

Minutes of the Council

County Hall, Worcester

Thursday, 13 January 2022, 10.00 am

Present:

Cllr Steve Mackay (Chairman), Cllr Alastair Adams, Cllr Mel Allcott, Cllr Martin Allen, Cllr Alan Amos, Cllr Marc Bayliss, Cllr Dan Boatright, Cllr Bob Brookes, Cllr David Chambers, Cllr Brandon Clayton, Cllr Kyle Daisley, Cllr Lynn Denham, Cllr Nathan Desmond, Cllr Allah Ditta, Cllr Matt Dormer, Cllr Elizabeth Eyre, Cllr Peter Griffiths, Cllr Karen Hanks, Cllr Ian Hardiman, Cllr Adrian Hardman, Cllr Paul Harrison, Cllr Marcus Hart, Cllr Matt Jenkins, Cllr Adam Kent, Cllr Luke Mallett, Cllr Emma Marshall, Cllr Karen May, Cllr Natalie McVey, Cllr Tony Miller, Cllr Jo Monk, Cllr Dan Morehead, Cllr Richard Morris, Cllr Tony Muir, Cllr Beverley Nielsen, Cllr Tracey Onslow, Cllr Scott Richardson Brown, Cllr Andy Roberts, Cllr Josh Robinson, Cllr Chris Rogers, Cllr David Ross, Cllr Mike Rouse, Cllr Jack Satterthwaite, Cllr James Stanley, Cllr Emma Stokes, Cllr Kit Taylor, Cllr Richard Udall and Cllr Tom Wells

Available papers

The members had before them:

- A. The Agenda papers (previously circulated);
- B. 4 questions submitted to the Assistant Director for Legal and Governance (previously circulated); and
- C. The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 (previously circulated).

2319 Apologies and Declaration of Interests (Agenda item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Salman Akbar, Aled Evans, Laura Gretton, Bill Hopkins, Adrian Kriss, Aled Luckman, Linda Robinson, Craig Warhurst, and Shirley Webb.

2320 Public Participation (Agenda item 2)

Cllr Elizabeth Eyre presented a petition to work in partnership with Highways, the Police and Crime Commissioner, and the Safer Camera Partnership to address the dangers of the Evesham to Beckford stretch of the A46.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Eyre for her contribution and said she would receive a written response from the relevant Cabinet Member.

2321 Minutes (Agenda item 3)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2322 Chairman's Announcements (Agenda item 4)

Noted.

2323 Reports of Cabinet (Agenda item 5)

The Leader of the Council reported the following topics and questions were answered on them:

- Consideration of Specification and Land Acquisition for New Secondary School
- Resources Report – Revenue Budget Monitoring – Month 6 (30 September) 2021/22
- Fair Funding for Schools 2022-23 – National and Local Funding Arrangements for Schools
- Policy and Process for the Determination of Penalties Under the Tenant Fees Act 2019 and Associated Legislation
- Waste Management Service Contract.

2324 Notices of Motion - Notices of Motion 1 - Her Majesty, The Queen (Agenda item 6)

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Cllr Elizabeth Eyre, Cllr Scott Richardson Brown, Cllr Richard Morris, Cllr David Chambers, and Cllr Brandon Clayton.

The motion was moved by Cllr Elizabeth Eyre and seconded by Cllr Scott Richardson Brown who both spoke in favour of it, and Council agreed to deal with it on the day.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were made:

- A year long programme of events was being devised to celebrate the Queen's Platinum Jubilee. It was important to make the celebrations held in Worcestershire bigger than for any previous jubilee events. To start the celebrations, the Chairman should write to the Queen to offer loyal congratulations on behalf of the county's residents and the Council

- The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Corporate Services and Communication commented that the Queen had long-held connections and visited the County on many occasions prior to and during her reign. He wished to encourage residents throughout Worcestershire to hold street parties to celebrate the Jubilee. He highlighted the measures that would be put in place in partnership with district and parish councils to help facilitate the street parties and provided a brief snapshot of the programme of events which would tree-planting beacon-lighting and a garden party
- The Queen and the royal family had contributed much to local charities in the county over many years
- The country had benefited considerably from having an apolitical figurehead which meant that everyone was able to enjoy these celebrations. The commitment by the Council to support these events as outlined by the Cabinet Member was welcomed
- The celebrations were particularly welcomed given the struggles people had experienced during the last couple of years because of the covid pandemic
- The ability for councillors to be able to use their divisional funds to help support the jubilee celebrations was welcomed.

