

EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MINUTES

Committee:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date:	Tuesday, 5 January 2016
Place:	Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping	Time:	7.30 - 9.11 pm
Members Present:	Councillors R Morgan (Chairman) K Angold-Stephens (Vice-Chairman) N Avey, K Chana, T Church, D Dorrell, L Girling, P Keska, J Lea, A Mitchell, G Mohindra, S Neville, B Rolfe, G Shiell, B Surtees and D Wixley		
Other Councillors:	Councillors R Bassett, W Breare-Hall, A Grigg, H Kauffman, J Philip, C P Pond, C C Pond, D Stallan and C Whitbread		
Apologies:	Councillors S Kane, S Murray and M Sartin		
Officers Present:	D Macnab (Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Neighbourhoods), K Bean (Planning Policy Manager), S Tautz (Democratic Services Manager), A Hendry (Senior Democratic Services Officer), S Kits (Social Media and Customer Services Officer) and M Jenkins (Democratic Services Officer)		
By Invitation:	Cllr R Gooding (Essex County Council), B Page (Epping Forest College) and M Pincombe (Essex County Council)		

35. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman reminded everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the Internet, and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meetings.

36. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was reported that Councillor K Chana was substituting for Councillor M Sartin and Councillor J Lea was substituting for Councillor S Kane.

37. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the last Committee meeting, held on 20 October 2015 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor W Breare-Hall declared a non-pecuniary interest in the following item of the agenda by virtue of being a governor of Epping Forest College. He advised that his interest was not prejudicial and he would remain in the meeting for the duration of the item and consideration thereon:

- Call-in – Release of Restructure covenants on land at Epping Forest College.

39. CALL-IN - RELEASE OF RESTRUCTURE COVENANTS ON LAND AT EPPING FOREST COLLEGE, LOUGHTON

The Chairman welcomed the participants for the Call-in, the relevant Portfolio Holder, Councillor J Philip and the two lead members who initiated the call-in, Councillors Chris Pond and H Kaufman. Also in attendance was Brian Page, the interim Principal of Epping Forest College; County Councillor Ray Gooding, the ECC Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning and Mark Pincombe the ECC School Organisation Officer.

The Committee considered the call-in of the Cabinet's decision (report C-018-2015/16) taken on 5 November 2015 regarding the release of restrictive covenants on land at Epping Forest College, Loughton. The decision being called in was:

(1) *That a Deed of Release of the 1952 and 1955 Covenants be issued by the Council, consistent with the previous Deeds of Release on the land at Epping Forest College, on the following basis:*

(a) *A Deed of Release of the 1952 and 1955 Covenants consistent with the previous deeds of release is executed by the Council and is held in escrow pending written confirmation from the College's Solicitors to the Council that:*

(i) *the College's application for [outline] planning permission for the development of its new Sports, Health and Well-Being facility for the benefit of the College's students and the wider community has been submitted to the Council; and*

(ii) *Contracts for the College's sale of the Middle Site and part of the Playing Fields for residential development, conditional upon execution of such Deed of Release of the 1952 and 1955 Covenants, have been signed and are held in escrow pending execution and delivery of the said Deed of Release; and*

(2) *That the pre-emption rights of the Council not be exercised on the land.*

The Call-in was based on the following premises, that:

- 1) *The covenants were imposed by the London County Council to protect an adequate supply of land for educational and NHS use in the vicinity of the residential development they had undertaken.*
- 2) *That need remains valid today.*
- 3) *ECC projections of rising 5s, plus the factors of extensive EFDC council house building and of continuing in-migration, imply a new school will be needed in 7-10 years.*
- 4) *There is no suitable spare land in Loughton on which a new school could be built.*
- 5) *Therefore this land, use of which was restricted for the needs of the then LEA (and NHS), should continue to be protected by covenant, for its original purpose.*

The lead member of the call-in, Councillor Chris Pond was asked to open the discussion. He noted that the covenants were applied by the London County Council (LCC) on completion of the Debden Housing Estate to provide educational facilities. Later the land was transferred to the further education college. The covenant was

transferred to EFDC and was still valid for educational facilities. He also noted that the financial compensation would not be sufficient.

