meeting as a substitute.

### **14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 November 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to:

Minute 19 – Anti-Poverty Strategy – the final paragraph being amended to include the following statement:

“In relation to the co-production of the strategy, it was highlighted that not all VCS partners feel like they are properly engaged and have a seat at the table to write and develop this strategy. It was confirmed that this would be happening going forward and a member or members of the VCS will be present at subsequent scrutiny meetings where this is on the agenda”.

Minute 20 – Unlawful Encampments – add new Resolution 5) as follows:

“5) the Committee receive further information on the outcome of national consultations relating to unlawful encampments”.

### **15. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **16. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

## **17. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

### **17.1 Gary Cowan asked the Chairman the following question:**

Agenda item 63 – Climate Emergency Action Plan.

#### **Question**

On carbon savings, the report states over the last year Wokingham Borough Council has worked in setting the ground to deliver projects that will increase the generation of renewable energy across the Borough....

And also the following:

My Journey completed summer and winter competitions in primary schools, and are currently running a film competition for secondary school students; but goes on to say that there are no new actions for this section.

My question is then: why did this Council create a situation where children who live In Arborfield Green, including those living directly opposite the new school gates were not allowed to go there and they have all had to be driven to other primary schools miles away from where they live. How will this achieve carbon saving?

#### **Answer**

At a strategic level our planning for the Borough's Strategic Development Locations (or SDLs) has been underpinned by principles of creating sustainable communities that can sustain local access to services and amenities whilst minimising the need to travel. This is also underpinned by sustainable transport options both within and between SDLs and with existing main towns. Ensuring primary school provision to meet future anticipated need within these new communities has always been a key priority and, although pre-dating our Climate Emergency, fully in line with the principles of sustainable development by reducing the need to travel and minimising carbon impact.

Of course, in detail at any one point in time changing the overall pattern of primary provision and seeking to balance demand versus school places available across the system will never be an exact science and there will always be some anomalies. It is anticipated that these will reduce over time as these new communities mature.

With regard to Arborfield Green, the new school premises could not open as a new school in 2021, as there was insufficient local need to ensure that all local schools, including potentially both the Farley Hill Primary School and the Coombes CofE Primary School, in the Arborfield ward, could remain financially sustainable. In theory, relocating the Farley Hill Primary School would enable significant numbers of children from the former Arborfield Garrison, Arborfield Green and Finchwood Park areas to benefit from a school they could walk to, at the earliest opportunity. It also addressed the long-standing issue of some undersized classrooms in the original Farley Hill School building.

There has never been any intention that the new school would accommodate all the children living in the garrison area. In all, ninety children living in the garrison area were admitted to Wokingham primary schools in 2021 – accommodating all of them in a new school would have effectively wiped out the intake to a number of schools.

In more detail, the decision to build the new school was taken before the pandemic, when experience in Shinfield was that new housing could lead to rapidly rising rolls. The intention was to avoid children having to be driven to school. It became apparent in 2020 that demand was unlikely to increase to a level to make a new school viable (as a stand-alone school) or, if it had been filled and so was viable, the significant fall in the rolls of other schools would have threatened their viability.

A significant contributor to this lack of demand was the cessation of house building in the early part of the pandemic. Therefore, the decision was taken to relocate Farley Hill school with a phased expansion from the current 30 places per year through 60 to 90, in line with the the expected growth in the number of families in the area currently served by Farley Hill and the Coombes.

So, although the plan is to expand the school to offer 60 places from 2022, there is no expectation that all garrison area families will be accommodated (as is clear in the November 2021 report to the Executive) and there was no expectation that this would be the case in 2021. Indeed, the January 2020 Executive paper was clear that expansion above 30 places hinged on the impact on the Coombes.

Incidentally, I share your concern, as do headteachers. As a former Executive Member for Children's Services and a former deputy head I am well aware that without a minimum number of children no school can be financed and, therefore, cannot function.

You may be interested to know that the newly formed Education Partnership, which includes 10 headteachers and the Director of Children's Services, are going to discuss school places at the first meeting at the end of January.

