

North Yorkshire County Council
Transport, Economy and Environment
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held at County Hall, Northallerton on 21 January 2015 at 10.00 am.

Present:-

County Councillor David Jeffels in the Chair

County Councillors John Blackburn (as substitute for David Chance), John Fort BEM (as substitute for Margaret Atkinson), Michael Heseltine, Robert Heseltine, Peter Horton, Penny Marsden, Caroline Patmore (as substitute for Robert Baker), Andy Solloway, Richard Welch, and Robert Windass.

Other Members present were: County Councillor Gareth Dadd (Executive Member) and County Councillor David Blades.

NYCC Officers attending: James Farrar, Assistant Director – Economic Partnership Unit (BES), Douglas Huzzard, Senior Project Manager(BES), Barrie Mason, Assistant Director - Highways & Transportation (BES), Allan McVeigh, Integrated Transport Group Manager (BES) and Jonathan Spencer, Corporate Development Officer (Central Services).

Present by Invitation: Phil Jepps, Divisional Manager (Ringway), Will Naylor, Chief of Staff to the Police & Crime Commissioner for North Yorkshire, and John Nicholson, Regional Director (Ringway)

No members of the public were in attendance.

Copies of all documents considered are in the Minute Book

60. Minutes

Resolved -

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2014, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

61. Public Questions or Statements

There were no general public questions or statements from members of the public concerning issues not on the agenda.

62. Highways Maintenance Contract: Ringway Performance 2014/15 Interim Update

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services advising Members of Ringway's performance under the Highways Maintenance Contract (HMC) 2012 during the period 1 April 2014 to 30 September 2014.

Barrie Mason introduced the report. He summarised the background to the contract and performance to date of Ringway in delivering the contract. He reminded Members that the contract period had been reduced from 10 years to nine years following the results of the second evaluation panel held in May 2014. Both the County Council and Ringway were working hard to improve performance. The workload of Ringway had increased significantly this year. This was due to the additional funding provided by the County Council and the Department for Transport for the highways capital programme.

He went on to refer to Appendix B in the report, which provided a comparison for the first two quarters of 2014/15 against the previous financial year. He noted that the figures showed an improvement in the number of both Primary Performance Indicators (PPIs) and Secondary Performance Indicators (SPIs) showing as a pass, compared to the number at the end of 2013/14. A validation process was being undertaken though so some figures might change.

Phil Jepps said that the report showed that Ringway was delivering on its commitments even though further improvements needed to be made. In addition Ringway was delivering significantly more work for the County Council over and above when Ringway tendered.

John Nicolson referred to Appendix C detailing the Rectification Action Plans put in place for failing performance indicators. He explained that these were reviewed internally by Ringway on a monthly basis to check that the actions put in place were working to improve results. If the actions did not show improved performance other possible actions were looked at to put in place. He concluded by noting that Ringway's contract performance showed a vastly improved position from where things were at in 2013/14.

Members made the following key comments:

- Members were continuing to receive complaints about faded road markings from parish councils and other members of the public. What actions were being put in place to improve performance? John Nicholson acknowledged that this was an area where further improvement was still needed, though current performance was above the PPI target for 2014/15. Ringway had put in place additional resources for road marking by bringing in external providers as well as using the in-house team. Ringway was seeking to put a new programme together before end of the financial year. Barrie Mason added that road marking was one of the areas being reviewed to see whether the PPI adequately measured the performance of road marking. Client satisfaction of Road Marking was low compared to the CPI target and yet the PPI target for road marking was above its target. The PPI related to road markings undertaken where surface dressing had taken place, and so did not pick up road marking issues elsewhere.
- With reference to PPI RM07 (Defects), what provision was there for the County Council or Ringway to inspect work after it had been completed, and if sub-contractors were employed by Ringway where did the responsibility sit for ensuring that the work had been carried out properly? Barrie Mason confirmed

that Ringway carried out quality checks of work undertaken but the County Council also carried out inspections if work was found to be defective. With regards to sub-contractors Ringway was responsible as the principal contractor. The County Council was currently looking at ways that Highways Officers could incorporate more inspections into their day to day duties. However this had to be within the existing resource levels.