The education projection of the population by the ONS suggested that no new places were to be needed in the next 10 years. But this did not take into account the Local Plan and the need for new houses. ECC had responded to the expanding need for places in Loughton, but now there was no more room left to expand. County Councillor Val Metcalfe and myself have been worried about this situation and had asked Councillor Gooding to visit Loughton. He did say that the county was not in a position to buy the land immediately but he would like to protect it for the future. The site on the field was of 11 acres and would be able to provide a new sports centre, a valuable asset for the community, as well as a new primary school which would take up about 3 of the 11 acres. Pertinent to protect at least a part of it for the purpose it was designated for.

Therefore I am asking that this be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for further consideration with a view to adding into the conditions after the words: "and the wider community" something like "taking into account the need to protect the suitable area of land for establishing a new school to the requirements of the education authority".

I would also point out that I think that the proposed condition as it is presently drafted maybe legally defective, in that it would permit the college, having secured planning permission for a new sports facility then not to proceed with it and to sell the land on without any protection from the covenant. As a grant of planning permission did not always compel the applicant to build as authorised. Although, I am not saying that Epping Forest College was acting in bad faith; but we know that colleges are subject to the whims of government policy and their finances are not always ensured.

Councillor Kaufman added that part of the site was in his ward and provided a local amenity. There were also pressures on school places in that area. All the land was urban open space as defined by EFDC's Local Plan. It would be a departure from Council policy to open up open space just for housing. I suggest that we have some local research commissioned by the Council to look at the local plan. Until we have a new Local Plan we would not know how many houses were to be built and therefore how many school places were to be needed. He also noted that no local consultation had taken place; neither the ward members nor the local population had been consulted. Other authorities having a similar case had decided to consult their local residents. On a site like this, including blocks of flats you would be looking at about 200 to 250 units being built. Where were these people to put their kids? There was no provision for education. We should reserve 3 acres from the covenant for the provision of a school.

Councillor Kaufman also went on to note that the value of the land differed substantially whether it had a covenant or not attached to it.

Finally, in his opinion, he did not believe that EFDC had undertaken its statutory duty of obtaining 'best value' for this council.

He would like O&S to send it back to the Cabinet for further consultation.

The responsible Portfolio Holder, Councillor Philip, was then asked to make his opening statement. He thanked the councillors for calling in this decision and noted that it was interesting that it was only for educational facilities and not for health facilities which were equally valid.

However, he thought that Councillor Pond's legal points were not valid. He had asked officers to consult ECC about this on a number of occasions asking them specifically to confirm if they wanted this site for educational purposes. It was not until we had confirmation from the County Council that they did not want this site that he took it to the Cabinet.

He noted that for a number of reasons we did not have our Local Plan in place at present. However we know that we are not looking to have the Local Plan adopted until 2017/18.

The Council received a request from Epping Forest College to release the Covenant and had to process that request in a reasonable timescale. So, waiting for another two years to know what our Local Plan was going to look like would not be a timely response.

Councillor Philip noted that it was not his job to address the provision of primary educational needs for the area. Officers had asked Essex County Council's Education department and they said that they did not want it.

He would not want to say that Epping Forest College would not line up with the conditions that we had put on. We had seen on previous occasions that when the Council had put on conditions on the release of covenants that Epping Forest College had followed those. He took legal advice on whether the conditions we were putting on were appropriate and they were.

Looking at the issue of local input into this; they had discussed this fully at Cabinet, which was a perfect opportunity for local ward members to put forward their points of view.

He was surprised to hear Councillor Kaufman say that that the average in this district were 18 to 20 dwellings per hectare. It was not.

The area of release was requested for the whole site. It would give an opportunity for the college to generate sufficient revenue to put in place the sports facilities that have been identified by everyone as delivering significant benefit to the area. Not just Loughton but also the surrounding areas.

