



CITY OF WESTMINSTER

# MINUTES

## Environment Policy & Scrutiny Committee

### MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of a meeting of the **Environment Policy & Scrutiny Committee** Committee held on **Monday 19th January, 2015**, Rooms 5, 6 & 7 - 17th Floor, City Hall.

**Members Present:** Councillors Ian Adams (Chairman), Thomas Crockett, Jonthan Glanz, Louise Hyams, Vincenzo Rampulla and Karen Scarborough

**Also Present:** Councillor Richard Beddoe, Deputy Cabinet Member for The Built Environment.

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Cameron Thomson and Councillor Jason Williams

#### 1 MEMBERSHIP

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cameron Thomson and Jason Williams.

#### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Councillor Jonathan Glanz declared that he had recently been appointed as a member of the Conservative Technology Forum which was looking at broadband coverage.

#### 3 MINUTES

- 3.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 10 November 2014 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record of proceedings.

#### 4 UPDATE FROM CABINET MEMBERS

- 4.1 The Committee received written updates from the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment, the Cabinet Member for City Management, Transport and

Infrastructure and the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking on significant matters within their portfolios.

- 4.2 The Chairman welcomed Councillor Richard Beddoe, the Deputy Cabinet Member for the Built Environment, to the meeting. Mr Beddoe was able to provide an update on one topic that had not been included in the Cabinet Member written update, the High Speed 2 railway. It was proposed that Phase 1 would have a terminal in Euston. The bill for this project was not expected to receive royal assent until 2016/17. The Council had lodged its petition in relation to its concerns on behalf of residents and businesses. The Cabinet Member was in favour of the principle of the project but research was taking place into what potential damaging effects there might be. If the High Speed 2 Phase 1 bill was granted royal assent, the indicated opening date for the railway line to the West Midlands was 2026. It was envisaged that Phase 2 from the West Midlands north would open in 2033. The Environmental Statement consultation for the scheme had been published last year. The final document was due to be published in September 2015. It was hoped that this document would mitigate the concerns.
- 4.3 The Committee put questions to and received responses from Councillor Beddoe on the following matters that were relevant to the Built Environment portfolio:
- 4.4 Development Planning – Councillor Rampulla asked about the number of new build properties that had been available for private renting on the open market and what the Council was doing to encourage affordable new builds. Councillor Beddoe replied that this question was perhaps more appropriate for the Cabinet Member for Housing. However, he advised that the Council was continuing to support affordable housing wherever possible in new developments. These included at Chelsea Barracks and recently at St John's Wood Barracks where 59 affordable new units had been approved. There was not a precise figure for the number of new builds since 2010. In the 2011 census, the private rented sector comprised 43% of housing stock.
- 4.5 Councillor Karen Scarborough asked what the Cabinet Member's response was to the Department for Communities and Local Government's ('DCLG's') proposals which were seen as restricting the ability of the Council to apply its short-term letting policy in the future and also to propose the removal of the exemption currently granted to the Central Activity Zone for offices to become housing as permitted development subject to prior approval. Councillor Beddoe stated that he and the Cabinet Member were working hard with MPs and the Lords in opposing the proposals regarding short term lets. There was cross party support for this and Karen Buck MP had been particularly helpful. In respect of the DCLG's proposed removal of the Central Activity Zone exemption, a response from DCLG to the Council's consultation submission was awaited. Councillor Beddoe also emphasised the impact of the financial incentive offered to developers called 'vacant building credit' in the set of DCLG's revisions to the National Planning Guidance. The new guidelines advised that schemes delivering 10 units or less did not have to provide Section 106 contributions towards local infrastructure, education provision and affordable housing and this was already resulting in the Council not securing

significant affordable housing contributions. Councillor Rampulla asked whether a work model had been established with expectations on receiving Section 106 contributions in the light of the new guidelines, particularly how schemes delivering 10 units or less would affect the Council. Councillor Beddoe stated that he would obtain further information on this issue for Councillor Rampulla. The impact would depend on the nature of the applications that were submitted.