- A Member questioned the deployment of resources for road marking. She commented that within her division she was aware of cases of road marking and resurfacing work being done on minor roads. However road markings nearby on more major roads, including at junctions and cross roads, were in need of redoing. Work should be planned in a more co-ordinated way for different types of work within a local area. Barrie Mason said that he took on board the comments regarding road markings at junctions, and added that a 'LEAN Review had been undertaken of Basic Maintenance to look at processes and systems in order to plan work better. The outcomes from this review were likely to mean that equipment would be used to carry out a number of jobs at the same time such as road marking and gully-emptying. He explained that where work was carried out on minor routes this was proportionate in terms of ensuring that the road network as a whole was fit for purpose. He went on to refer to the LEP funding provided specifically for category 4a and 4b roads. Executive Member County Councillor Gareth Dadd added that when highways repairs were being undertaken it was for very good reasons. The Council operated on an 'invest to save' basis to stop the road network deteriorating yet further and avoid being served with costly Section 56 Notices under the Highways Act 1980.

Resolved -

That Ringway's performance under the Highways Maintenance Contract 2012 during the period 1 April 2014 to 30 September 2014 be noted.

63. Road Casualties 2013 North Yorkshire

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services advising Members of the road casualty statistics and activity for 2013 in North Yorkshire. The statistics were monitored against the previous year. The report also provided a summary of road safety issues and activities and provisional data for 2014 together with a look forward for future road safety delivery.

Allan McVeigh introduced the report. He referred to sections two and three of the report detailing the statistics for personal injury accidents and casualties up to the end of 2013 and the provisional statistics for personal injury collision and casualties in 2014. The provisional records showed that there were 45 fatalities up to the end of December 2014 compared to 51 to December 2013. This modest but welcome reduction had been mainly been amongst motorcyclists, older drivers, passengers and pedestrians.

He went on to refer to sections four and five of the report highlighting the various initiatives being taken to reduce accidents including road engineering measures and road safety education and information. The continuing government funding cuts, referred to in section seven of the report were continuing to place pressure on the delivery of such preventative measures. The County Council was exploring with partners the potential for alternative funding mechanisms for delivering the most effective and key priority programmes. With reference to section six of the report he

mentioned about the benefits that the Speed Management Protocol for the county had brought since it was introduced in 2012. A Speed Management Protocol was also in place covering the City of York area. The intention now was to combine both into a single shared 'toolkit' approach to ensure a more consistent approach to addressing local speeding issues in both local authority areas.

Will Naylor gave an update on the four trial areas for the Police Community Speed Watch Programme due to commence in February in Selby district, two other North Yorkshire districts yet to be finalised and City of York. The pilot in Selby would be different to other areas in that any community with a speeding concern living there would be able to approach a community speed watch group to actively monitor speed. In other areas only specific pre-categorised sites would be included. Two types of devices would be tested. He went on to note that there was more scope for North Yorkshire Police and the County Council to join up on road safety initiatives. The joint Speed Management Protocol covering City of York and North Yorkshire should help foster this.

Members made the following comments:

- Members expressed various concerns about the road safety implications of increasing numbers of cyclists using the roads in the county arising from the introduction of the Way of the Roses route and in the wake of the Tour de France last year. A Member whose division was located on the route of the Way of the Roses commented that there were not specific signs to warn cyclists to slow down on Greenhow Hill near to Pateley Bridge. He suggested that Sustrans could do more to invest in this type of signage. There was also a need to do more to educate cyclists to ride safely on the roads as some cyclists were riding in an aggressive fashion including riding two abreast. Allan McVeigh said that he was aware that since the recent collisions on Greenhow Hill the County Council had worked with North Yorkshire Police and Sustrans to improve the signage in the area but that he would look into this matter further. It was noted that the Highway Code stated that cyclists should never ride more than two abreast, and should ride in single file on narrow or busy roads and when riding round bends.
- The Chairman read out a letter from Riccall Parish Council seeking permission to buy its own permanent pole-mounted solar panel sign. Allan McVeigh replied that it was possible to include Riccall Parish Council in the temporary VAS rollout. However an individual purchase was not provided for through the temporary VAS protocol. The process to identify parishes in the temporary VAS scheme was in process now. Parish councils needed to be in a position to buy into the scheme. Will Naylor mentioned that the Community Speed Watch Scheme could be another alternative for Riccall Parish Council to join. Whereas in the other two North Yorkshire districts only those parishes listed as low risk under the Speed Management Protocol would be eligible to apply, any local community in Selby district with speeding concerns would be able to approach a community speed watch group to actively monitor speed in their area. The reason for the difference was that the Police and Crime Commissioner wanted to trial two models – a restrictive scheme and a more open one. Executive Member County Councillor Gareth Dadd added that the principles put forward by the Transport, Economy & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the temporary VAS protocol was that speed signs needed to appear in a controlled manner in order for them to be effective. Community Speed watch would help tackle perceived speeding.
- The Chairman read out a letter from the Institute of Advanced Motorists requesting North Yorkshire Police help fund advance training schemes for

