

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Scrutiny Committee** held in the Deben Conference Room,
East Suffolk House, on **Thursday, 14 July 2022 at 6.30pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Edward Back, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Judy Cloke, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Tony Goldson, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Keith Robinson

Other Members present:

Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Louise Gooch, Councillor James Mallinder

Officers present:

Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer), Andy Jarvis (Strategic Director), Nick Khan (Strategic Director), Paul Mackie (Lead Officer - Environment and Climate Change), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer) and Daniel Wareing (Environmental Sustainability Officer).

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillors Coulam, Gandy, Green and Lynch.

Councillors Cooper and Gooch attended as substitutes for Councillors Lynch and Gandy respectively.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of interest.

3 Minutes

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 June 2022 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Review of the Council's Progress Following the Declaration of a Climate Emergency

The Committee received report ES/1220 of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment who briefly introduced it. He emphasised that it was all about a choice for individuals, communities, the Council and Westminster. He stated that the

Environment was a strategic priority and was at the heart of everything the Council did. Members were reminded that the Climate Emergency had been declared in 2019 by the new East Suffolk Council and the Environment Task Group had been borne out of that to focus on achieving carbon neutrality by 2030. In relation to carbon outputs in East Suffolk, the Council was only responsible for less than 1% which was a tiny amount and the Cabinet Member stressed, therefore, that engagement with residents and stakeholders was key because the Council was only part of the solution, not the only solution.

Councillors Back, Gooch and Robinson joined the meeting at 6.35pm.

The Cabinet Member explained that there were three main areas being focussed on, East Suffolk's reduction in the carbon footprint, communicating to the outside world and biodiversity. The Council was embedding the environmental decision making process into the structure of East Suffolk, similar to how we looked at the financial and community impact of decisions, and also focussed on the environment across everything the Council did. He drew attention to the report's appendix which illustrated particular documents across Council departments focussing on the environment. The Cabinet Member explained that, although they were guidance rather than statutory, it focussed East Suffolk on what was important to the Council and residents. He concluded that the big challenge ahead was to keep front line services running environmentally, ensuring value for money and representing what residents expected a good Council to produce.

Councillor Beavan joined the meeting at 6.40pm.

The Lead Officer – Environment and Climate Change explained that officers and Members were working actively and collaboratively on the environment and climate change. The Council continued to ramp up its response to the Climate Emergency even during the last few years during Covid. The Environment was a core theme of the Council's Strategic Plan enabling us to be really bold in responding to challenges and it was also a day to day part of our work. Off the back of the Strategy, there was the Environment theme Delivery Plan, which was a detailed series of works to respond to the challenges and it was monitored by Members on the Environmental Task Group, Officer Groups and the Strategic Plan Delivery Board, so there was a really strong governance structure overseeing all the great work taking place. He added that a Key Performance Indicators Dashboard monitoring the Council's progress would be available on the Council's intranet shortly. He concluded that responding to climate and environment challenges was a journey and the Council was making fantastic progress on approaching net zero and were committed to doing it, and were also considering how to respond to biodiversity challenges and how additional funding could be brought in to ramp up the work.

The Lead Officer responded to Councillor Goldson's query that he was unsure of the percentage of properties that had solar panels installed but confirmed there were panels on the Depot, Riverside offices, the Leiston, Deben and Waveney Valley Leisure Centres and on 10 retirement living scheme properties. He agreed the Council needed to go further. Councillor Goldson also asked what the plan was to have East Suffolk District carbon neutral by 2030. The Cabinet Member stated that all the Council owned buildings were being looked at but, after a full investigation on East Suffolk House, it

was not deemed suitable for solar panels. He continued that the focus was on the Council becoming carbon neutral as it was something we controlled but we were also trying to encourage and educate other stakeholders, such as businesses and residents, to make the right decisions and try to become carbon neutral.

In response to Councillor Goldson's query about tetra recycling, the Cabinet Member stated that the Council and the Suffolk Waste Partnership constantly monitored new systems and the way things were recycled eg tetrapacks could only be recycled and processed in Hull and a tetrapack did not make another tetrapack but its component parts were split up, so it was not always as easy to do as people thought. He confirmed that the Council would like to do more but were waiting for the Government RAWs legislation which would introduce changes to recycling so there was no point introducing anything new until it was known what we would have to provide statutorily. He added that the Greenprint Forum was constantly encouraging communities to recycle and residents to make the right choice including encouraging them to buy less so there was less to recycle.