The difference in value as Councillor Kaufman referred to has to be taken back to the difference in value to when the covenant was put in place in 1952. Which was in the order of £10k. The cost of taking this to the Land Tribunal would be significantly in excess of that.

This was a decision that we looked at in great depth, this was a decision in which we asked the education authority whether they wanted the land and they did not. Given that we had no option but to say that it made sense to release the covenants.

We have looked at this in great depth, it was a sensible decision and I ask you to keep the decision as is.

The Chairman asked if any of the invited guests had any comments to make at this point.

Mr B Page the interim Principal of Epping Forest College emphasised that the proposed sports centre would be for Community use as well as college use. They were seeking to replace the leisure centre that was there. The sports centre would be for their students use and for the community. They were also seeking to dispose of

their surplus land and the derelict building there now using the capital receipts to fund the development and he added that their financial base was very strong.

If the release of the covenants did not go ahead then their plans would have to be slimmed down.

County Councillor R Gooding, the ECC Cabinet member for Education and Lifelong learning thanked Councillor Pond for his summation of their discussions. He noted that at present the ECC was not in a position to purchase this land to bank for future use. He was confident that we did not need this land for school development in the next 10 years. He would like to hedge his bets as this may be an issue in 15 to 20 years time, but the covenant was in the District Council's control now. In terms of overall pupil numbers this was not an issue for new housing.

In summary the ECC did not need new places for the next 10 years and it was up to EFDC what they did with the covenant.

Mr M Pincombe, the ECC School Organisation Officer noted that the situation had been well described. As for the forecast for school places for the next 10 years; they were confident for the first 5 years as it was based on children living in the area; but the following 5 years they were less confident as that was based on trends and ONS data. But statically they are fairly accurate on a long term basis. They had looked at the forecast over two areas, Loughton and Buckhurst Hill. They would require additional places over the next 10 years but we already have that planned. It takes into account housing that we are aware of and planning permission in these areas. But obviously it did not take into account new housing. But for the figures that we have we are confident that we could accommodate them certainly from 2017.

Finally to state again, they are just forecasts; I can't say we will not require any additional places in Loughton primary schools in the next 10 years but what I cannot do is demonstrate with evidence that there was a need for additional places in the next 10 years in the area.

The meeting was then opened to general discussion. Councillor Surtees asked if consent would be held off until planning permission was granted or had been applied for; when we have some clarification. Councillor Philip said it would be for an application for outline planning permission.

Councillor Surtees went on to say that for matters as important as this it was not satisfactory just to involve the local councillors, it was more appropriate to have wider public consultation.

Councillor Mohindra noted that he was a Chigwell Councillor and was interested in what the Essex Officer had to say about the provision of places in Buckhurst Hill and Loughton but not necessarily Chigwell. They had issues with Chigwell Primary School and he had concerns about the provision of schooling in that urban triangle.

He thought the proposal of part of the site not being released was an interesting one. He did not agree with the other sentiments being put forward about consultations especially as we have had the college at our meetings and we have discussed potential future plans. He had reservations and if the Portfolio Holder would like to revisit part of the decision I would be agreeable to that.

Councillor Girling remarked that he had a young family who may be affected by this and so had people that he knew. They were not being listened to. They could not get school places in Loughton and had to go to Chigwell. Many had to travel over the

district and you may have people from Epping having to go to Loughton or Chigwell schools. There was a need to involve families over this as there were no local schools for local families.

The Local Plan does not talk about amenities needed, but school places were a major problem. For my information I would like to know if the ECC own all the school sites; do educational trusts and independent schools have a say if they wanted this land?

I have spoken to eight local head teachers in Loughton who all said they could not take any more children into their schools. Population statistics should relate to the whole district and not just to Loughton. And if ECC cannot afford it, could another education establishment take this on.

County Councillor Gooding accepted his concerns. In the issue around preference for school places the County had less input and control as more schools are becoming academies and become more directly related to the Department of Education. Parental preferences across the county can mean you might not go to a local school. So all good schools are over subscribed and have waiting lists. Also, we cannot have an over supply of school places. It was a difficult process matching supply with demand. The DFE are the only other education authority likely to make speculative purchases and I can't speak for them.