- 4.6 Councillor Scarborough referred to paragraph 9.5 of the Cabinet Member's report that the Council was the busiest planning authority in the country and asked if the Council was now employing sufficient numbers of officers. Understaffing had been stated in a previous Cabinet Member update as a concern. Councillor Beddoe responded that the situation did not equate to a staffing crisis. The situation had been improved as a result of six new members of staff being funded by the Westminster Property Association.
- 4.7 Westminster Community Infrastructure Levy 'CIL' – Councillor Scarborough asked when the CIL was likely to come into operation and what would developers be offering to undertake responsibilities such as pavements that were typical as a result of Section 106 agreements. The Deputy Cabinet Member stated that the CIL Draft Charging Schedule was due to be finalised in March. It was expected that the CIL would be adopted in September or October. He added that the Cabinet Member was keen to point out that this was not a damaging position for the Council as Section 106 agreements would not come to an end in April. It would still be possible to reach agreements on affordable housing. In terms of pavements, it was possible to use Section 278 contributions which were linked to transport policies.
- 4.8 Garden Bridge – Councillor Scarborough enquired whether it was known how the funding for the project was progressing. Councillor Beddoe commented that he had been informed that the funding was progressing well. The trust fund was not obliged to report this information to the Council. In response to a question from Councillor Crockett about how the increased footfall would be handled on the north side of the Garden Bridge, he made the point that this was a matter that the Planning Committee would have been required to take into consideration.
- 4.9 Crossrail – Councillor Jonathan Glanz expressed his constituents' concerns in West End Ward regarding potential work sites for Crossrail 2. They had experienced issues from ten years' of works for Crossrail 1 and ten years of uncertainty prior to that. Soho Square had been identified as a possible work site for Crossrail 2 and the local press was suggesting Curzon Cinema in Shaftesbury Avenue was another potential site. Councillor Glanz stated that whilst the project in principle would be welcomed, he was seeking some assurance the long suffering residents' interests would be looked after. Councillor Beddoe replied that he and the Cabinet Member fully appreciated the residents' concerns regarding further works being likely to take place. The Crossrail 2 proposals however were still at the draft stage and it would not be appropriate to formally respond to them until they were concrete.

4.10 Neighbourhood Planning – Councillor Jason Williams had submitted questions to Councillor Beddoe prior to the meeting on this topic. They were as follows:

- How many expressions of interests in setting up neighbourhood forums have been received? Councillor Beddoe informed those present that to date the Council had received sixteen firm expressions of interest in establishing neighbourhood forums. Seven had been designated. Three were due for designation shortly. Two consultations were currently taking place in respect of applications received. There were a total of twenty one designated neighbourhood areas in Westminster which accounts for 43% of all neighbourhood areas in London.
- What is the average time frame for a decision on setting up a neighbourhood forum in the City? Councillor Beddoe stated that the average time frame for a decision was three and a half months. The Planning Authority was required to publicise the application for at least six weeks. The Authority then had to analyse any representations submitted and undertake its assessments.
- What support and resources are available for neighbourhood forums for developing their plans and at what stage are the forums at in developing their plans? Councillor Beddoe explained that the Council had a duty to support the neighbourhood forums and was able to offer advice and assistance. The Government provided a grant of up to £7,000 per forum to develop neighbourhood plans. The forums are independent bodies and are expected to also generate their own funding.

4.11 **ACTION:** The following action arose from questions raised by the Committee:

- That Councillor Rampulla receive further information on the perceived impact for the Council as a result of DCLG's new guidelines that schemes delivering 10 units or less did not have to provide Section 106 contributions towards local infrastructure, education provision and particularly affordable housing (**Councillor Richard Beddoe** and **John Walker, Operational Director Development Planning**).

4.12 **RESOLVED:** That the written updates from the Cabinet Members be noted.

## **6 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY FOR WASTE DISPOSAL CONTRACT**

6.1. The Committee received a presentation on the procurement strategy for the waste disposal contract from Phil Robson, Waste and Recycling Manager. Members were aware that a version of the presentation had been included in the agenda papers which did not include commercially confidential information. The presentation being given at the meeting did include some commercially sensitive information at the end of the slides and the Chairman suggested that as much of the presentation as possible was heard in public with the few more sensitive aspects raised towards the end in private session.

6.2 Mr Robson was asked by the Chairman what he hoped to achieve in providing the presentation. Mr Robson replied that he was aware that waste as a topic had not been discussed at the Committee or scrutinised since the Council elections in May 2014 and only one Councillor had been a member of the Committee prior to that date. The presentation was therefore an opportunity

to give the Committee an up to date concept of the market place, some background to the waste strategy and what the planned next steps were.