The Chairman acknowledged that, whilst the Council was not responsible for what every resident in East Suffolk did, it was responsible for the waste collected and he pointed out that the KPI's for the amount of waste per household had increased from 459kg to 510Kg and the percentage of household waste being recycled had gone down from 44.86% to 40.50% so both had gone in the wrong direction, He queried, therefore, what would be done to educate and encourage residents to change that. The Cabinet Member responded that, since Covid, people were working from home more which meant the amount of waste at home had increased and people were also buying more off the internet so there was more packaging as items were delivered to the home, so the situation was changing and sometimes statistics could be misleading. He added that he was very frustrated about the 20% contamination in the blue bins which were mainly glass bottles, food waste and dirty nappies, so the Suffolk Waste Partnership and through Food Savvy constantly ran campaigns e.g. one at the moment was about freezing food waste and using leftovers. He pointed out, however, that there was a fine line about telling people how to behave and educating residents on things that would help them financially and benefit the community. When talking about waste, he stressed that it was important to link it to the environment. He stated that a lot of people felt powerless about the environment and carbon neutrality but if, when thinking about food, they bought locally and ate all the food purchased then that was a positive thing to do in each household and also if they recycled correctly. He reiterated that campaigns were run locally and through Suffolk as a whole to try to get people to make the right decisions. He also referred to a webpage that was available with details of how to recycle difficult items and concluded that it was about encouragement and education to make a difference.

The Chairman queried if bins were rejected at the kerbside to minimise rejecting a whole lorry load if contaminated. The Cabinet Member confirmed that blue bins were inspected before being put in the truck but if offending items were in the bottom of the bins they would not always be seen. He added that information stickers were put on the bin if items were found and consequently the bin was not emptied. He reminded Members that there had been a couple of streets in Lowestoft which had heavily contaminated bins so he had written to them and the recycling rates had gone up. He pointed out that recycling helped individuals, the Council and the planet.

In response to Councillor Hedgley's question about how confident he was that the Council's CO2 emissions target would be met by 2030, the Cabinet Member stated that statistics needed to be looked at carefully because the Council could be carbon zero tomorrow if it stopped providing services. He stressed, therefore, that the Council had to balance the carbon footprint against the services it wished to provide eg leisure centres etc. Members were reminded that the Council was changing the waste trucks to Hydro-treated Vegetable Oil (HVO) which reduced our carbon footprint by over 90% for the fleet and 30% for the Council as a whole. He explained that, whilst it cost a bit more money to move away from diesel, it was worth it as transport was one of the biggest impacts on carbon footprint. The Council was constantly looking at new innovations and new technology to enable us to be exemplars and encourage others to do the same. He concluded that it was a challenge but the worse thing would be to do nothing and he was sure the Council would be close to the target in 2030. The Lead Officer stated that, when the Council started reporting emissions in 2015/16, they were 6,500 tonnes CO2 equivalent but, last year, it was down to just over 5000 tonnes CO2 equivalent. He explained that the challenge was that organisations were still getting to grips with how to measure their carbon footprint. He added that Covid had been a particular challenge and there had been a bounce back as people went back to normality. The Council had to decide what to include when measuring the carbon footprint and he would be targeting key parts of Council services to get significant reductions e.g. the fleet and leisure centres which would include using low energy equivalent replacements. He concluded that he needed to understand what could be done to help services and whilst the direction of travel was good it was a steep learning curve and the Council needed to understand how it could do better and show how it was getting on through the dashboard.

In response to the Chairman's reference to the difficulties of measuring CO2, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that there was a danger of double counting of direct and indirect CO2 that the Council was responsible for. He added that this was a methodology question e.g. where did the Council's responsibility stop and start, as it kept shifting in that it might go up if the Council did something it had not a few years ago. The Environmental Sustainability Officer explained that there were two different sets of data, the first was the Council's own corporate emissions which were measured internally. The second was a separate set of data collected by central government re territorial emissions in all Local Authorities across the country which included emissions from the transport sector, energy related emissions from agriculture, business, commerce and energy from the entire public sector as well, so East Suffolk Council emissions would be included in the latter, although the Council made its own calculations which were more direct because we had access to our own information about our consumption of gas, electricity, diesel, mileage etc.