Councillor Wixley was aware that in the past schools closed down and then had to be replaced. Could we have a compromise on this and set aside some local land in case a primary school was needed. Seems to me an air of caution should be adopted and some land set by for the eventuality that we would need an extra primary school.

Mr Page replied that the College had been working with some property advisors, giving them some advice on figures and he would say that unless we can dispose of all the area that we do not require it would become unviable and therefore needed release of the covenant. So even keeping part of it in reserve would still have significant impact on our model for the scheme we would like for the community.

The lead member responsible for the call-in and the Portfolio Holder were asked to sum up the debate.

Councillor Pond in summation asked that the decision be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for:

- Correction of the loopholes when the covenant was discharged on just a planning application;
- To allow for consultation of local residents as nothing matters more to people with children than their education; and
- That the question of the reservation of part of the site be pursued as it had not been considered before. We heard what Mr Page said but we need to see those figures.

Finally I ask the Committee to refer the decision back to the Portfolio Holder for reconsideration.

Councillor Philip thanked Councillor Pond. He wanted to address the key points:

- The provision of sports facilities was something that we as a council want to happen. Only EF College could do this as they own the land;
- Trends for school places were driven by ONS data. The same data we use for forecasting housing figures and as part of our Local Plan; and the evidence of

ONS figures are accepted by Planning enquiries and I would suggest Land Tribunals;

- He understood Councillor Girling's passion for young families and it was important. However, we must look at this on the basis of the evidence that we have. It's not a guess, we used the same figures that the County Council used;
- I do not agree with the call for local consultation, we can't consult on every local decision the Cabinet takes, we have local councillors who can partake in the discussion at Cabinet meetings. And, who should we consult, families, people who propose to have families in the future, or all residents?

We were asked by the college to release these covenants, not just on part of the site; and we have looked carefully at this and our research has led us to believe it would not be needed for the next ten years for education needs. Given that was the case I believe we made the right decision to release the covenants, we made the right decision at Cabinet and I ask you to endorse that decision.

RESOLVED:

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee confirmed the original decision of the Cabinet (C-018-2015/16) regarding the release of restrictive covenants on land at Epping Forest College, Loughton.

40. CORPORATE PLAN - KEY ACTION PLAN 2015/16 - QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE

The Committee received a received a report from the Deputy Chief Executive regarding the quarter 2 performance figures of the Key Objectives Key Action Plan for 2015/16. The Corporate Plan is the Council's key strategic planning document, setting out its priorities over the five-year period from 2015/16 to 2019/20. The priorities or Corporate Aims are supported by Key Objectives, which provide a clear statement of the Council's overall intentions for these five years.

It is important that relevant performance management processes are in place to review progress against the key objectives, to ensure their continued achievability and relevance, and to identify proposals for appropriate corrective action in areas of slippage or under-performance. This report presents progress against the Key Action Plan for 2015/16 at the end of the second quarter (30 September 2015).

Progress against the Key Action Plan was reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure the timely identification and implementation of appropriate further initiatives or corrective action where necessary.

It was noted that at the end of Quarter 2:

- a) 49 (89%) of the individual actions have been achieved or are on target to be achieved by the target date or a revised target date by the end of the year;
- b) 5 (9%) of the individual actions are behind schedule and may not be completed by the end of the year;
- c) 1 (2%) of the individual actions are currently on hold as a result of external circumstances.

Councillor Mohindra asked if the new Economic Development Plan for the District was still to be implemented and was told that it had slipped by another month to six weeks.

Councillor Wixley wanted to know the latest on working in Partnership with Moat Housing to commence the development of the Council garage site. He was informed that there would be a meeting between the cabinet house building committee and Moat Housing on 19 January and hopefully this would be on that agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the progress made at the end of quarter 2 against the Key Objectives Key Action Plan for 2015/16 be noted.