- 6.3 During the presentation, Mr Robson advised that the current waste disposal contracts expired in September 2016. Three key stages had already been undertaken over an eighteen month period. These were internal scoping, public consultation on the draft waste strategy and Greater London Authority approval for the final waste strategy. The procurement phase was now being taken forward. Mr Robson confirmed that the procurement phase for the contracts expiring in September 2016 did not include waste collection, only disposal. The three key service drivers for the procurement phase were that the needs of residents and businesses were met, that it was compliant with national and regional waste strategies and it was affordable, particularly given the current climate.
- 6.4 Mr Robson stated that of the 184,000 tonnes of waste collected per year, 10% was litter, 40% from households and 50% from businesses. 4% of the waste was currently going to landfill, 14% was being recycled and 82% being taken to energy from waste facilities. Mr Robson provided some background to Members of the Committee's role with the waste strategy in the past. This included a Members Task Force which had provided useful recommendations on the structure and content of the public consultation exercise and incentives that would assist in residents and businesses 'doing the right thing' in terms of recycling. The public consultation involved knocking on the doors of over 12,000 residents. There had also been 450 residents' responses to an online questionnaire and 49 business responses to the questionnaire. The responses gave a clear impression that people wanted to recycle more food waste and also battery and waste electrical and electronic equipment. Mr Robson explained that Westminster did not have garden waste collections. Only 9% of properties in the borough have gardens and most that do have gardeners to collect the waste so there was a lack of take-up for the service when it was provided.
- 6.5 Mr Robson advised that the Council's current performance was that 86% of collections were black bags for residual waste and 14% were blue bags for recycling. The Mayor's Strategy Target for 2020 was 50% for both. The Council had agreed with the Mayor a target for 2020 of 65% residual waste collection and 35% recycling collection. This took into account the challenging operating environment which Councillor Argar, the Cabinet Member in this area, had referred to at the November 2014 meeting. The Council was not looking to build its own plants to treat the waste. It had a commitment to significantly boost commercial waste recycling services. The waste strategy targets for 2016 to 2031 were to achieve a municipal waste recycling rate of 35% by 2020, 40% by 2025 and 45% by 2031; achieve zero growth in the amount of waste produced by each household per year by 2020; reduce the amount of household waste not re-used, recycled or composted by the residents of Westminster to 225kg per capita by 2020 and to maximise diversion of biodegradable municipal waste from landfill to exceed 2020 national targets.

- 6.6 The scope of the requirements for the waste disposal contracts were the treatment and disposal of residual waste, provision of a public tip, the disposal or treatment of organic waste and the disposal of dry recyclables. Consideration was being given to whether there was a need for transfer station facilities. If the facilities were further than thirty five minutes away they were not economically viable. Mr Robson's presentation set out the prices for recycling, organics, mechanical biological treatment, energy from waste and landfill. He made the point that these demonstrated that there was a clear economic incentive in terms of the disposal costs of recycling waste over burning it although it was not possible to compact recycling at the same compaction rate as residual waste. More recycling vehicles were required to collect the same level of waste as residual waste. The Council was looking to minimise sending to landfill, particularly as there was a significant tax on this.
- 6.7 The Committee agreed to discuss the commercially sensitive aspects of the presentation in private session.

**RESOLVED:** That under Section 100 (A)(4) and Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business because they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information on the grounds shown below and it is considered that, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information:

| <u>Item Nos.</u> | <u>Grounds</u>   | <u>Para. of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act</u> |
|------------------|--|---|
| Part of item 6   | Information relating to financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). | 3   |

- 6.8 Further slides which were not commercially confidential included one that predicted municipal waste recycling rates to 2031/2. Also, the timetable for the procurement phase was set out. Soft market testing had recently commenced and would be a two month exercise over the winter. Discussions would take place with the industry leading to the production of a tender document which would need to be signed off by the Mayor. The intention would be to commence procurement in the summer and that the contract award would be in summer 2016. Mr Robson added that it was envisaged that the item would be brought before the Committee to be scrutinised when the implications of the tenders, including in terms of what the market was offering, were understood.
- 6.9 The Chairman thanked Mr Robson and added that it would be useful to include the waste disposal procurement strategy as an item for the 2015/16 Work Programme. There was the potential for a task group to be established in order to scrutinise the work and assist and support officers.

- 6.10 **RESOLVED:** That the waste disposal procurement strategy be included as an item for the 2015/16 Work Programme.