On being put to the vote, the motion which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED “This Council acknowledges the unique achievement of Her Majesty, The Queen, in being our longest-serving monarch; it commends her long life of service to our nation, our Commonwealth and many aspects of International life.

It requests the Chairman send loyal congratulations on behalf of our residents and agrees to support them and their communities, during the 4-day 2022 programme of events, around the County, as permitted by the Covid restrictions at the time: from facilitating road closures for street parties, to supporting tree plantings, to encouraging divisional funds appropriately to support the costs of celebrating her Platinum Jubilee.”

2325 Notices of Motion - Notices of Motion 2 - Declaration of a Biodiversity Emergency (Agenda item 6)

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Cllr Mel Allcott, Cllr Josh Robinson, Cllr Jack Satterthwaite, Cllr Lynn Denham, Cllr Richard Udall, and Cllr Dan Boatright.

The motion was moved by Cllr Mel Allcott and seconded by Cllr Richard Udall who both spoke in favour of it, and Council agreed to deal with it on the day.

The following amendment was moved by Cllr Tony Miller and seconded by Cllr Emma Marshall and accepted as an alteration by the mover and seconder of the motion which therefore became the substantive motion:

“Council welcomes the focus of the new Environment Act 2021 (the 2021 Act) on Biodiversity which updates and strengthens the existing Biodiversity Duty on public bodies (including local authorities) contained in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act) and commits to doing the following:

- In compliance with, and subject to, the requirements of the Act, produce a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the Strategy) which will set out the priorities for protection and enhancement of biodiversity within the area covered by it, key habitats and geographical locations of focus.*
- Work with partners to review and update all existing relevant strategies.*
- Expand the mandate of the existing Member Advisory Group [on Low Carbon/Net Zero] to include biodiversity and assist with any future revision of the Strategy and report annually on actions taken.”*

In the ensuing debate, the following points were made:

- The protection and enhancement of Biodiversity was vital for our future. This was highlighted by the approximately a million species of animals and plants currently threatened with extinction. However, it was not too late to make a difference at all levels of government
- The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Environment commented that the Council already had a Biodiversity Action Plan in place with a vision and a set of objectives up to 2028. The word “emergency” had been removed from the original motion because it was recognised that nature needed to develop. In addition, the proposals set out in the Motion formed part of the existing work of the Council (for example the Green Infrastructure Strategy was the subject of a review for completion in 2022). This work would take time to complete. The Member Advisory Group [on Low Carbon/Net Zero] was the appropriate forum to take this issue forward. The Cabinet Member then set out the biodiversity measures that the Council had already adopted
- It was clear that tackling climate change and biodiversity losses were interlinked and therefore it was appropriate to expand the mandate of the existing Member Advisory Group [on Low Carbon/Net Zero] to include biodiversity. The establishment of two separate Advisory Groups would add an unnecessary layer of complexity. A single group was a far more expedient way of addressing these time-sensitive issues. A holistic approach was required which worked across all sectors of government with a green thread running through all council policies. The Council would seek to meet the targets of the Environment Act over the next 7 years
- It was disappointing that the word “emergency“ had been removed from the motion because there were considerable immediate pressures on the varied natural habitats in Worcestershire
- A recent report had found that none of the country’s rivers were pollution free and therefore every effort should be made to address this biodiversity emergency
- There was a commitment within the Environment Act to stop the decline in Biodiversity within the next 8 years. A long and sustained approach was required to tackle the issue

- The Council should always have the aim of a net reduction in carbon alongside a net gain in biodiversity running through all its policies
- As the Council had accepted that there was a climate emergency, it made sense to accept that there was an ecological emergency. Actions to support biodiversity had an additional benefit of storing carbon to help to address climate change. The Council had taken action to support biodiversity but more action was needed now. An ecological emergency strategy was required to set out a way forward to achieve a wildlife-rich, ecological resilient county. The Low Carbon/Net Zero Group was well placed to deal with the matter but needed the involvement of all councillors. Efforts to tackle these issues needed to be at the heart of the work of the Council
- Ecological systems could be irreparably damaged before the damage was visibly obvious. It was important to bear this in mind when addressing the more visually obvious signs of ecological decline.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: “Council welcomes the focus of the new Environment Act 2021 (the 2021 Act) on Biodiversity which updates and strengthens the existing Biodiversity Duty on public bodies (including local authorities) contained in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act) and commits to doing the following:

- In compliance with, and subject to, the requirements of the Act, produce a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (the Strategy) which will set out the priorities for protection and enhancement of biodiversity within the area covered by it, key habitats and geographical locations of focus.
- Work with partners to review and update all existing relevant strategies.
- Expand the mandate of the existing Member Advisory Group [on Low Carbon/Net Zero] to include biodiversity and assist with any future revision of the Strategy and report annually on actions taken.”