41. CHELMSFORD CITY LOCAL PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS - CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy Manager, Mr K Bean introduced the report on Chelmsford City Local Plan consultation issues. Chelmsford's current local plan runs until 2021 and the next local plan is intended to roll forward to 2036. This consultation on the issues and options was the first of three such public consultation exercises.

The Issues and Options consultation runs from 19 November 2015 to 21 January 2016 – longer than the normal six-week period, but allowing for the Christmas/New Year break. 30 questions have been posed by this consultation document.

Chelmsford shares boundaries with seven other Essex local authorities including Epping Forest District. It has an area of about 34,000 ha, 34% of which is in the Green Belt – this covering the south-west of the City Council area, including the boundary with this Council. It has a current population of 168,300 (with approximately 110,000 in Chelmsford Urban Area) and this is expected to increase to 192,000 by 2022.

There are 13 themes which make up the vision for the new Local Plan. From Epping Forest Council's perspective, the most significant of these are:

- protecting the Green Belt – there was no intention to undertake a strategic review;
- meeting the housing needs of existing and new communities (including appropriate levels of affordable and other specific forms of housing) at sustainable locations where supporting infrastructure will be provided;
- ensuring sufficient land was available to promote a wide range of employment and business opportunities, and continuing to support and encourage diversification within the rural economy;
- supporting development and improvement of the strategic transport network, including (inter alia) a potential western relief road for Chelmsford City; and
- retaining the town's status as the premier city centre shopping destination in Essex – this should be reinforced by the opening of the new Bond Street centre in 2016 (anchored by John Lewis).

The consultation document outlined how (i) housing need (including affordable housing) has been calculated at 930 new homes per year (totalling 13,950 over the period 2021 to 2036) and (ii) using Edge Analytics work, the need to make provision for an additional 887 new jobs per year was also to be tested through the consultation.

Mention was also made of future accommodation needs for travellers with the Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA – 2014) identifying a need

for an additional 55 pitches in the period 2013 to 2033. The consultation document suggested that (i) the revised Government Guidance (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015) may reduce this figure, because of changes in the definition of a “traveller” for planning purposes, and (ii) the need can be broadly met by making provision on major housing sites.

Members noted that provision for traveller sites and pitches was a particularly difficult issue for this authority because of the 92% Green Belt coverage and the fact that permanent and temporary pitches were inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As this authority has a target of 112 extra pitches from the Essex GTAA 2014, one of the options for meeting this figure will be to discuss with our neighbouring authorities the possibility of their meeting some of this need through joint or shared provision. Chelmsford’s consultation document does not mention this as a potential option and therefore the report suggested in the response sent, raising this matter as a cross boundary issue.

Councillor Neville noted that there were other ways of dealing with bottle necks other than building a new (western) bypass – such as increasing public transport.

Councillor Wixley asked if the development of the Gypsy and Traveller sites would have to be in one authority or the other or would they be jointly owned. The Planning Policy Manager explained that under the duty to co-operate requirements, if it could be demonstrated that the identified need for additional pitches cannot be met within Epping Forest District, surrounding authorities maybe asked to consider whether they are able to provide suitable pitches to help meet any identified EFDC shortfall. Councillor Wixley asked if that meant that Chelmsford was unwilling to co-operate. Mr Bean replied that this could not necessarily be assumed and at this early stage with Chelmsford’s plan, the intention was just to flag the concern up as a potential boundary issue.