motorcyclists. He asked if a proportion of the excess cash raised by the Police Safety Camera Vans for motoring fines could be used to fund such training. Will Naylor commented that the use of the revenue raised from the safety vans was detailed in an annual report in respect of where, when and what the money had been spent on. For the foreseeable future the revenue would continue to be ploughed back into road safety projects. Allan McVeigh added that for a number of years North Yorkshire Police had run 'bike safe' and suggested that the Institute of Advanced Motorists be referred through to this scheme.

- The revenue raised from penalty notices from the Police Safety Camera Vans should continue to be put back into road safety initiatives. The public would otherwise see the vans as just a money making source of revenue to shore up the Police Force's budget.
- A Member commented that parish councils in his division were often at a loss to know which authority to approach to deal with speeding problems in their area. He commented on the range of organisations and partnerships involved in road safety in his district. Allan McVeigh said that this was precisely why the Speed Management Protocol had been produced to ensure a consistent, graduated method of managing inappropriate and excessive speed and to address complaints and concerns about speeding vehicles on the roads of North Yorkshire. Will Naylor added that with the introduction of the shared toolkit a list of central contacts was being produced. The Speed Complaint Form, together with information on the Speed Management Protocol was contained on the website of the North Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner.

Resolved -

That the figures for collisions and casualties on the roads in North Yorkshire and the actions being taken to improve safety be noted.

64. Grass Cutting Reductions Update

Considered -

The oral report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services to provide an update on the outcomes of the consultation on grass cutting reductions.

Douglas Huzzard explained that the grass cutting reductions programme had originally identified an initial savings target of £700,000. However a detailed analysis of the current service budgets and historic spend profile had concluded that such a sum was unachievable and suggested that a revised target of circa £500,000 was achievable.

He reminded the Committee that the current service was delivered by or in conjunction with the following:

- Rural grass cutting: HMC2012 Contractor (Ringway)
- Urban grass cutting: HMC2012 Contractor (Ringway)
- Urban grass cutting: Harrogate/Scarborough/ Selby – Service Level Agreements
- Urban grass cutting: Parish Councils/Town Councils/Residents Association/Housing Association

The total existing service costs was £1,062,644 comprising £567,874 for urban grass cutting and £494,770 for rural grass cutting.

The consultation with all parishes had provided the opportunity for communities to

consider what level of service they might wish to try to provide themselves, given that the County Council would be no longer able to due to its funding constraints.

County Council Members had been invited to make representations on behalf of parish councils at a meeting held on 12 December 2014 with the Corporate Director (BES) and BES Executive Members. County Council Members had been invited to make further representations at the next BES Executive Members meeting on 30 January 2015.

The contract negotiations with Ringway were nearing the end of the process and it was anticipated that the new rates would be set by the end of the month, with a view to taking proposals to the County Council's Executive in February. Both Harrogate and Scarborough Borough Councils were also aware of the proposals and consequences of the changes to be implemented by the County Council. Should either or both borough councils wish to exit the current service level agreement in its entirety this would likely trigger a further set of contractual discussions.

There had been a mixed response from parish councils. Some had fully embraced the opportunity to undertake grass cutting whilst others had not. The County Council had provided guidance and assistance to parish councils particularly around public liability issues. Some parish councils were proposing to extend the grass cutting area to get greater consistency through the village. A number of parish councils were proposing to 'piggyback' on to the grass cutting service provided by Ringway, the Highways Maintenance Contractor. Other parish councils were intending to make other arrangements.