Councillor Cooper queried if the Council talked to manufacturers to cut back on packaging so there was less in household waste. The Cabinet Member stated that through RAWs and the Environmental Bill there was likely to be more accountability for producers and he referred to internet providers who used a lot of packaging, suggesting that maybe a package tax could be introduced. He acknowledged that some companies did now use less packaging or offered customers the option of less packaging. He suggested that, where possible, consumers could start choosing

producers that used less packaging and concluded that the Government needed to control those things that District Councils could not.

Councillor Cloke stated that she had stopped buying tetrapacks when she found out they could not be recycled easily. She referred to the graph on Page 7 which stated that the Council produced less than 1% of carbon emissions whereas other public sectors produced 1.5% and she queried how East Suffolk compared with other District Councils. The Environmental Sustainability Officer stated that the Council compared quite similarly to other District Councils in terms of its share of emissions but explained that the figure for the public sector included districts, the County Council, Police, Parish Councils, Health Care, the Environment Agency etc so it was the footprint of all the public sector agencies that had a degree of activity within East Suffolk.

Councillor Robinson queried what happened to the money brought in by green charges or taxes and the Cabinet Member responded that the Government was reluctant to ringfence taxes but he would like it reinvested back into environmental policies and to try to incentivise producers to use less packaging. He reiterated that individuals needed to make better choices, although he acknowledged it was difficult e.g. milk was put in tetrapacks rather than glass bottles, but he suggested it was down to people power and company shareholders making changes, but he could see change happening. He added that there were lots of discussions regarding tax but suggested that perhaps incentivisation was perhaps a better use of language.

Councillor Deacon commented that, whilst the report was well constructed and presented, he was surprised only one Strategic Plan primary priority had been ticked with the rest as secondary, given how serious this issue was. It was explained that the report template only allowed one primary priority to be selected but Members were assured that everything about the environment and climate challenge was seen as a primary priority as it underpinned everything the Council did. Councillor Deacon referred to paragraph 1.1b on page 8 regarding low carbon energy and asked how the Council was going to work with energy companies and communities. Strategic Director Jarvis stated the Council was already working with energy companies on a number of projects eg Freeport East; pilot projects to retrofit the housing stock, and also on some of our developments including the Felixstowe Passivehaus development; and in the past insulation schemes etc. He concluded that discussions were being held with a whole range of companies about different things and in many cases it was about having those direct discussions with local contacts on specific projects. Councillor Deacon also referred to 1.1b on page 9 regarding environmental protection within Planning and expressed concern that developers were still installing gas boilers and he queried if pressure could be put on them. The Cabinet Member responded that he was also frustrated but commented that Planning Officers talked to developers about this and the Sustainability and Design Guides. He suggested Councillors ask developers the question because they were not thinking about the environment and they put the burden on the house buyer which was unacceptable. He stated that the Council wanted developers to build houses and homes fit for the future and not waste resources because if they had to be retrofitted it would be a waste of resources. He stressed that Council Officers and Members tried to influence developers but it was difficult as the Council did not have any statutory powers. Strategic Director Jarvis commented that some house builders only worked to the national standard but others did do more e.g. fitting solar panels. He reminded Members of the imminent far

reaching changes in Building Regulations and also about the fact that the Council was already leading by example and showing others how it could be done by building Passivehaus developments.