### **Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much, that is actually very helpful. The point really is that, if the developer had submitted a plan to build 2,000 houses on Arborfield Garrison and stated that he was not going to provide a primary school for the occupants of those houses the Council, quite rightly, would have refused that planning permission. So, it is very clear that the purpose of building that school was to accommodate the children on the garrison, for obvious reasons. The developer marketing those houses achieved sales because he offered a school on site – children could walk or cycle to school. This is all very "green" and is actually laudable.

My question is, how can the Council justify what you have just said and how does it bode for future large-scale developments? History shows that the Council cannot be trusted to deliver on the promises made, particularly on this site.

### **Supplementary Answer**

I think that the essence of supplementary the answer was contained in my first answer. I will highlight that part.

A school can only be viable if it has sufficient numbers of children. Otherwise, it does not attract the finances. If you put all the children into one school in an area, that has an impact on surrounding schools which, of course, we do not want to undermine. As for the Climate Emergency, everything is a balance. Yes, we are committed to it but, at the same time, we are committed to keeping existing schools open. Nothing is as straightforward as we would like it to be, unfortunately. The fact is that the Council is aiming to support all primary schools, not just one at the expense of another.

## **18. Q2 2021-22 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 65 to 82, which gave details of performance management for the period July to September 2021 (Quarter 2). The report gave details of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which measured how each service was delivering against its current objectives.

Steve Moore (Interim Director, Place and Growth), Will Roper (Customer Insight Analyst and Performance Manager) and Shahid Younis (Deputy Executive Member, Insight and Change) attended the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions.

The report included 46 KPIs which were intended to be SMART targets (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely), taking into account historic trend information and benchmarking. The KPIs were assigned a RAG status (Red for on target, Amber for close to target and Red for missing the target).

The following KPIs were reported as Red for Quarter 2 of 2021/22:

- KPI AS1: Social work assessments allocated to commence within 7 days of the requests (counted at point of allocation).
- KPI AS4: Safeguarding timeliness – concerns completed within 2 working days.
- KPI AS7: Proportion of people receiving long term care who were subject to a review in the last 12 months.
- KPI RA3: Usage of Wokingham Leisure Centres.
- KPI RA4: Participation in leisure activities to support those who may be experiencing social isolation.

The report gave details of the corrective action being taken to address these Red KPIs. Of the five Red KPIs it was confirmed that the three adult social care indicators were deliberately stretching with the intention of driving improvement in the service. The other two Red KPIs related to the leisure service and reflected the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The report also stated that five KPIs had moved from Amber to Green whilst one KPI had improved from Red to Amber.

In the ensuing discussion, Members raised the following points:

Children's Services Challenges (page 22 of the Agenda) – Recruitment of qualified Educational Psychologists creating a capacity issue impacting on EHCP assessment performance. It was suggested that this issue should be referred to the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny for further consideration. It was agreed that this issue would be considered at the next meeting of the Committee as part of its forward programme.

CS6: Percentage of 16/17 year olds Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) (Page 41) – this was a new indicator replacing the previous indicator Percentage of Care Leavers who were NEET. That indicator had set a target of 52% compared with the new target for all 16/17 year olds of 97%. It was queried why the original indicator had been

archived without reference to the Committee. It was felt that the KPI should have the same target for care leavers as for all other children. It was confirmed that the Interim Director of Children's Services would be happy to discuss this and other KPIs highlighted by Members. The process for identifying KPIs was also confirmed. This involved discussion between Directors and the relevant Assistant Directors, followed by agreement with the relevant Executive Member.

RA8: Capital Budget Monitoring Forecast Position (Page 54) – the indicator was reported as -3.69% against a target of +/- 1%. Consequently it was suggested that this indicator should have a RAG status of Red not Green, as reported. It was confirmed that this indicator would be checked.