2326 Notices of Motion - Notices of Motion 3 - Health Impacts of the pandemic (Agenda item 6)

The Council had before it a Notice of Motion set out in the agenda papers standing in the names of Cllr Matt Jenkins, Cllr Natalie McVey, Cllr Beverley Nielsen, Cllr Tom Wells, and Cllr Martin Allen.

The motion was moved by Cllr Matt Jenkins and seconded by Cllr Natalie McVey who both spoke in favour of it, and Council agreed to deal with it on the day. The following amendment was moved by Cllr Karen May and seconded by Cllr Marcus Hart and accepted as an alteration by the mover and seconder of the motion which therefore became the substantive motion:

“The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has had a huge impact on all our lives. In particular, it has highlighted and exacerbated the existing health inequalities that exist within our society.

There are various areas where these effects are felt, often cutting across the council departments of health, adult care and children’s services.

Examples of the concerns are:

- *The impact on children born during the pandemic*
- *School readiness of children on free school meals*
- *Worsening educational outcomes and risk for the most disadvantaged*
- *Impact on mental health*
- *All sectors of society that are socially and economically disadvantaged*

This motion calls for this Council to request that all of the above issues are fully considered by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.”

In the ensuing debate, the following points were made:

- It was important to understand the health impacts of the pandemic on the residents of the county so that the Council could make the right decisions going forward. A scrutiny group should be established to undertake a cross-departmental investigation into the impact of the pandemic on the health of Worcestershire residents with a particular focus on health inequalities such as deprivation, low income and poor housing. Covid 19 had exacerbated the relationship between these inequalities and poor health. Particular focus was needed on learning disabilities, mental health, age, ethnicity, and Inclusion health groups such as the homeless and Gypsy Roma Travellers. The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment was an important document that highlighted the fact that the impacts of Covid 19 had not been felt equally in Worcestershire. It was likely that the impact of the pandemic would be felt for many years to come
- The health impact of the pandemic on children born before or during the pandemic was not known. However, it had been recognised that there had been a negative impact on children of pre-school age in terms of impaired speech and language development. Young people had borne the brunt of the impact of the pandemic.
- The full impact on quality of life and the number of local residents suffering with long-covid was not known
- The scrutiny group was an ideal forum for local residents to share their stories about the impact of the pandemic
- The Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Health and Well-being commented that Covid 19 had affected Worcestershire residents in many ways. There were some impacts that were not known or fully understood. The impact on areas of inequality had been compounded by occupational exposure of staff working in for example, the care, security, travel and hospitality sectors. Age, gender, social deprivation, pre-existing health conditions, smoking and disability were all factors in increasing the impact of Covid 19 on the health of residents. The

pandemic had also had a severe impact on mental health. There had been positive impacts in terms of strengthening family bonds, a reassessment of priorities, less commuting to work and increased flexible working patterns. Locally, there had been an increase in civic participation and social cohesion. There had been a shift in the way local services had been provided. The Contained Outbreak Management Fund (COMP) had enabled Public Health to establish a number of qualitative covid impact focus groups, an in-depth ethnic research survey and a detailed covid impact survey. The findings which were due in March 2022 would support the Health and Well-being Strategy which would then inform the HOSC review

- The issue did really need a deeper dive and there was a concern that HOSC would not have sufficient capacity to do the subject matter justice
- The impact of the pandemic on the health of society was an emergency, particularly as it exacerbated pre-existing inequalities
- The Chairman of HOSC commented that a further scrutiny task group or member advisory group was unnecessary. The HOSC was the most appropriate body to look at this issue having already looked into a number of related issues
- The HOSC received input from district council partners which made it the appropriate body to look at this issue. In addition, if necessary HOSC could establish an appropriate sub-group
- The Cabinet Member for Education congratulated Headteachers across the county for keeping schools open throughout the pandemic in very difficult circumstances.