The Chairman expressed concern that retrofitting was not a key feature of the report given it was within the Council's control and he queried what the trials referred to earlier were, when the retrofitting programme was due to take place and was the Council on target to have all the housing stock retrofitted and environmentally sustainable by 2030. Strategic Director Jarvis responded that the Council owned 4.5K properties of different types, some were new build and some were very old so there was a range of problems in terms of retrofitting but the key thing was about obtaining data about the condition of properties, what was needed to get them up to the required standard and what the cost was going to be, which was the piece of work that was currently being undertaken and a detailed report would be made to Members shortly on this. He pointed out that it was about choices and priorities and, at some point, the Council would have to make some difficult choices about money and if/when investments should be made in the stock. In relation to the trials, he said there were about a dozen properties in each and these would give an idea of how properties could be retrofitted e.g. would people have to be moved out on block, as the properties became void, or would it be better to do it in a managed programme. He stated that other large housing providers also grappled with this issue and, as it was not likely to be cheap, it might require some national assistance. Strategic Director Khan stated that the Council had agreed the Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was a material consideration for developers in terms of the energy efficiency, renewable energy, water conservation, sustainable transport and building materials etc of their developments. In addition, there was also a Net Zero Carbon Toolkit which Suffolk authorities had signed up to which, although more guidance than an SPD, also carried some weight. The Chairman pointed out that the Council had declared the climate emergency in 2019 but was only now trying to work out what retrofitting would mean for the housing stock and he queried if the Committee could be assured that the Council would be on target to have all Council homes retrofitted and at an acceptable standard by 2030. Strategic Director Jarvis responded that he could not give an assurance that all the stock would be retrofitted by 2030. The Chairman expressed concern that this did not show the Council leading by example. Strategic Director Jarvis explained that the Council had declared an emergency and put a huge amount of resources into that but leading by example did not necessarily mean that the Council would meet the retrofitting target given the large number of priorities it had and the finite amount of funding at its disposal. The Cabinet Member agreed, stressing that it was about choice and where to spend limited funds because the Council needed to get the balance right eg residents needed housing and the Council had to decide whether to retrofit and/or build new acceptable housing at the same time.

Councillor Gooch referred to the Cost of Living Crisis and in particular the impact on fuel efficiency for residents and the viability of the Council's leisure centres etc and she suggested that residents might get sidetracked from separating recycling because they were worrying about heating and eating. The Cabinet Member acknowledged it was a big challenge and that the environment was not necessarily a big priority for people who were struggling to pay rent, affording to heat their homes and buy food etc but he pointed out that East Suffolk only had one recycling bin so it was easier. He suggested

people might appreciate that nature was all around us at this difficult time. He added that Enabling Budgets and a new grant would be available shortly to help and Community Partnerships would be able to bring people together eg lessons on cooking, eating together, so it was about enabling communities, supporting them to help themselves and signposting the help available. But if we do more for communities this would increase our carbon footprint which could be seen as a negative, which was why it was important to look at the bigger picture and not look at the environment in isolation, but it needed to be embedded and part of the process. Strategic Director Khan gave some examples of the support available including a handyman service to help with things like installing thicker curtains/draught excluders, turning off vampire devices which drained energy etc. The Council had also employed 2.5 FTE Financial Inclusion Officers to help residents with budgeting and see if they could reduce their bills. Across Suffolk, there was support to help residents with their energy needs and East Suffolk was due to be allocated £3m over 3 years from the Government's Shared Prosperity Fund which could be used to assist people during this crisis.

On behalf of Councillor Gandy, Councillor Gooch asked for an update on the blue bins contamination in the Harbour and Normanston Ward in Lowestoft and the number of residents who were not using blue bins at all. The Cabinet Member stated that he would report back on details about the particular area in Lowestoft, but confirmed recycling rates had increased following his letter to residents. He stressed it was about education as well as emphasising to individuals that they needed to recycle. He explained that the Suffolk Waste Partnership constantly ran campaigns such as Bottle Banks and left over items in the freezer, so it was about the consumption individuals had and how they dealt with waste products. He suggested everyone should stop talking about "waste" and re-term it "resource" because it was a resource and that might encourage people to think about it differently. He concluded that the real difficulty was getting people to listen and engage especially schools and community groups. Councillor Gooch asked how communication and engagement with Town and Parish Councils was going in terms of flytipping and littering. Strategic Director Jarvis stated that, as part of recent reviews, it was recognised that more could be done on street cleaning and, therefore, the Council had invested in several mechanised street sweepers and were liaising with Town and Parish Councils to use them across the area. He added that they had already been used in the town centre and they could cover a lot wider area than the previous barrows. The Environmental Sustainability Officer stated that he circulated information on a range of initiatives and points of interest to the Greenprint Forum which he then copied to Parish Clerks and, although some were quite engaged, he would like more information from them on anything they wished to share and he was also open to receiving ideas/points they wanted to raise with the Greenprint Forum for them to take forward as points of discussion. In response to the street cleaning question, the Cabinet Member stated that the Council watched the seasons and had more bins available in the summer.

Councillor Beavan suggested Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were needed in relation to housing insulation to enable performance to be monitored and also that the Council should bear in mind the District got a north east wind which made a difference if a property was insulated so investing in this could save money. He also asked how many public Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers were in East Suffolk. The Environmental Sustainability Officer stated that there were public car charging points at the Deben and Waveney Valley Leisure Centres and at a public car park in Felixstowe. He added

that the Council was also linking up with other Districts and the County Council to support projects such as Plug in Suffolk to promote more businesses, destinations, Parishes, community buildings etc to benefit from the offer of subsidised installations of slow chargers. A bid had also been submitted for levy funding for potential projects in partnership with other Suffolk local authorities. Strategic Director Jarvis added that there were also EV points at the two depots and, although they were not public, the Council was running public vehicles on them. The Council had also commissioned a study on how we could get on-street chargers, including how much work would be needed and the costs. In relation to retrofitting, he agreed that stretch KPIs would be in the report with the stock data.

In response to Councillor Gooch's query on a policy that any Council events must have plant-based menus, the Cabinet Member stated that he did not feel it was appropriate for the Council to tell people what to eat or have a policy on only vegan or vegetarian meals at Council offices but he did agree that it was important to buy local and bear in mind where food came from.

Councillor Goldson asked the difference in price between EVs and conventional vehicles and how the costs had been justified and also what happened to the batteries when they ran out as they could not be recycled. The Cabinet Member agreed that it was a good point regarding batteries but pointed out that this was a world issue not just a question for this Council, so he thought the answer was not to just move to EVs but also have less journeys. Strategic Director Jarvis responded that the Council had trialled an electric refuse vehicle but they were about twice the price of conventional refuse trucks and because the district was very rural, the Council needed something that had a higher range. It was thought that hydrogen powered vehicles would be much better but they were not readily available yet and were too expensive so in the meantime it had been decided to use HVO instead. He explained the additional cost was to convert vehicles to HVO and, whilst per litre it was more than diesel, he pointed out that the Council had decided to use it because of the environmental benefits. He added that the Council was discussing trialling EVs in Lowestoft because there might be an opportunity to use them in built up neighbourhoods, and was also talking to companies across the District e.g. Freeport and Sizewell etc about opportunities for hydrogen, and there were also opportunities in Lowestoft for an electrolyser trial. In response to Councillor Goldson's query, Strategic Director Jarvis stated that he would report back to Members on scrapped batteries.

Councillor Cooper referred to an East Anglian Daily Times article today that said air quality in Woodbridge was 2½ times above the legal limit. The Cabinet Member stated that he would look at the article and ensure it was corrected because the air quality in Woodbridge had been much improved and the Council met all the statutory requirements across the whole of the District. He added that, no one size fit all, in relation to transport and vehicles e.g. EVs would be okay in urban areas but rural communities would need to be looked at differently, therefore, a diverse portfolio of energy would be required for vehicles.

The Chairman sought reassurance about interventions to combat climate change given the recent heatwaves. The Cabinet Member stressed that the smallest of changes made a big difference over time e.g. the planting of wildflower border in front of East Suffolk House had a fantastic visual impact and lifted the spirits, it meant nature was all

around. Less cutting of grass through the Pardon the Weeds, Feed the Bees campaign made a difference in people's behaviours and made a big difference. He added that a little thought and change in behaviour could solve these problems. He pointed out that the climate changed over time but the issue was when we as humans caused changes and had a massive impact on biodiversity, therefore we should protect and celebrate our deep forests and beaches. He concluded that we could control some of the outcome and change the direction by coming together as a District Council, individuals and through Westminster to make real changes.

The Chairman suggested that, rather than making a formal recommendation to Cabinet for firm targets on retrofitting, an assurance should be sought that the information was forthcoming and that it would be a comprehensive report. Strategic Director Jarvis stressed that he was happy to give that assurance and added that the information would be brought to Members to decide on what they wished to do given it was a very large programme which would impact quite considerably on the Council's future spend. The Chairman queried the likely timescale for the retrofitting report and Strategic Director Jarvis stated that he was unsure on the date but would let Committee know.

Councillor Beavan suggested the Council should have targets to increase the number of public car chargers given they could make money. Councillor Goldson pointed out that, if we wanted to increase the number, Officers needed to say where we wanted them and that could include on the Council's own car parks. The point was made that the commercial sector could also be encouraged to put in EV charging points. Strategic Director Jarvis reported that discussions were being held about putting chargers in Council car parks, on-street charging and upgrading power grids etc, however, it was about prioritisation e.g. RAWs would require more money and changing the fuel in the Council's vehicles cost, so Members had to decide where they wanted to spend money e.g. providing public chargers or insulating building/homes. Members were reminded that any recommendations to Cabinet needed to be SMART and evidenced based and the Chairman suggested, therefore, that the Strategic Director produce a briefing note for the Committee on the Council's plans, or what might be feasible in terms of increasing the number of public EV points across the district.

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment and Officers provide the following information to the Scrutiny Committee to be reported to the next meeting on 29 September 2022:

Updates:

- What happened to the batteries of scrapped electric vehicles?
- What was the latest situation in relation to the problem with contaminated Blue Bins in previously identified streets in Lowestoft?

Information Notes:

- What were the practicalities and costings of providing more publicly accessible electric vehicle charging points on Council owned land?

- What was the proposed plan for retrofitting the Council's Housing Stock including indicative timescales and costings, and would this be achieved in time to meet this Council's target to be carbon neutral by 2030?

The meeting adjourned for a comfort break from 8.20 to 8.28pm.

5 Cabinet Member Scrutiny Session

The Chairman welcomed and thanked Councillor Mallinder, Cabinet Member with responsibility for the Environment who firstly gave a brief verbal presentation in relation to the Waste Management element of his portfolio. He highlighted, in particular, that education and communicating to residents on the right behaviour and the best way to do things were his main focus, whilst also waiting to find out the impact of the new Waste and Recycling legislation which would introduce a homogenised system across the whole country. Scrutiny Committee Members raised several queries in relation to information on the Council's website on bins, flytipping and littering. In response to a question on what improvements he wished to see when the Council started its arms length management company, the Cabinet Member responded that he wanted a system that operated to the same standard but was more agile eg could provide ad hoc collections for village halls etc, and he would look at whether it was possible to provide a mobile unit which could go out into rural communities for those people who could not get to recycling points.

The Cabinet Member also gave a brief verbal presentation in relation to the Environmental Protection side of his portfolio. He explained that there were two categories to Environmental Protection, firstly reactive in that they dealt with complaints about noise, artificial light, smoke, fires etc. The second was proactive in terms of responding to licensing/permits and planning applications including the impact on traffic movements, air pollution, light, smoke and fumes. He confirmed that East Suffolk met our statutory requirements across the whole of the District especially in relation to air pollution but stressed that he wanted to do better than that and educate and engage communities with various campaigns. He emphasised that much of the Team's work depended on evidence provided by residents. He added that a 24 hour phone number was available throughout the summer so Officers could visit if there were complaints about noise, bonfires etc. In response to several issues raised by Committee Members, the Cabinet Member stated that he would look into them and report back.

RESOLVED

That the relevant Cabinet Members and Officers provide the following information to the next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee on 29 September 2022:

- Do we/Norse liaise with partner authorities in Norfolk and Essex regarding verge cutting and litter picking along the A12 corridor?
- How can we mitigate the impact on residents of weekly Norse Commercial Waste Collections in Felixstowe at 5.30am?
- In liaison with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development, to explain why nuclear energy was classed as "clean" energy.

6 Appointments to Outside Bodies for 2022/23 (Scrutiny Functions)

The Committee considered the Leader of the Council's report ES/1219 in relation to the appointment to Outside Bodies for 2022/23 (Scrutiny Functions).

In the absence of any further nominations and on the proposition of Councillor Robinson, seconded by Councillor Bird, it was

RESOLVED

1. That Councillors Cloke and Back be appointed to the Outside Bodies listed in Appendix A for the 2022/23 Municipal Year (Suffolk Flood Risk Panel and SCC Health Scrutiny Committee respectively).
2. That Councillors Robinson and Hedgley be appointed as the designated substitutes for the two Outside Bodies listed at Appendix A for the 2022/23 Municipal Year in the event the primary appointee is unavailable.
3. That the Leader of the Council fill any outstanding vacancies left unfilled by the Scrutiny Committee.
4. That the Leader of the Council make any necessary changes to the membership of the Outside Bodies for the remainder of the 2022/23 Municipal Year, in consultation with the other Group Leaders.

7 Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

The Chairman reported that the Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report 2021/22 had been postponed from this meeting until the next one on 29 September 2022 and he confirmed that the substantive items for that meeting would be the Sale and Disposal of Council Assets and the Cabinet Member Scrutiny Session of the Deputy Leader and Economic Development Cabinet Member.

The meeting concluded at 9.08pm.

.....
Chairman