Top 3 Wins – In relation to the format of the report, what was the process for identifying "Top Wins"? As an example (Page 20), two of the three Top Wins were not related to any KPIs. For example, the Top Win on Climate Emergency referred to activity that had taken place – the activity was only relevant if it led to a carbon reduction. The activity in Top Wins should be linked to measurable impact. It would be useful if the Top Wins and Opportunities were linked to the relevant KPIs. It was confirmed that KPIs only gave part of the story relating to a key priority. Other aspects were highlighted in order to give a wider picture and context. This include challenges relating to performance and service risks.

AS7: Proportion of people receiving long term care who were subject to a review in the last 12 months (Page 38) – performance against this indicator was consistent but had been below target for several years. Was this a SMART indicator? It was confirmed that the target was deliberately stretching in order to drive service improvement. The service was aiming for excellence.

PG21: Percentage of waste recycled from the kerbside (Page 51) – what were the reasons for the above-target performance of the service? Did it relate to the collection of food waste and the additional cardboard arising from deliveries during the pandemic? It was confirmed that the service had been working hard to engage with residents and encouraging greater levels of recycling. The collection of food waste had also been successfully delivered. The emerging Waste Strategy would pick up these themes and emphasise the waste hierarchy – reduce, reuse and recycle.

RA2: Occupancy rate of WBC-owned regeneration units (Page 52) – the indicator had moved from Green to Amber. Were there any issues relating to the letting of these units? It was confirmed that a number of deals were in the pipeline which would bring the RAG status back to Green.

AS1: Social work assessments allocated to commence within 7 days of the requests (Page 37) – concern was expressed at the reported vacant posts in the assessment team and their potential impact on the service. It was confirmed that the service was working on a recruitment and retention strategy and a workforce plan. Short term planning was in hand, but there remained longer term national challenges relating to the adult social care sector.

Report format – the Committee had previously discussed the amount of detailed information in the report and options to enable more focussed scrutiny. It was reported that a new reporting system and report format would be available for 2022/23. This would deliver more timely reports and enable Members to submit questions in advance the Committee meeting. This, in turn, would enable the relevant Executive Members and officers to be invited to attend the meeting.

Top Win: Reduction in the number of residents in B&B temporary accommodation (Page 23) – Officers were congratulated on the reported reduction in the use of B&B accommodation. It was confirmed that the Council had secured long term contracts with providers which reduced reliance on B&B. This was better for the residents and a much cheaper option for WBC.

PG13: Proportion of Highways Infrastructure Schemes on track for delivery (Page 50) – In Q1 two roads had been highlighted – the South Wokingham Distributor Road and the Western Gateway. These schemes had been reported as Red in Q1 but were now reported as Green. There was no explanation for the change in RAG status. Could the Committee be provided with an explanation for the change in RAG status and an explanation of how progress on these delivery schemes was measured and reported? It was confirmed that this information would be provided for the Committee.

Top Wins – WBC activity in response to the Climate Emergency – Dinton Activity Centre showcased at COP 26 (Page 20) – It was confirmed that COP 26 took place in Q3 not Q2. Could more detail be provided re activity in Q2?

Top Wins – Completed retender and route optimisation of the Home to School service (Page 24) – it was felt the problems which arose during this process and the impact on some families questioned its inclusion as a Top Win. It was confirmed that this was a big project which had produced a number of learning points which would be used to improve service delivery in the future. In that sense it could be described as a Top Win.

CIC8: Number of fly-tipping incidents (Page 44) – could WBC encourage the Government to increase the maximum fine for fly-tipping from the current level of £400? It was confirmed that WBC was one of the most proactive Councils in relation to fly-tipping. Progress continued to be monitored by the cross-party working group. As part of the reorganised public protection service a WBC anti-social behaviour team would be introduced. The new team would provide an increased focus on environmental crime. It was suggested that consideration be given to developing a KPI relating to the number of prosecutions for fly-tipping in the Borough.