On being put to the vote, the motion which was agreed.

RESOLVED “The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has had a huge impact on all our lives. In particular, it has highlighted and exacerbated the existing health inequalities that exist within our society.

There are various areas where these effects are felt, often cutting across the council departments of health, adult care and children’s services.

Examples of the concerns are:

- The impact on children born during the pandemic
- School readiness of children on free school meals
- Worsening educational outcomes and risk for the most disadvantaged
- Impact on mental health
- All sectors of society that are socially and economically disadvantaged

This motion calls for this Council to request that all of the above issues are fully considered by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.”

2327 Annual Report of the Leader of the Council (Agenda item 7)

The Leader of the Council presented his report.

The Leader then answered a broad range of questions from members.

The Chairman thanked the Leader for his report.

The report was noted.

2328 Annual Report of the Chief Executive (Agenda item 8)

The Chief Executive presented his report to Council which covered various topics.

The Chief Executive answered a broad range of questions from members.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive for his report.

2329 Annual Report of the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board (Agenda item 9)

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board (OSPB) introduced the report. He acknowledged the high standard of scrutiny work since the council elections in May which was testament to the work of scrutiny chairs. In future, the Annual report would be timetabled to fit in with the Municipal year and therefore the next scheduled report would be May 2023.

The Vice-Chairman of the Board welcomed the positive approach of the Chairman of OSPB, as well as the cross-party nature of the scrutiny work and the good work of the scrutiny panels and their chairs. He thanked officers and members of Cabinet for their support.

The Chairman answered questions on the report.

The report was noted.

2330 Question Time (Agenda item 10)

Four questions had been received by the Assistant Director for Legal and Governance and had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The answers to all the questions are attached in the Appendix.

2331 Reports of Committees - Audit and Governance Committee (Agenda item 11 (a))

The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report.

The Chairman undertook to provide a written response to a request for details of the number of amber and red risks on the Council's Risk Register in relation to environmental recruitment and supplies.

The Council received the report of the Audit and Governance Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.

2332 Reports of Committees - Pensions Committee (Agenda item 11 (b))

The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report.

In response to a query about whether a timeframe had been established for the Fund to cease investing in fossil fuels, the Chairman of the Committee commented that the County Council's Pension Fund invested its funds through the national pooling arrangements. The Pension Fund had adopted a Responsible Investment approach and was encouraging other organisations to do the same. It should also be noted that the Fund had a fiduciary responsibility to look after the pensions of employees and ex-employees and therefore a balance needed to be struck.

The Council received the report of the Pensions Committee containing a summary of the decisions taken.

The meeting was adjourned from 11.45am to 11.55am and 1.00pm to 1.40pm ended at 2.25pm.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 13 JANUARY 2022 - AGENDA ITEM 10 – QUESTION TIME

Questions and written responses provided below.

QUESTION 1 – Cllr Josh Robinson asked Cllr Andy Roberts:

“Following the tragic murder of Arthur Labinjo-Hughes, can I ask what lessons our council will learn from this?”

Answer

Thank you for the question. I know the whole Council was appalled by the fate of Arthur, but it is too soon to know all that can be learned from the tragedy. The way things will be managed in Solihull are very similar to how it would be done here, so I will cover our procedures. I can't give a short answer. I need to outline what safeguarding is, where legal responsibility lies and how such cases are reviewed.

'Safeguarding' refers to processes that are put in place to ensure that vulnerable children and young people don't experience abuse or neglect, including physically, emotionally or sexually. This duty is shared in the main by Health, the Police and local authorities (in particular social care and education) though district councils and public health have a role. To address this responsibility the Children Act 2004 requires every upper tier local authority to appoint a Director of Children's Services and designate a Lead Member. The Director has professional responsibility for children's services, including operational matters; the Lead Member has political responsibility.

Tina Russell is a dynamic and driven Director of Children's Services with a team of dedicated directors and staff. She has professional responsibility for the leadership as defined by Section 18 of the Act. As the County's DCS, she is responsible for securing the provision of services to address the needs of all children and young people, including the disadvantaged and vulnerable, and their families and carers. Section 19 of the Children Act 2004 also requires every top tier local authority to designate one of its members as Lead Member for Children's Services. In fulfilling this duty I am democratically accountable to communities, with a key role in defining the local vision and setting political priorities for children's services within the broader political context of the Council.