## 7 BROADBAND COVERAGE

- 5.1 The Chairman stated that the purpose of the item was to get a good understanding of the obstacles and risks to achieving high speed broadband access throughout the borough. It would then be for Steve Carr, Acting Head of Economic Development, Business & Growth and the Committee to look at what additional work could be done, potentially with the providers, to take this matter forward.
- 5.2. Mr Carr introduced the report. Officers were receiving representations from Members, businesses and residents in relation to cases of poor connectivity and poor broadband speeds. Currently 47% of premises were receiving superfast broadband. This was an improved figure from the year before but still remarkably low. There was a high demand for superfast broadband in Westminster. There were 47,000 businesses, 65% of which were small firms. 84% of businesses stated in a Council survey that connectivity was very significant for them. There was a particularly significant digital media presence in the borough. The Government was promoting broadband connectivity, including with the Broadband Connection Voucher scheme but the rate of take-up was variable. The Government had permitted broadband street cabinets and other infrastructure to be installed without the need for planning permission. There was a healthy market with huge competition.
- 5.3 Mr Carr advised that the Council was working with providers currently to examine ways to improve connectivity. Ideas included using premises and assets in a more proactive way. Officers were particularly aware of the City of London's pilot regarding 'fibre to basement'. The Council would continue to work with landlords and the property sector. The Greater London Authority's ('GLA) 'Wired Property Scheme' with ratings for premises' connectivity was expected to stimulate demand for broadband. The Council was liaising with Ofcom and Broadband UK. Broadband UK was keen to address the issues relating to low levels of connectivity in Whitehall and Soho, including the small micro companies that may not be able to afford the lease lines. The current meeting was a useful forum to hear from the providers what they believed the barriers to improving connectivity and take-up rates for superfast broadband were. A connectivity working group had been established to look at some of these issues. Ben Goward, Interim Chief Information Officer added that in respect of using Council assets, he had been involved in the previous deal with O2 regarding the use of street furniture as locations for 4G and WiFi. Other local authorities had been looking at maximising use of street assets and other sites such as rooftops, new developments and partnerships with landlords and agencies to provide extra coverage. Mr Goward was part of a GLA forum examining poor levels of superfast broadband connectivity in London
- 5.4 Councillor Glanz spoke in his capacity as the Lead Member for Connectivity in addition to being a Member of the Committee. He described the issues for the

large numbers of smaller companies in the creative industries based in West End Ward (particularly Soho), which he represents, who were struggling to achieve the connectivity they required. They were struggling to compete with similar businesses based in other world cities. Some of the larger companies had found their own private lease lines solutions. It was also difficult to explain to residents, who had made the decision to reside in Westminster and were paying substantial rents, why they could not access the broadband speeds that could be accessed elsewhere, including in other parts of the United Kingdom. Councillor Glanz explained the problems of living in Central London and having an office close by which could not achieve the 20 megabytes per second ('mbps') internet speed which he had paid for. It was often in the 1-6 mbps range and on occasion there were issues with sending out emails with attachments. It was not acceptable for people not to be able to access the likes of 'iplayer' when they were paying significant prices for these services.

- 5.5 The Committee heard evidence from representatives of a number of broadband providers. The attendees were Andrew Campling, General Manager London, BT Regions; Sue Terpilowski OBE, Chairman of the London Policy Unit at the Federation of Small Businesses; Dana Pressman Tobak, Managing Director, Hyperoptic; Brian Iddon, Director, Venus Business Communications and Tim Stranack and Callum Dick, Directors of Community Fibre. They were asked by the Committee to give their thoughts on the environment for connectivity and superfast broadband and also what assistance the Council could give. Mr Campling was of the view that BT had not received as much support from the Council previously as the company would have liked. The company was looking to invest again in improving the broadband situation in urban areas including Central London in the near future. He added that it was more expensive to provide the services in Central London than elsewhere in the UK, deployment of infrastructure costs were greater and there was not generally a willingness on the part of recipients of the service to pay more. It was also quite difficult to find places to establish locations to deploy the infrastructure, including in the street. However, business grade services and standard broadband were available to 100% of premises in the capital. The PwC Cities of Opportunity report ranked London second only to Seoul out of 30 global cities for the quality of its broadband. Where one was located in London was relevant to the service received. There was the potential in multi-tenanted buildings to share the costs of services with tenants.
- 5.6 Sue Terpilowski, addressing the Committee, stated that the Federation's members regularly complained about poor connectivity and high costs of broadband services in Central London. Businesses carried out more work online than in the past and the loss of connectivity had a serious adverse impact, including for those who were working from home. Federation members were saying that they needed SDL with same speed uploading and downloading. Ongoing costs in the centre of London were making it unviable for businesses to operate there. She recommended that broadband was established as a fourth utility for planning purposes. The Federation's survey had found that London had compared poorly with other capital cities'



broadband connectivity, particularly Berlin, and it was stated as an issue as to why businesses leave London.