Shahid Younis (Deputy Executive Member) commented that work was ongoing to refine the KPIs to be reported to the Scrutiny Committees. It was suggested that the new list of KPIs for 2022/23 be reported to the Committee for discussion and comment.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) Steve Moore, Will Roper and Shahid Younis be thanked for attending the meeting to answer Member questions;
- 2) the Q2 Performance Monitoring Report (July-September 2021) be endorsed;
- 3) further information be provided to Members in relation to the specific points and questions raised at the meeting.

## **19. CLIMATE EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN**

The Committee considered the six monthly update to the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan, set out at Agenda pages 65 to 82.

The report gave details of highlights relating to each section of the Action Plan, along with deliverables planned for the next three months and new actions added to the Action Plan.

Gregor Murray (Executive Member for Residents Services, Communications and Emissions), Rhian Hayes (Interim Assistant Director, Housing and Place), Grant Thornton (Category Manager, Economic Prosperity and Place) and Andrew Collins (Specialist Climate Emergency Officer) attended the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions.

The report stated that, within the Borough-wide aim to achieve Net Zero, the Council aimed to become a carbon neutral organisation by 2030. A breakdown of the Council's emissions in areas such as heating, business travel and waste was included in the report. 2021 was the first year in which these figures had been fully accounted for.

The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Action Plan was noted in areas such as public transport usage, which had still to recover to pre-Covid levels.

In the ensuing discussion Members raised the following points:

Electric vehicle charging points (Page 70) – further information was requested on the location of EV charging points (on-street and at public car parks) and the way in which they were funded. It was confirmed that a report had been submitted to the Executive recommending that a pilot scheme be introduced (supported by Government funding). Installing charging points at on-street locations was more challenging than off-street. Over 30 potential locations for on-street charging points were being explored across the Borough. Members would be consulted on the potential sites.

Local Plan Update (Page 77) – confirmation was sought that the supplementary planning guidance underpinning the updated Local Plan would include a commitment to net zero development, clean energy generation and maintenance of trees. It was confirmed that the Local Plan Update would have to comply with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – the Government's planning policies and how they should be applied. The Council had the power to set standards for carbon neutral buildings but needed to be aware of the impact, for example additional building costs. Further information would be provided for Members on the Council's powers to require solar panels on new homes.

The report (Page 69) referred to Transport as one of the key sectors contributing towards emissions in the Borough. Two of the most important targets in the Action Plan related to reducing the number of cars on the road and the distance travelled by residents. Yet there was little in the report on these two issues. It was confirmed that the report was the six-monthly update. There would be much more detail in the annual update report, submitted to Council in July. In the meantime, officers confirmed that a more detailed update on the Transport elements of the Climate Emergency Action Plan would be submitted to the February 2022 meeting of the Committee.

In relation to Engagement and Behaviour Change (Page 79), how would subject experts engage with residents taking part in the ongoing deliberative processes? It was confirmed that the deliberative processes, now badged as "Let's Talk Climate", would include video evidence submitted by relevant subject experts. Having viewed the experts' evidence, residents would then meet again to discuss ideas, supported by an independent facilitator. Ideas developed through the deliberative processes would then be submitted to Council for discussion. Council would decide which ideas should be subject to further investigation

and carbon budgeting. These ideas would then go back to Council for a final, public decision on which ideas to include in the Action Plan.

Based on the information currently available, was the Borough on track to achieve Net Zero by 2030? It was confirmed that, currently, there was a gap between the forecast position and Net Zero. The aim was to reduce this gap as new ideas and projects came forward over the next few years.

The report (Page 69) referred to the London Road trial installation of a 1,321metre stretch of plastic kerbing with a carbon saving of 40,555kg. How did the use of plastic kerbing deliver this level of saving? It was confirmed that the use of recycled plastic kerbs (instead of concrete) delivered a saving through a reduction in manufacturing, transport and construction. It was confirmed that further information would be provided on the methodology for achieving the carbon saving and how this fitted into the Transport section of the Action Plan.

In relation to the retrofitting of domestic properties, it was suggested that EPC ratings should be used to measure success. It was confirmed that the Government target of achieving EPCs of C or above by 2025 for all newly rented properties was reflected in the Council's targets.