So, in that context, what happens if a tragedy occurs?

Worcestershire Safeguarding Children Partnership is a strategic group with an independent chair. Tina Russell is a key member of the Partnership. Its three named Safeguarding Partners are the Local Authority, the Police and Health Clinical Commissioning Group. Collectively they are responsible for overseeing safeguarding work. The Partnership's Children Safeguarding Practice Review is a multi-agency subgroup having responsibility for reviewing and the management of all child safeguarding practice reviews [which we used to call Serious Case Reviews]. These include child deaths and incidents of very serious harm. Each case is reviewed through a multi-agency 'Rapid Review' to identify immediate learning. Then there can be either a local case review under an independent author, or the case may be referred to a National Panel for a Serious Case Review.

Both local and national case reviews bring together the records of all agencies that have had involvement with the child or family. An overview report is produced which provides a complete picture of events. This report contains analysis of contact with the child and family and decision making, it draws conclusions and makes recommendations on how agencies

have identified risk or harm and worked together to reduce and manage that risk and to promote the child's overall welfare and safety.

Reviews are referenced in the Partnership's annual report, which is considered by the County's Children and Families Scrutiny Committee and received by the Cabinet. If a case involves a child in care or a care leaver the outcomes are also considered by the Corporate Parenting Board.

The Director of Children's Services and myself, as the Lead Member, the Leader of the Council and my colleague Councillor Hart (who oversees education and early years) will learn from experiences, but it essential that every councillor shares the same commitment.

Supplementary question

The Cabinet Member confirmed that the lessons learned from the Arthur Labinjo-Hughes case would be reported to the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Panel in due course.

QUESTION 2 – Cllr Adrian Hardman asked Cllr Alan Amos:

"Can the Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Highways use his executive powers to suspend Spitfire Homes statutory right of access to the Highway, and that of their contractor, Healey's? if they continue in the way they have been behaving; the damage to Eckington and surrounding area and it's businesses will be considerable. I would suggest a 2 year pause on the site to allow Eckington business's to recover."

Answer

I thank Cllr Hardman for his Question.

Can I say at the outset that if I did have the power he ascribed to me, I can assure him that his suggested ban of 2 years on that company would have been *at least* 2 years!

Unfortunately, County Highways do not have the power to suspend the developer, Spitfire Homes, from requesting activity on the network. Once planning permission is granted, WCC cannot reasonably hold back section 278 or section 50 works to connect the site and its required services to the public highway.

However, Cllr Hardman will be pleased to know that, following repeated failings and a previous warning, contractors L Healy Ltd *have* now been suspended from undertaking any new works on the Worcestershire highway network for a minimum of six months. They need to know that this may well be extended, depending on how well rectification works are completed on Pershore Road, Eckington and also on Main Road, Hallow. Rectification works are likely to be undertaken by a specialist surfacing company on Pershore Road, Eckington.

Officers are currently dealing with defective surfacing for section 50 works to install a sewer undertaken by L Healy Ltd on behalf of Spitfire Homes. Further to a WCC request, Spitfire Homes have agreed to set up a public engagement session in Eckington. They have agreed to both apologise and update businesses and the public on the recent failings and the future required works to take place.

Furthermore, I can confirm that WCC are also pursuing a future bond scheme for section 50 works, as is operated in Warwickshire, to help protect Worcestershire's highway asset further when section 50 works are undertaken by private contractors.

I hope that all contractors undertaking, or planning to undertake, works on our highway network will note the action in this case and will operate on the basis that we will not

tolerate shoddy work from any of them. I am sure that Cllr Hardman will want to put his considerable weight behind **our campaign to ensure that only the best is good enough for Worcestershire.**

Supplementary question

It should be noted that local businesses had been financially impacted by these street works as well as the covid pandemic, as they see it through no fault of their own. The Cabinet Member noted this concern and would take an overview of the issue and examine how processes could be further improved.