Douglas Huzzard went on to explain about the data improvement project. Online maps of the county had been produced for the benefit of parish councils and local residents. The maps showed the grassed areas that the County Council was required to continue to cut in order to meet its highway safety requirements under the Highways Act 1980.

Members made the following key comments:

- There was confusion locally about whether parish meetings could raise a precept in order to fund grass cutting. Douglas Huzzard confirmed that parish meetings could raise a precept and the Chair of Parish Meetings had the delegated power to raise a precept. He agreed to re-circulate a briefing note for Members on the issue.
- The timescales for the consultation had not corresponded to the quarterly meeting cycle of some parish councils.
- A Member sought clarification on the contract price and deadline for parish councils wishing to 'piggyback' on to the North Yorkshire contract. Douglas Huzzard replied that the County Council was not yet in a position to enter into such discussions with parish councils. First the County Council needed to reach agreement with Ringway, which would be by February at the latest. The rate of payment that the County Council would pay parish councils for cutting areas that had to be cut, in order for the County Council to meet its highway safety requirements, had yet to be determined. He went on to add that whilst there could be a further review of grass cutting arrangements in the future any subsequent changes would be incremental.

Resolved -

- a) That the report be noted.

- b) That the Committee be provided with an update in 2016 on the grass cutting reductions programme.

65. On Street Countywide Civil Parking Enforcement Review 2013/14

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services updating Members on the review of countywide Civil Parking Enforcement in 2013/14.

Barrie Mason introduced the report, providing an analysis of the 10 month period from the start of the on-street Countywide Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) scheme in May 2013 to March 2014. Scarborough Borough Council and Harrogate Borough Council acted as the respective enforcement agents for North Yorkshire County Council and the other North Yorkshire district councils.

He referred to section 3 of the report detailing the traffic management benefits that had arisen from the introduction of the CPE scheme, especially in areas with identified traffic management problems. He went on to detail the financial position set out in section 4 of the report and Appendix 1. Expenditure to date was broadly in line with the business case projections. However in Hambleton, Richmondshire and Ryedale the expenditure figures were not fully reflective of the actual costs incurred. This was because more enforcement time had been spent in response to the nature of the issues. The 2013/14 figures for all new districts included start-up costs which would not occur in future years. The surplus position was the result of higher than projected income from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs). The PCN issue rate and payment rate were both higher than projected.

Analysis had been undertaken of the locations where PCNs had been issued, as detailed in section 5 of the report. The PCN figures for Northallerton and Bedale were significantly higher than for other towns even though enforcement activity was consistently applied across all towns. There were a number of possible reasons for this. The figures for both towns would be monitored closely but the expectation was that the number of PCNs would reduce as motorists became accustomed to the CPE scheme.

With reference to section 6 of the report Barrie Mason noted that there had been some criticism from a number of communities about enforcement activity. This was to be expected given the much more limited level of enforcement undertaken prior to the introduction of the countywide scheme. Enforcement procedures had been carried out fully in line with the relevant legislation and both Scarborough and Harrogate Borough Councils had recently carried out a review to ensure compliance with the commitments set out in the government's document: 'Response to consultation to local authority parking'.

Members made the following key comments:

- The focus on key market towns meant that other areas with parking problems within a given district were not being sufficiently patrolled. Parts of Selby district and Craven district were specifically mentioned. Barrie Mason replied that the initial focus was on towns/tourist areas and outside schools. However in future resources would be deployed away from those areas when contravention rates became lower there. Executive Member Gareth Dadd suggested that Members highlight to their local highways team where the problem parking areas were within their divisions. These could help inform the deployment of resources in the future once contravention rates had fallen in the initial areas of focus.

- A Member referred to the surplus raised from the county-wide CPE scheme in the ten months to date since its inception. He queried how the surplus would be used in view of the government stating that revenue from parking charges should only be spent by councils on transport schemes. Barrie Mason confirmed that the surplus would be reinvested in transport and highways related projects. Executive Member Gareth Dadd added that the expectation was that over time the surplus would reduce as contravention rates fell.
- A Member queried if sufficient resourcing was being provided to patrol parking outside schools. Barrie Mason confirmed that schools were part of the initial focus and prior to the introduction of the county-wide CPE scheme targeted work had been done on inappropriate parking outside schools. The County Council did not 'micromanage' Scarborough Borough Council and Harrogate Borough Council's parking enforcement operations but quarterly meetings were held to analyse the latest statistics and areas where contraventions had taken place, including outside schools.

Resolved -

- a) That the report be noted.
- b) That the Committee be provided with an update in 2016 on the On Street Countywide Civil Parking Enforcement programme.

66. LEP Update on the Skills Agenda and Performance of the Current Programmes, and Local Governance for Economic Growth

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services updating the Committee on the work of the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnerships (YNYER LEP) on the Skills Agenda and performance of the current programmes.

James Farrar introduced the report. He referred to section A of the report providing an overview of the work of the YNYER LEP on the Skills Agenda and performance of the current programmes.

Two skills programmes were being delivered on behalf of the LEP. These included Skills Support for the Workforce and the Local Response Fund. Each had been managed in a different way, however in both circumstances the contractual relationship was between Skills Funding Agency and the delivery partner. Delivery of both was through a consortium led by Grimsby Institute of Further & Higher Education. With skills Support for the Workforce, the LEP had limited influence, whereas delivery of the Local Response Fund was in partnership with, and led by the LEP.

The performance delivery of the Skills Support for the Workforce programme had been very poor. There were two restricting factors, firstly the LEP was not part of the contractual relationship, therefore had limited levers to influence delivery and secondly public procurement timescales dictate that it would not have been feasible to remove the contract from the consortium and re-tender. The LEP had therefore focused on ensuring the contract holder worked to recover the position. An under spend was expected and would be clawed back. A positive lesson had been learned from this issue because the delivery model with a contract from the Skills Funding Agency to a delivery partner is likely to be repeated and the LEP needs to ensure it has sufficient

controls over the programmes to ensure performance is achieved.

The Local Response Fund was fully on track and the funding almost fully committed. Five projects have been contracted out and delivery would commence shortly. The remaining projects would be going out to tender imminently.

James Farrar went on to explain about the Leeds City Region Apprenticeship Hub project, which in North Yorkshire was operating in Craven, Harrogate and Selby districts, and the City of York. A number of businesses had expressed an interest but the conversion to apprenticeship starts had been slower than anticipated. The nature of such a project was that there would be peaks and troughs depending upon different points in the academic year.

Reference was made to sections 6, 7, 8 and 9 of part A of the report. These detailed the objectives of the 'Inspired People' priority within the Strategic Economic Plan; and the future LEP Skills Delivery plan, including actions around promoting employment growth in micro businesses and providing stronger links to businesses and work with schools and local authorities. A key ambition was to connect every student to business, along with targeting gold standard careers advice in all schools.

Reference was made to section B of the report: local governance for economic growth.

James Farrar explained that the devolution agenda had accelerated in the last six to nine months arising from the referendum on Scottish Independence. What was clear from government was that in England if further powers and associated funding were to be devolved to a local area there would be a need to have robust local governance arrangements in place. In North Yorkshire, retaining the existing arrangements would not be an option if more powers and funding were to be devolved. The three options for change were to have a Joint Committee, an Economic Prosperity Board or a Combined Authority. The Economic Prosperity Board model was less attractive than the other two in view of it not covering transport issues. A decision on which model to adopt would need to be taken shortly after the General Election.

The optimum model to maximise investment into the region would be a Combined Authority. However the situation was complicated by the forthcoming General Election and the fact that in North Yorkshire there were overlapping LEP areas. A county council could not currently become a member of a combined authority with respect to part of its area, without each of the district authorities within the county area also being members. The government was consulting on changing this amongst other things to give local authorities greater flexibility in forming a Combined Authority. Another proposed change was to allow local authorities with non-contiguous boundaries to form or join combined authorities. If this proposal was implemented it would mean that City of York Council would have the option of joining the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. The current level of uncertainty meant that the preferred approach of Local Government Yorkshire and North Yorkshire was to have a Joint Committee initially.

The next few months leading up to and immediately after the General Election would need to see a lot of work being done to try and present a unified county-wide case to press the case for devolving powers from the incoming government.