Waste and Recycling (Page 76) – was the target of 80% recovery of wet paper achieved? It was confirmed that this target was met. Further information on the recovery of wet paper would be circulated to the Committee. It was also noted that the emerging Waste Strategy would build upon recent initiatives to deliver on the waste and recycling goals in the Action Plan.

Renewable Energy Generation (Page 72) – had the Barkham Ride solar farm now received the go-ahead? It was confirmed that further information would be circulated to the Committee on the current status of the project.

In relation to Transport, it was noted that car usage had returned to levels seen before the pandemic whilst public transport usage was still well below pre-pandemic levels. Increasing the usage of public transport would be a key element in delivering the targets in the Action Plan.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) Gregor Murray, Rhian Hayes, Grant Thornton and Andrew Castle be thanked for attending the meeting to present the update report and answer Member questions;
- 2) the six month update on the Climate Emergency Action Plan be noted;
- 3) further information be circulated to the Committee in relation to the points and questions raised by Members;
- 4) a further update report on progress against Transport targets in the Action Plan be submitted to the February 2022 meeting of the Committee.

**20. TREE STRATEGY**

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 83 to 90, which gave details of the emerging Tree Strategy for the Borough. The Strategy would provide improved



direction for tree management and guide the Council's approach to trees across the Borough.

Fran Hobson (Service Manager, Green and Blue Infrastructure) and Laura Buck (Green Infrastructure Special Project Manager) attended the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions.

The report stated that the Tree Strategy would set out how the Council would manage its statutory responsibilities for trees and woodlands (including Council-owned trees), replanting policy, new planting schemes (including the 250k tree Climate Emergency project) and woodland management. The strategy would also cover the issues relating to the maintenance of newly planted trees in new development locations.

An early engagement survey had been carried out in November 2021 with the aim of gathering views from residents and other stakeholders about the key areas to be addressed in the strategy. The report gave details of the priorities identified in the survey, including species diversity, community involvement, preference for planting schemes, maintenance of newly planted trees and the creation and management of woodlands.

The report set out the proposed timeline for developing and agreeing the Tree Strategy. It was anticipated that the draft Tree Strategy would be ready for review in July 2022 with the aim of publishing the agreed strategy in January 2023.

In the ensuing discussion, Members raised the following points:

What was the process for residents to express an interest in planting a tree in their garden? It was confirmed that residents should contact Laura Buck at WBC – [laura.buck@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:laura.buck@wokingham.gov.uk)

Information was also set out on the Council's Engage platform.

The report referred to the establishment of a cross-party working group to steer the content of the Tree Strategy, with a suggested first meeting in February 2022. What was the process for identifying Members to sit on the working group? It was suggested that all Members be offered the opportunity to join the working group after liaison with the Group Leaders.

An important issue was the effective maintenance of new trees planted by developers. This was highlighted by residents in the early engagement survey. It was confirmed that the service was looking to recruit two additional officers which would increase capacity to address this and other issues. The Tree Strategy would also focus on this issue including the maintenance programme for the 250k tree Climate Emergency project.

Whilst the emerging Tree Strategy was welcome, it was too late for many new development sites in the south of the Borough where developers had not maintained newly planted trees and common areas. It was confirmed that lessons learned from these developments would be addressed in the Tree Strategy. A key issue was closer working relationships with Town and Parish Councils and local community/voluntary groups.

Recent incidents involving the loss of trees raised the question of the enforcement powers available to the Council. It was confirmed that the Council did have enforcement powers set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, for example through the use of Tree Preservation Orders. Anyone contravening a TPO was guilty of an offence and could be

fined. It was important to communicate the Council's powers to the relevant interested parties.

The 2019 Estate Infrastructure Task and Finish Group made a recommendation relating to the maintenance of newly planted trees. This would see the Council taking on the responsibility for maintenance, to be funded by a commuted sum. It was confirmed that progress against this recommendation would be investigated.

It was requested that the draft Tree Strategy be reported back to the Committee for comment before its submission to the Executive. It was confirmed that the draft strategy would be submitted to the Committee.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) Fran Hobson and Laura Buck be thanked for attending the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions;
- 2) the results from the Tree Strategy early engagement survey be noted;
- 3) the timeline and milestones for the emerging Tree Strategy be noted, with the request that the timeline be shortened if possible;
- 4) the draft Tree Strategy be submitted to the Committee for comment before consideration and approval by the Council's Executive.

## **21. TREE PROTECTION & BIODIVERSITY TASK & FINISH GROUP - UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 91 to 96, which gave details of progress made by the Tree Protection and Biodiversity Task and Finish Group.

The report stated that the Task and Finish Group had been approved by the Committee in July 2021. The Group met for the first time in late August 2021 and agreed its terms of reference which were set out in the report. The terms of reference were subsequently amended to include discussion of the November 2021 Council Motion on the potential declaration of an Ecological Emergency.

The report stated that the Task and Finish Group had been established in line with the political balance arrangements. Councillor Chris Bowring had been elected Chairman at the first meeting.

The Task and Finish Group had met several times and held discussions with a number of witnesses including WBC officers, Town and Parish Councils and the Wokingham District Veteran Tree Association. The Group had also considered a case study relating to the loss of circa 450 mature trees at Bearwood Lake.

The report stated that the Task and Finish Group would continue to meet with a view to submitting its final report to the Committee in February or March 2022. The Group's recommendations on the Council Motion relating to the declaration of an Ecological Emergency would be submitted to full Council for consideration.

In the ensuing discussion Members raised the following points:

The Task and Finish Group terms of reference referred a review of best practice. Could this include best practice from other countries? It was confirmed that this point would be discussed with the Task and Finish Group.

A suggested witness for the Task and Finish Group was a representative from the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT). It was confirmed that BBOWT would be contacted about joining a meeting of the Task and Finish Group.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the progress report on the work of the Tree Protection and Biodiversity Task and Finish Group be noted;
- 2) any evidence or details of potential witnesses for consideration by the Task and Finish Group be submitted to Neil Carr in Democratic Services.

## **22. DEVELOPMENT OF THE O&S WORK PROGRAMMES FOR 2022-23**

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 97 to 102, which gave details of the process for developing the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programmes for 2022/23.

The report stated that, in line with best practice, the work programmes would be developed between January and March 2022 on the following basis:

January/February – initial consultation with Overview and Scrutiny Members, Executive Members, senior officers, partner organisations, Town and Parish Councils, residents and community/voluntary groups;

March – final work programmes to be agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee;

April – publication and implementation of the work programmes.

Members highlighted the need for separation of meeting dates in the Council calendar to enable time for comments/recommendations from the Committee to be included in reports to the Executive.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the process for developing the Overview and Scrutiny work programmes for 2022/23, as set out in the report, be approved;
- 2) the 2022/23 work programmes be approved at the Committee's meeting in March 2022;
- 3) each Overview and Scrutiny Committee carry out one or more detailed Scrutiny reviews during 2022/23;
- 4) future versions of the draft Council Calendar of Meetings be submitted to the Committee for comment before approval by full Council.

**23. EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME AND INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION FORWARD PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a copy of the Executive Forward Programme and the Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programme, as set out at Agenda pages 103 to 112.

**RESOLVED** That the Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programmes be noted.

**24. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES**

The Committee considered its Forward Work Programme and that of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out on Agenda pages 113 to 124.

The Chairman advised Members that an extraordinary "Call-In" meeting of the Management Committee would be held on Tuesday 8 February at 7.30pm.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Forward Programmes be noted;
- 2) the report of the Tree Protection and Biodiversity Task and Finish Group be added to the Management Committee's Forward Programme.

**25. ACTION TRACKER REPORT**

The Committee considered the latest Action Tracker report, set out at Agenda pages 125 to 128.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the Action Tracker report be noted;
- 2) the Chairman write to the Chief Executive in relation to setting up meetings with the Executive and CLT as per the Executive-Scrutiny Protocol.