QUESTION 3 – Cllr Lynn Denham asked Cllr Marcus Hart:

"The government established a Holiday Activities and Food (HAF) programme for summer 2021. This was in response to Marcus Rashford's campaign to try and prevent children going hungry during school holidays. In a report to Worcestershire County Councillors in Autumn 2021, we were told that the summer HAF programme in Worcestershire reached '3,252 different children and young people'. Could the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Children and Families tell us what percentage of children eligible for free school meals participated in the summer programme? I would be grateful if he could be split by a) primary school age (Years 0 to 6) and b) senior school age (Year 7 and above)"

Answer

The percentage figure overall is 53.7% (42.5% for primary age children and 11.2% for secondary age children).

Supplementary question

It would appear from the data that 85% of children at secondary school age did not have access to free school meals in the summer holidays. In addition, recent figures had suggested that only £700k of the £1.5M Government funding had been allocated by the Council for the summer holiday programme, what happened to the other £800k? The Cabinet Member responded that just because parents did not take up the offer to partake in the holiday activities did not mean they had not been reached or given the opportunity to take part. There were clear mechanisms though the community and voluntary sector and schools to promote the voucher scheme for the HAF programme. The Government funding had totalled £1.6m and had been allocated to activities that had taken place across the summer, half-term and Christmas programmes.

QUESTION 4 – Cllr Lyn Denham asked Cllr Alan Amos:

"Following my question to Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport at Council on 11 November 2021, we now know that people are having to wait a very long time to get a disabled parking space. He said there is a five month wait to even begin the TRO process which itself takes over six months. I have been told that demand for disabled persons parking spaces has increased and that there are a large number of TRO's waiting for consultation. How many disabled people are waiting across the county to get the parking space they are eligible for? How many people have waited more than 18 months from eligibility to installation?"

Answer

I thank Cllr Denham for her Question.

I fully accept the assumption behind it about the absolute importance that people place on owning and using a car and how dependent most people are on it for both their livelihood and leisure activities. I therefore completely agree how important it is for everybody, and disabled people in particular, to have ready use of their car and, in these cases, for there to

be adequate and convenient parking. That is why our policy is NOT to close roads, NOT to reduce road space, and NOT to remove residents parking, but rather to *increase* all three.

On Cllr Denham's particular point about numbers, I can confirm the following :

And in so doing I would advise that applications are added to the TRO waiting list as soon as they've been approved after meeting the eligibility criteria.

There are currently 4 active Disabled Parking Space proposals going through the TRO process of which :

- 1 was added to the TRO waiting list in March 2021, the TRO process commenced in July 2021; and is now due to be implemented;
- 1 was added to the TRO waiting list in June 2021, TRO process commenced in October 2021, and will be implemented next month;
- 1 was added to the TRO waiting list in July 2021 with the TRO process commencing last month; and
- one that was added to the TRO waiting list in November 2020 is now due to be implemented but that one was delayed by the change of Member in the May elections.

There are 13 Disabled Parking Space proposals awaiting the formal TRO process to start, of which

- 1 was added to the TRO waiting list in May 2021;
- 1 in June 2021;
- 2 in August 2021;
- 3 in September 2021;
- 3 in October 2021;
- 1 in November 2021;
- 1 in December 2021; and
- 1 this month.

Objections notwithstanding, it is highly unlikely that *any* of these will exceed 18 months between being added to the list and implementation.

And, of course, it's not just about the number of applications that meet the eligibility criteria that take up officer time but the total number of applications *received* as each one has to be fully considered and assessed, whether they turn out to be successful or not. For example, whilst last year 37% of completed applications were approved i.e. met the criteria, the other 63% also had to be assessed.

At the last Question, I did ask Cllr Denham to let me have details of any particular cases that were causing concern. Unfortunately, she declined to do so and whilst she was perfectly entitled to, it did mean that I could not establish whether any case or cases had been unreasonably held up. But on the above statistics, across the County of nearly 600,000 people, that certainly does not appear to be the case and there is no evidence of any systemic failure. On giving Disabled Parking Spaces TROs priority over other TROs, we need to remember that TROs (mainly yellow lines) are put down for safety reasons to prevent accidents and injuries taking place due to selfish or dangerous parking. So every TRO is important and we consequently treat them all equally and fairly. The number of TRO applications overall is increasing so we have increased staff resourcing in the Traffic Management Team by 15% to meet this growing demand.

Supplementary question

In response to a query about the criteria for the introduction of TROs and whether a Quality Impact Assessment had been undertaken, the Cabinet Member undertook to provide a copy of the relevant criteria to Cllr Lynn Denham.