- 5.7 Brian Iddon stated that Venus is based in Westminster. It had started its build out of the network four years previously. It had sought to supply fibre optic broadband services to media and broadcast companies and now had a dark fibre network across London. Soho was the busiest of the exchange areas. He made the point that fibre to the premises was the highest quality service available as the speed did not diminish as was the case with copper. He appreciated that in some cases small businesses did have issues affording fibre optic services. However, they could make use of the Broadband Connection Voucher scheme and they often teamed up in multi-tenanted buildings to obtain fibre to the premises. There was plenty of capacity available for fibre to the premises across Central London including where fibre to the cabinet was not available. The Government's voucher scheme was steadily increasing awareness of the options available.
- 5.8 Dana Tobak stated that Hyperoptic had been established in 2010 and were specialists in installing fibre into residential blocks. They were the largest fibre to the premises providers in the UK. These included providing a service or being in the process of installing fibre into over eight thousand flats in the borough. Ms Tobak expressed the view that what was preventing further progress in this service being provided was the reluctance of freeholders. Initially freeholders preferred tenants to use broadband over a phone line and not install the required cabling.
- 5.9 Community Fibre was established to provide TV, telephone and ultra-fast broadband services to Westminster's 22,000 social housing residents. Tim Stranack commented that the broadband statistics available were confusing. It appeared that in many cases they were averaged across London and the company was willing to assist in collating relevant information. There was an active competitive market for fibre optic services and he stated that it would aid the take-up if the Council or the Federation of Small Businesses would advise potential customers of the independent providers in the market. More could also be done in making potential customers aware of the Government's voucher scheme. He concurred with Ms Tobak's point that landlords had to be persuaded of the benefits of fibre to premises. It had taken two years to obtain the necessary permissions. Ultimately there was the potential for broadband to help the price of landlords' properties. Mr commented that any concerns with street cabinets did not need to arise if there was a fully fibre network. He offered to be involved in the Connectivity Summit which had been included in the report as a possible way forward.
- 5.10 The Committee asked the representatives present a number of questions and the following points were raised:
- Ms Terpilowski was asked about the take-up of the Government vouchers scheme. She stated that it was improving. It had been more extensively advertised and people who had used the scheme were able to speak in support of it. There was still the issue that the different tenancy time frames meant that it was difficult to convince a number of potential users

to join together. There were premises where there was no communication between the tenants. The Federation of Small Businesses had to remain neutral in publicising the scheme. Croydon Council had been an example of a local authority that had been proactive in promoting the vouchers scheme.

- The providers were asked about their solutions to increase the connectivity in the 'blackspots'. Mr Campling stated that there were currently 52% of premises who were not receiving superfast broadband. The issues of lack of space under the pavement and historic issues with looking to provide the services in conservation areas were faced by all providers. The different length of leases was affecting the take-up of the Government vouchers scheme. If landlords provided connectivity as part of the service in their premises, this would largely address the problem of the number accessing superfast broadband in Westminster. He clarified that BT could reach any part of Westminster for business grade connectivity. It was volume broadband connectivity which was the challenge where additional infrastructure was required. Ms Topak wished to emphasise that BT was focussing on providing fibre to the cabinet to as much of the country as possible. Hyperoptic was focussing on fibre to the premises. If there was one provider the cost would rise and there was a mental shift away from one provider creating a solution for every home and business. Competition solved people's different needs. Mr Iddon commented that fibre to premises was a mainstream product and the necessary equipment had been placed in exchanges by Venus so that the services could be provided to areas such as Whitehall, Mayfair and Covent Garden. Ms Terpilowski stated that wireless connectivity was another solution. Mr Goward added that the Council was looking at the assets it has such as roof spaces and the use of 5G would give more options in terms of mobile space. Mr Stranack made the point that some of the other providers would be able to use different technologies that BT may not have decided to use. There were potentially wireless, in addition to fibre network, solutions that could be employed to assist harder to reach businesses.
- Mr Iddon explained how fibre to premises worked as opposed to fibre to cabinet. It was not necessary to dig under streets to get a fibre connection to the local exchange. There were often existing BT Openreach ducts or a duct would be dug into a building. There was a single unbroken cable from the premises to the local exchange. He did not believe that there were sufficient street cabinets in London for fibre to cabinet. All businesses were required to contract with Openreach to provide fibre to premises connections on the same terms and price. He advised that if the customer needed to contact the provider, it would be the provider who would speak to the customer and not Openreach. Venus had a team of provision specialists and engineers who managed the connection process. Mr Campling informed Members of the Committee that BT did provide more fibre to premises services than the rest of the industry combined and were testing different methods. They were provided where it made economic sense to do so. He expressed the view that the speed differential between fibre to premises and fibre to cabinet solutions was fast eroding.