Councillor Chris Pond asked how recommendation ‘f’ on the support of the potential western bypass to Chelmsford helped this district. Mr Bean agreed that maybe the word ‘support’ was too strong in this context. Councillor Pond supported Councillor Neville’s request that the wording be changed to “notes with interest”. This change of wording was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the following comments on and responses to the consultation be made:

- (a) To note Chelmsford City Council’s commitment to on-going co-operation with other Councils and key organisations on cross-boundary planning issues including housing provision;
- (b) To note the approach being proposed for future provision for the travelling community in the light of the revised guidance “Planning policy for traveller sites” (August 2015), and to suggest that this should be included as a cross-boundary issue, particularly with reference to paragraphs 4(d), 4(h), 10(c) and 16 of the revised guidance;
- (c) To support the City Council’s intention to discount development growth in the Green Belt;
- (d) To support the intention to meet the housing needs of existing and new communities including appropriate levels of affordable housing and of other specific groups at sustainable locations and including necessary supporting infrastructure;
- (e) To support the spatial principles and the options (including hybrids) for accommodating future growth;

- (f) To note with interest the idea in principle of a potential western bypass to Chelmsford.

42. CROSSRAIL 2 - CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy Manager, Mr K Bean introduced the report on the consultation relating to Crossrail 2, which had a deadline of 8 January 2015.

Following an earlier consultation in 2013, the route for Crossrail 2 was decided upon with the Regional option favoured over the Metro option. This decision accorded with the route preference expressed by this Council at that time. Subject to funding and Government approval, it was anticipated that an application for powers could be made in 2017, with construction beginning in 2020 and completion at the earliest in 2030.

The route of the Regional option Crossrail 2 Line would run north-east to south-west in tunnels through central London linking up Wimbledon with Tottenham Hale. At the south-west end separate spurs following existing track run to Shepperton, Hampton Court, Chessington and Epsom. At the north-east end of the line a branch was proposed from Dalston heading to New Southgate in Enfield via Seven Sisters. However, the main line would run through Tottenham Hale following the West Anglian Mainline (WAML) route up to Broxbourne.

Crossrail 2 was proposing to build additional track and station infrastructure along the WAML between Tottenham Hale in the south and Broxbourne to the north. Officers understood that the existing twin track line is soon to be upgraded by Network Rail to three tracks between Coppermill Junction, south of Tottenham Hale, and Angel Road station. Crossrail 2 requires the addition of more tracks along the route to at least just north of Broxbourne. At present there remains a question mark whether the Crossrail 2 line terminates at Broxbourne or continues to either Hertford East or Harlow. Whilst canvassing opinions on the potential route beyond Broxbourne was not the subject of this consultation it would clearly be of great interest to local authorities in the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium (LSCC) wider area.

Mr Bean flagged up the following issues for Members' consideration and agreement for including in the Council's consultation response:

- That it was important to understand what the overall benefits and impacts of Crossrail 2 were likely to be for the District.
- In reiterating EFDC's continued broad support for Crossrail 2, there were invariably a number of issues and uncertainties at this stage regarding the likely impacts that implementation of the scheme may have.
- Given that 2030 was the very earliest date that the line could become operational, assessment of likely impacts on Epping Forest District were very difficult to gauge at this stage.
- Once Crossrail 1 begins service in 2019/2010 the Council will also have an adopted Local Plan in place outlining the number and location of growth that will need to be planned for across the District up to 2033.
- For EFDC it was suggested flagging up the need for careful thought and extensive consultation on the matter of level crossings. For the section of line running through Enfield and Hertfordshire, as the consultation identifies, a key issue to be resolved will be where existing level crossings need to be closed. In particular, the extent and form of alternative access for vehicles and pedestrians that would need to be provided either by way of bridge, underpass or via a diversion.

- The level crossing barriers at both Roydon and Sawbridgeworth were currently down for up to 30 minutes in every hour, an issue that would need to be addressed if improvements made to the West Anglia route drew extra rail traffic.
- If it was decided that the Crossrail 2 terminus was to be in Broxbourne it was likely to mean the requirement for a marshalling yard in the vicinity of either Broxbourne or Cheshunt stations, and therefore relatively close to the District boundary.
- In expressing a preference for the regional option in 2013 this Council highlighted its concern about the need for guaranteed future investment in, and improvements to, the Central Line – both the Epping branch and the Hainault loop.
- The route, speed and relative ticket pricing for Crossrail 2 when it becomes operational are all variables that are likely to influence passenger behaviour between using Crossrail 2 or the Central Line to access central London.