Members made the following key comments:

- A Member said that in respect of economic development it was not just a matter of creating jobs but creating good quality jobs so that people could afford to live in the county. There was an urgent need to ensure that all district councils in North Yorkshire had local plans in place to increase the supply of affordable housing, particularly in rural areas. James Farrar replied that what made local

economies successful was a mix of good quality jobs, affordable housing and good quality skills, with schools playing a part in this. An issue was that government-led housing programmes tended to be urban-centric and so the LEP was working with the Homes & Communities Agency to develop more bespoke smaller housing schemes. In rural areas in conjunction with more affordable housing there was also a need for high speed broadband and mobile connectivity to attract more businesses. A Spatial Plan covering the whole of the North Yorkshire was in the process of being developed.

- The Chairman reported that the All Party Parliamentary Group for Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire was planning to launch a "manifesto" for devolution and prosperity in February. The manifesto would be making recommendations on transport, skills and support for businesses as well as outlining the key principles necessary for devolution to be successful.
- Members needed to be able to influence the devolution debate locally rather than react to it. It was important therefore for Members to be given a greater understanding of the direction of travel that the devolution agenda was taking and the consequences locally. Consideration should also be given to having a regional approach to devolution so that there was not an urban/rural split. Executive Member Gareth Dadd said that he supported the idea of having a Members Seminar topic on devolution. However he said that it was important to be aware that the devolution debate was a 'moving feast'. Things could change following the General Election and local elections in May.
- There was a case for developing a county-level economic development strategy in light of the devolution changes on the horizon. Such a strategy would provide the County Council and district councils with greater weight when lobbying government about devolving powers and funding to rural areas.

Resolved -

- a) That the work of the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP on the Skills Agenda and performance of the current programmes be noted.
- b) That the topic of devolution/Combined Authorities be included as an item for discussion at a forthcoming Members Seminar.

67. Work Programme

Considered -

The report of the Corporate Development Officer inviting the Committee to:

- (a) Note the information in the report.
- (b) Confirm, amend or add to the areas of work shown on the Work Programme schedule (attached as Annex A to the report).

Executive Member Gareth Dadd mentioned that he had met with the local Member for Skipton East, County Councillor Robert Heseltine and local residents to discuss the situation regarding parking on the residential streets immediately to the east of Skipton Building Society's headquarters. The County Council's Residents Parking Scheme policy did not allow residents parking schemes to be put in place where residents had access to off-street parking. Parking congestion was an issue in certain locations

including some residential streets with off-street parking. He suggested that the Committee, with appropriate officer support, sets up a task group to consider whether any such changes should be made to the County Council's Residents Parking Scheme. He said that he did not have a view either way as to whether the assessment criteria in the current policy should be relaxed.

County Councillor Robert Heseltine said that local residents had been canvassed for their opinion and the vast majority was in favour of having a residential parking scheme. A large employer in the area had also offered to provide the appropriate funding. Properties did have off-street parking but several had only short private drives. This meant that some multiple car households had to park at least one of their cars on the street. Alongside this a significant number of visitors to the area also parked on the streets especially during the working week. This was resulting in parking congestion and access problems for residents. A solution needed to be found for those living in the area as the current situation was not acceptable. A possibility could be that the Residents Parking Scheme was adapted to allow bespoke arrangements to be implemented. This would take into account issues that were specific to an area, rather than having a 'one size fits all' approach.

The future Work Programme of the Committee was discussed. Jonathan Spencer confirmed that the Chairman of the Leeds Northern Railway Reinstatement Group had asked to attend a future Committee meeting to discuss the campaign to reinstate the railway from Harrogate to Ripon and onward to Northallerton. Arrangements were being made for this item to be discussed at the Committee's meeting in April.

Jonathan Spencer referred to Appendix B of the work programme report outlining the consultation on savings proposals in relation to home to school transport and college transport. The public consultation ran from 17 December 2014 to 11 March 2015. He invited the Committee to consider if it wished to receive a report relating to the results of the public consultation exercise at its meeting on 15 April 2015. This would be in advance of a final report with recommendations being presented to the Executive, enabling the Committee's views on the proposals to be included in that report.

Resolved -

- a) That the items listed within the future Work Programme schedule be agreed.
- b) That the Committee reviews North Yorkshire County Council's Residents Parking Scheme Policy.
- c) That the Committee receives a report at its meeting on 15 April 2015 relating to the results of the public consultation exercise on the savings proposals in relation to home to school transport and college transport.

The meeting concluded at 12.54 pm

JS