- The providers were asked what the Government vouchers covered. Mr Campling replied that the rules were clear that they could only contribute to connection costs to the network and not monthly rental costs.
- Ms Topak and Mr Stranack and Mr Dick were asked whether there was sufficient competition to ensure that customers would be able to access consistently high speeds at affordable prices. Ms Topak referred to Hyperoptic providing 1000 mbps. She did not accept that fibre to cabinet was able to achieve similar speeds to fibre to premises and made the point that the more people using the service, the greater the slowdown. Mr Dick stated it was necessary to offer something to the city and the individual. It was necessary to be competitive in terms of speeds and price with other major cities and he also believed that the speeds sought could only be achieved via fibre to premises.
- The Chairman asked the attendees what is the one key aspect they would like the Council to be mindful of. Mr Stranack requested that the Council made its businesses and residents aware that alternative providers do exist. He accepted that the Council had to be unbiased in terms of making this information known as was the case with the Federation of Small Businesses. There were not too many infrastructure competitors. There were a number of different suppliers who used the same infrastructure. Ms Terpilowski reiterated her request that broadband was made the fourth utility for planning applications in the same way as electricity and gas. Mr Campling asked that the Council look at its approach to street works. He believed it was possible to take out a lot of the costs that would make it more economical to provide the service in areas like Marylebone. Ms Topak responded that there was more than one key aspect to be mindful of. These included making the most efficient use of the investment able to consumers including the Government vouchers. She concurred with the idea of making broadband a fourth utility for planning applications and asked that key landholders across the borough take responsibility for making high speed broadband available to the residents and businesses. Mr Iddon asked for making potential customers aware of the services available and the Council having a consistent process for getting fibre to buildings.

5.11 It was agreed that the Westminster Connectivity Group would look at what more the Council could do on this topic, taking into account what had been discussed at the meeting. The intention would be for the group to report back to the Committee with their findings within six months. Mr Carr stated there would be an ongoing dialogue with providers. The current meeting had been useful, including highlighting the strategic issue of broadband being the fourth utility and whether there was the potential for this to feature in the City Plan. It was recommended that the Committee's work would feed into a Member led meeting on broadband (involving Councillor Glanz) with principal landowners in Westminster taking place in February.

5.12 **RESOLVED:**

1. That the Westminster Connectivity Group report back to the Committee with its findings within six months of the current meeting.

2. That the Committee recommended that the Committee's work feed into a Member led meeting on broadband with principal landowners in Westminster taking place in February.

## **8 PRESS RELEASES**

- 7.1 The remainder of the meeting was held in public session. The Chairman advised those present that he had been communicating with Mark Ewbank, Scrutiny Manager and Ellie Caine, Media Officer, regarding the broadband item prior to the meeting and they would discuss the following day the merits of a press release on this topic. Councillors Rampulla and Scarborough recommended that there was a press release to state who had given evidence at the meeting and inform people of the range of providers offering a service to Westminster customers.

## **9 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME AND ACTION TRACKER 2014/15**

- 8.1 The Committee considered that it was appropriate to retain two way traffic schemes and the Walking Strategy as items for the next meeting scheduled for Monday 2 March. The Committee also decided the progress of the Westminster Community Infrastructure Levy would remain on the Work Programme for the April meeting and that an item on climate change would specifically focus on reducing emissions in the borough.
- 8.2 It was proposed that the last scheduled meeting of the Committee in the Council year 2014/15 would be held on Monday 13 April. This had been the original date of the meeting. This appeared to be a date when many Members of the Committee were able to attend and it was noted that the Cabinet Member for the Built Environment was available. It was agreed that the Minority Party Chief Whip would be consulted on the proposed date of the April meeting.
- 8.3 **ACTION:** That the Minority Party Chief Whip be consulted on the proposed date of the April meeting.
- 8.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Annual Work Programme 2014/15 be amended accordingly.

## **10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

- 9.1 There was no additional business for the Committee to consider.

The Meeting ended at 9.35 pm

**CHAIRMAN:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_