Councillor Wixley agreed that we should emphasise the need for improvements to the Central Line. Councillor Neville agreed and added that the Central Line needed adequate funding.

Councillor Chris Pond said that there were no plans for a Marshalling Yard but for a Maintenance Depot. Also a new line would mean handling about 10,000 seats per hour as opposed to 3,000 at present. Councillor Bassett noted that the Maintenance depot would be in Wimbledon; there was already a Marshalling Yard in Broxbourne. They were talking about a fast line being able to handle considerably more trains and passengers travelling into London in peak hours. All authorities had their own idea of where the line should end.

RESOLVED:

To make the following comments on and responses to the consultation:

- (g) That the Committee considered the issues set out in the report and determined the view to give in responding to the consultation having had regard to the matters set out in paragraphs 6 to 9 of the officer report, especially to emphasise the need for continued investment in the Central Line.
- (h) That the views of EFDC are made known to other relevant stakeholders including: London Stansted Cambridge Consortium, London Boroughs of Redbridge and Waltham Forest, Essex County Council, Borough of Broxbourne, Corporation of London, LVRPA, SELEP and MPs for the Epping, Harlow and Brentwood & Ongar constituencies.

43. WORK PROGRAMME MONITORING

(a) Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Committee considered their work programme and noted the current progress. The Committee noted that:

- (i) The Fire and Rescue Service would no longer make their proposed presentation to the Committee and it would be removed from the work programme. They will now do separate, private briefing on 27 January 2016.

- (ii) It was noted that a progress report on the recent Youth Engagement Task and Finish Panel would be scheduled for a future meetings, probably to the next meeting and the April meeting.
- (iii) The original timescale of the Grant Aid Review Task and Finish Panel could not now be met. See below.

Select Committees:

(1) Housing Select Committee

The vice chairman had nothing to report.

(2) Governance Select Committee

The Chairman, Councillor Church, reported that their work programme was on schedule. He also noted that they had asked the Resources Select Committee to consider the Planning Enforcement report as in more readily sat within their purview.

(3) Neighbourhood & Community Services Select Committee

The lead officer Mr Macnab reported that the committee had held a waste review meeting on 17 December. The Key finding are to be considered at their next meeting on 19 January and will then go on to the main Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then on to an appropriate Cabinet meeting in the Spring.

(4) Resources Select Committee

The Chairman, Councillor Mohindra, reported that at their last meeting they discussed the EFDC apprenticeship scheme and were looking to have a presentation on this. They also looked at Private Funding and concluded that they would like local ward members to be made aware of this funding.

They also had a report on sick absences and would like to applaud the council on the work it was carrying out on mental health issues.

Task and Finish Panels:

Grant Aid Task and Finish Panel

The Chairman of this Panel Councillor Caroline Pond reported that they had submitted an interim report last April. But, unfortunately due to the untimely death of the lead officer, they had had to rearrange a lot of their meetings and workload. They will now have two more meetings one on 15th February and another on 14th March. They hoped to have a final report by April.

(b) Reserve Programme

There were no current items on the reserve list.

(c) Request for Scrutiny Review (PICK Form)

Councillor Wixley submitted a PICK form, to invite, for a return visit to the committee, the Superintendent of Epping Forest, Paul Thomson and Judy Adams the Chairman of the Friends of Epping Forest. Given the current widespread general interest in

Epping Forest and issues such as the present public consultation on the Forest Management Plan for 2017-27 and also the public interest in the proposed City of London (Various Powers) Bill which according to the press reports had attracted 14000 signatures on an on-line petition.

The Committee agreed to add this item to their work programme for a future presentation. When arranged members would be asked via the Council Bulletin for any questions to be put to the speakers.

Councillor Surtees commented that at recent meeting he had noted that the first part of the public consultation had been completed and a further consultation was to be held in the summer. This may alter the time we ask the speakers to come to us.

44. KEY DECISION LIST - REVIEW

The Committee noted the Cabinet's Key Decision List for November 2015. They had no specific items that they wished to consider.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank