

Minutes of a Joint Meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Audit & Governance Committee held at Riverside, Lowestoft on **Thursday, 7 December November 2017 at 6.02 pm**

Overview & Scrutiny Committee Members Present:

Councillors S Allen (Chairman), S Barker, E Back, A Cackett, G Elliott, T Gandy, L Gooch, P Light, J Murray and N Webb

Audit & Governance Committee Members Present:

Councillors S Woods (Chairman), P Byatt, J Craig, A Green and L Smith

Cabinet Members in attendance

Councillor B Provan – Cabinet Member for Resources

Other Members in attendance

Councillor L Coulam

Officers present

J Berry (Economic Development Manager), H Javadi (Chief Finance Officer), A Photi (Democratic Services Officer), L Rogers (Finance Manager) and N Wotton (Democratic Services Manager)

1 CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chairman announced that there was a possibility of a change to the order of business as the Cabinet Member for Tourism & Economic Development was travelling in directly from another meeting. It was agreed that the Agenda would be kept flexible in order to accommodate Item 6 – Post Implementation Review of the Closure of Tourist Information Centres and Replacement with Visitor Information Points upon his arrival.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / SUBSTITUTES

Apologies were received from Councillors T Goldson, K Grant, K Robinson and K Springall from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee,

Apologies were received from Councillors E Back, T Gandy (as they were sitting as Members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee) and I Graham from the Audit & Governance Committee.

Councillor P Byatt substituted for Councillor I Graham on the Audit & Governance Committee.

Councillor A Cackett substituted for Councillor K Robinson on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor J Craig Substituted for Councillor T Gandy on the Audit & Governance Committee.

Apologies were also received from Councillor M Ladd, Cabinet Member for Tourism & Economic Development.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 9 November 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, RESPONSES OF THE CABINET TO ANY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OR REPORTS OF ANY DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CABINET

There were no announcements on this occasion.

6 DRAFT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND EFFICIENCY PLAN

Note: The Audit & Governance Committee was invited to attend the meeting for the consideration, debate and vote on this item, as it was considered that the Committees had complementary functions.

The Cabinet Member for Resources introduced the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) report which provided a baseline forecast of income and expenditure and looked at the overall financial climate. It provided a framework within which the Council's overall spending plans were developed.

The Government had announced proposals for Councils to retain all locally raised business rates by the end of the decade, and to end the distribution of core grant from central Government. The proposals had been subject to delay as a result of the General Election and the Local Government Finance Bill not being included in the legislative programme for Parliament. However, the government continued in its commitment to the change, and was continuing to develop key aspects of the new system, for example the invitation to groups of authorities to become pilots for 100% Business Rates retention.

Overall, the long-term Local Government financial picture continued to be characterised by an increased shift towards locally-generated resources, with an accompanying transfer of both risk and opportunity. The report set out the assumptions made in identifying resources for the MTFS period.

The Council had signed up to four-year Local Government (LG) Finance Settlements for the period 2016/17 – 2019/20, which covered the Revenue Support Grant. To take advantage of the offer, each authority needed to submit an Efficiency Plan. Although an updated Efficiency Plan did not need to be submitted to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in respect of the four-year LG Finance Settlement, it was an overarching document that sat between the East Suffolk Business Plan and the MTFS, and the report sought approval of an updated Efficiency Plan.

During the timescale of the updated MTFS presented in the report, the Council had progressed the potential creation of a new single council for East Suffolk. If progressed and approved by the

Secretary of State, it was possible that the new East Suffolk District Council would be established with effect from 1 April 2019.

The draft MTFS would be revised for further updates including those resulting from the Chancellor's Autumn Budget; further developments in the Business Rates Retention proposals; the outcome of the business rates Pilot invitation; budget monitoring forecasts; and the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement.

At the end of the 2018/19 budget process, in February 2018, the Council would be required to approve a balanced budget for the following financial year and set the Band D rate of Council Tax. The report set out the context and initial parameters in order to achieve this objective and contribute towards a sustainable position for the major changes planned in the medium term.

The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) gave a presentation on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2017/18 to 2021/22. She explained that the strategy was an ongoing process due to significant changes in the Council's budget and the shortfalls due to the current economic climate.

N.B Councillor L Smith arrived at this point in the proceedings at 6.07pm.

The presentation summarised the Population, Housing and Enterprise statistics for Waveney:

- Waveney District had a population of 116,514 and 55,880 households.
- 11.5% of 56,000 households fell within council tax Band D, compared to 18.6% in Suffolk Coastal, 14% in Suffolk County and 15.4% across England. Suffolk Coastal received a higher level of council tax income to Waveney. The difference in levels of Council Tax between Waveney and Suffolk Coastal was just £0.09; as a result the decision had been taken to align them to the same level in 2018/19.
- The average house price in Waveney was reported at £168,000 compared to £276,000 in Suffolk Coastal and £244,000 across England.
- There was a 69.5% employment rate for 16-64 year olds, compared to 74.4% across England. The unemployment rate was 6.1% compared to 4.3% in Suffolk, 3.9% in the East of England and 4.6% in England. 62.5% of the Waveney population were in full-time employment.
- The average weekly wage in Waveney was £455.90 compared to £500 in the Suffolk Coastal area and £552.70 across England.
- 20.6% of the Waveney working age population were educated to NVQ4 level and above compared to 34.9% in the East of England and 4.6% across England.
- 17.5% in Waveney were employed in manufacturing compared to 8% in the East of England and 8.1% across England.
- 62.5% of jobs in Waveney were full time and 34.8% were part time, compared to 65.2% full time and 34.8% part time in the East of England.
- There were 3,775 Enterprises within the Waveney District offering a good mixture of services and facilities. There were 5,400 across Suffolk Coastal and 274,335 in the East of England.
- Waveney District was an area of 370 km squared, compared to 800 km squared in Suffolk Coastal District, some of which covered rural areas, which had an impact on access and provision of services.
- There were 11,016 reported crimes in Waveney and 61,661 in Suffolk County.

- There were 2,271 anti social behaviour incidents in Waveney and 61,661 in Suffolk County.

Overall, Waveney was in a strong position, having delivered services with a good performance record and value for money. This had been made clear in the annual audit report, whereby auditors reported they were satisfied with the management of the Councils finances and service delivery.

There had however been challenges in ensuring the adequate provision of resources to finance the operational costs. This had been more difficult to achieve since June 2017 due to Brexit and an uncertainty of what lay ahead post Brexit. Other challenges included managing changes in government policies and the cost pressures of the minimum living wage increase. This had impacted on the Councils contracts due to the cost increases in the services it provided. Other factors which had impacted on the services delivered by the Council included Universal Credit and local and regional issues such as Coastal Management and the Social Demography and Wellbeing Profile.

The Chief Finance Officer explained the Council had been looking at the possible opportunities presented by Brexit and that there were ways in which the authority could benefit. Other opportunities included the Council becoming more commercial in order to generate more income, a more intensive use of its social media, a greater focus on local issues and wider collaboration with partners. It was anticipated that those opportunities would result in:

- A stronger East Suffolk
- Economic and housing growth
- Greater investment opportunities

She explained to the Committee that the Council had a statutory responsibility, as confirmed at the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy Briefing in March; whereby all Local Authorities were required by law to have a balanced budget. Chief Finance Officers are required to use their professional judgement to ensure that the Local Authority's budget was robust and sustainable and therefore she was personally responsible for ensuring that the right advice was given.

The CFO then gave the Committee an overview of some of the significant changes in Local Government Finance. The most significant change was that the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) was being phased out. It was reported that the RSG would drop £2.6 million; from £2.909 million in 2015/16 to £0.322 million in 2019/20, which was a challenge. Another significant change was that the allocation for the New Homes Bonus scheme had been reduced from six years to four years. Previously payments would also have been higher, whereas with the four year allocation, the Council needed to provide more houses in order to receive the same level of income received previously.

The Councils main sources of funding included Council Tax, Revenue Support Grant, Business Rates Income, Business Rate Renewables and Pooling Benefit. Council Tax was therefore the most certain and reliable form of income, and was one of the Council's primary areas of focus at this time.

The key budget planning assumptions were explained:

- Goods & Services – The Councils financial strategy assumed that any inflationary pressures incurred were contained within existing budgets, or through more efficient spending. It would remain under review to ensure the planning assumption remained adequate.
- Fees & Charges were based on the Councils agreed principals of increasing existing fees and charges on a market forces basis whilst having regard to the Councils policies and objectives. The agreed fees and charges had been set at 3.5% for the period 2018/19 to 2021/22.
- Public Sector Pay - The MTFS assumed a one-off 2% pay increase for 2018/19 followed by 1% per annum thereafter from 2019/20 to 2021/22.
- Utilities & Energy were assumed at 3% for the period 2018/19 to 2021/22.

The CFO outlined the MTFS underlying budget gaps and the Medium Term Budget Key Movements:

MTFS Budget Gaps

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
February 2017	0	1,344	1,875	2,003	
Mid November 2017	387	369	2,384	2,545	2,433

Overall the position was positive and the Council had consistently made significant savings over the last two years, which had been banked and utilised in future years budgeting, therefore a balanced budget had been achieved.

The Medium Term Budget Gaps were summarised by the CFO:

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
February 2017	-	1,344	1,875	2,003	-
Mid November 2017	387	369	2,384	2,545	2,433
December 2017	-	-	TBA	TBA	TBA

The CFO reported that the final figures would be near to completion before the end of 2017 and that the final version of the budget would be completed during January/February 2018 for Full Council approval in February 2018.

Questions from Members

- **A Member asked for clarification with regards to the phased reduction in the Waveney New Homes Bonus allocation from 2017/18 through to 2021/22.** The CFO advised that the government had introduced a threshold for baseline growth which was set at 0.4% of growth in the number of properties. This would remove growth which normally occurred without active delivery by Councils. Councils only received the New Homes Bonus for additional properties above that level. She explained that planning permission did not necessarily lead

to development. It was not possible to take advantage of the New Homes Bonus until the construction and valuations had been completed.

- **A Member asked why Parishing costs had been reduced from £1 million to £800,000?** The CFO advised that at the point of setting the budget in the previous year, the costs of services which related to Lowestoft Town Council had not been finalised. When the Council had undertaken a more detailed analysis later on, the associated costs were likely to be £800,000.
- **A Member asked why there had been a reduction in the income generated by Sentinel Leisure Trust bearing in mind the positive and encouraging report that was presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee earlier in the year?** The CFO advised that a healthier projection had been given to that which was possible to deliver. If an area of income was untested, then it was sensible to build in a contingency to cover any over projections.
- **A Member commented that she had heard it reported that over 2 million business owners had complained about their business rates. How did that relate to Waveney?** The CFO advised that for the district, concerns were raised mainly in Southwold, however it was largely due to a lack of understanding regarding the details. A number of businesses had qualified for reliefs and once this information had filtered through, the situation was not as bad as business owners had originally believed it to be.
- **A Member asked what contingencies were in place for emergency planning?** The CFO advised that no changes had been made within the budget for emergency planning.
- **A Member commented that in his view, the Councils decision to freeze council tax over a five to eight year period had resulted in an overdependence on other sources of funding. Was this the right decision, as it had left Waveney District with a lower council tax base?** The CFO advised there had been a shift in government policy during that time. All districts and shires were able to raise council tax by nearly £5. It was now assumed by the government that there would be increases.
- **With reference to the Efficiency Strategy in the report, whereby capital receipts could be used for one-off costs for a range of transformational projects, what was the approval process for these projects?** The CFO advised that the approval process was no different to that in any other Portfolio area.
- **A Member asked for clarification with regards to the East Suffolk People Strategy and the resourcing reviews which had resulted in almost £90,000 of savings.** The CFO advised that the Council's preferred approach to any staff savings was an organic one and through natural reduction.
- **A Member asked for further explanation in relation to the Funding Team and how funding was secured and distributed?** The CFO explained that the Council had a Funding Team who identified and submitted bids for targeted grants to support the Councils activities. They were able to provide analysis on the various projects they were involved with.
- **A Member requested clarification on section 5.6 of the report – Actuarial Valuation in relation to pensions.** The CFO explained that the pension was performing well, higher than

80%. The pension was a funded scheme and more information could be provided at a later date. Waveney and Suffolk Coastal District Councils had different pension calculation systems and the two had been aligned together. In summary, there was little difference between them but they used a different system of calculation.

- **A Member asked that the variances in the table shown in section 5.9 of the report be explained.** The CFO advised the table showed incremental movement's year on year. The full service costs would be clear in the Budget report for February 2018 and therefore would be analysed in more detail at this point
- **A Member asked for an explanation of the invitation from the government to groups of authorities to pilot the 100% Business Rates retention in 2018/19.** The CFO advised that all authorities including Suffolk councils were invited to become involved in the scheme. The Suffolk authorities had been submitted their bid for participation in 2018. The scheme was likely to benefit many authorities in Suffolk and could amount to over £10 million. The government had funding allocated to this process and if successful, additional funding would go to area based, inclusive growth initiatives. Should the Suffolk bid be successful - further work will have to undertaken to determine and agree the actual amounts for 2018/19. This will be subject to a two week cooling off period - allowing pilot authorities to reconsider their bid if needed.
- **A Member asked if the Suffolk Pool scheme was still in existence?** The CFO advised it was still available and that it may be linked to a new financial scheme in the future.
- **A Member asked how many Business Rates appeals had there been and how many had been successful?** The CFO explained that a "Check, Challenge, Appeal" system had been introduced. This was handled by the Anglia Revenues Partnership on behalf of the Council. It was an area of risk that the Council was keeping a close eye on and reassurance was provided that sufficient contingencies had been made.
- **A Member asked if appeals had been dealt with and concluded?** The CFO advised that the assessment of appeals was the responsibility of the valuation office and the Council was not involved with the process. A transitional grant was made available to those businesses which had been affected the most.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for Resources, the Chief Finance Officer and the Finance Manager for attending and answering the Committees questions so thoroughly.

Following the questions and answers session, each Committee considered and voted separately on the following recommendations and it was:

RESOLVED

1. That the principal assumptions and actions which surrounded the baseline MTFS forecast be noted.
2. That the Efficiency Plan and draft Medium Term Financial Strategy be noted.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6.50PM AND RECONVENED AT 6.55PM TO ALLOW THE MEMBERS OF THE AUDIT & GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE TO LEAVE THE MEETING

NB: The Cabinet Member for Resources, the Chief Finance Officer and the Finance Manager also left the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

7 INFORMATION BULLETIN – UPDATE ON THE REVIEW OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCES IN WAVENEY DISTRICT

The Chairman advised the Committee that the Information Bulletin was a document made available with the published agenda papers but was not for discussion at the meeting. The Information Bulletin provided an update on the review of Public Conveniences in Waveney District. Members were advised to contact the relevant Officers with any questions regarding the information contained within it.

A Member commented that it would be useful to have an update on the assets and if they were still in use one year on after their transfer. The Chief Finance Officer said that in the absence of the Strategic Director and Head of Operations at this meeting, she would take the request on board and ensure that the Committee would be provided with an update following the transfer of the assets.

A Member queried whether an update on the Battery Green car park would be included in the update. The Chief Finance Officer explained that the update would relate to particular public conveniences and that there would be a specific report for Battery Green car park.

8 CURRENT POSITION OF THE WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview & Scrutiny Chairman presented the report which reminded Members of the Committees work programme in order for it to be continually reviewed.

At its meeting on 9 November 2017 the Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered items to be included in the Work programme for Scrutiny.

The Chairman reported that two Scrutiny Scoping forms had been submitted for review:

1. The Marina Theatre asset transfer and associated costs of the transfer

The Chairman advised that the request had been reviewed and reported that the asset had been transferred by virtue of the Order which Waveney District Council made on 26 January 2017 for the creation of Lowestoft Town Council (LTC). Therefore, the transfer had already taken place. There was no other contract or conveyance as such, to affect that transfer and therefore no contract to be reviewed. The Order which the Council had made affected the transfer.

Negotiations with Waveney Norse and LTC regarding the provision of maintenance services remained on-going; therefore it was not relevant or timely to review the negotiations at present.

In relation to the legal costs associated with the contract, it was not possible to place a final figure on them due to their ongoing nature. A Member commented that they had noted different figures reported within two different published reports. The Chairman advised that there were varying legal aspects in relation to the Marina Theatre and that it was assumed that the Medium Term Financial Strategy report contained the total figure.

The Chairman advised that taking into consideration the information reported, it was not appropriate to review the Marina Theatre asset transfer and associated costs at this time due to ongoing matters. Therefore, it would not be placed on the current Work Programme until such time as matters had been concluded.

2. Anglian Water's capacity to deal with the greater demands on existing sewage systems as housing and development increased

The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to put forward any questions and queries, to which there were none.

RESOLVED

1. That the current position of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme as set out in Appendix A to the report was noted.
2. That Anglian Water's capacity to deal with the greater demands on existing sewage systems as housing and development increased be placed on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee's Work Programme.

The Chairman advised that the Scrutiny Scoping form for Coastal Partnership East remained pending and that it would be brought to the next Committee meeting for consideration in January 2018.

The Chairman announced that Item 6 would be taken at this point in the proceedings in the absence of the Cabinet Member for Tourism & Economic Development, who had not been able to make it to the meeting in time and therefore sent his apologies.

9 POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW OF THE CLOSURE OF TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRES AND REPLACEMENT WITH VISITOR INFORMATION POINTS

The Economic Development Manager (EDM) presented the report which provided a post implementation review of the closure of Tourist Information Centres and their replacement with Visitor Information Points.

A decision was taken in January 2016 to modernise the way Visitor Services were offered within the Waveney District. A network of Visitor Information Points (VIPs) had been established which replaced the two pre-existing Tourist Information Centres (TICs) in April 2016 and the number of VIPs currently stood at 22. This included a mixture of business and community establishments, all holding visitor information, which provided a very cost effective service that also benefited the network host and the visitor economy as a whole.

The Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation had continued to develop the self service offer through the development of campaigns, a website and social media. There had been over 1.1 million page views in 2017 (which was a 45% increase on the previous year) and significant increases to social media usage, suggesting that visitors were using the site before and during their stay, to obtain tourist information.

A total of 15 VIPs were initially opened across Waveney District before the main summer season of 2016. The network had continued to grow in 2017 and currently stood at 22. The network

covered a number of locations in Beccles, Bungay and Halesworth, as well as in the key resort locations of Lowestoft and Southwold.

The closure of Lowestoft and Southwold TICs had saved the Council £97,395 per year and had allowed an additional rentable income to be achieved at the East Point Pavilion. The cost to the Council was £5,000 per year to provide the VIPs with the equipment and information they needed to provide the service. The Economic Development Officer (EDO) responsible for tourism provided support to the network as and when required and kept the host businesses engaged with the service. The EDO also arranged one leaflet exchange a year, conducted an annual review each spring and kept an overview of the VIP service.

Questions from Members

- **How much confidence was there that £97,000 of savings would be achieved through the initiative?** The Economic Development Manager reported that the number of calls regarding tourist enquiries had reduced from 700 to 100 over the last year. There would be differing associated costs regarding Customer Service answering the queries, therefore it was not possible to provide an exact answer at this time.
- **Was the rental income received from the East Point Pavilion in addition to the £97,000 savings figure stated?** The Economic Development Manager advised that the rental income was additional.
- **A Member commented that they were concerned that places such as cafes and shops had not been informed of the updates. How did the Council ensure the provision of updated printed information across the VIPs and how was this operation organised?** The EDM advised that the management of the distribution network was built into the running costs and managed by a third party distribution management company. A Member asked if any spot checks were performed to ensure the same standard was being provided across the VIP's. The EDM advised that he would check this point and come back to the Committee with a response.
- **In relation to the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation 2017 update, was it possible to have a breakdown of the particular areas where people were searching from?** The EDO advised that the data only showed what people were looking at and not where they were coming from. The Chairman requested that further information on this matter be provided to the Committee via the Democratic Services Department.
- **A Member asked why some of the VIPs had not taken up the offer for the Economic Development Team to list their locations on Google maps?** The EDO advised that the service was encouraged and offered free of charge, however it was their choice whether or not to participate.
- **A Member asked how the Council intended to plug the gaps in areas which did not have VIPs and should the Council be encouraging larger venues such as wildlife parks and theme parks to feed into smaller venues?** The EDM agreed that larger venues should be encouraged to participate in order to provide a greater inclusion of smaller

venues whereby they would feed into each other. This was something the Economic Development team was looking into.

- **A Member asked if all VIPs were staffed?** The EDO explained that they were staffed during their normal working business hours. Larger venues such as supermarkets were staffed for longer hours than smaller venues and the Council had an obligation to ensure that Visitor Information material was made available in a wide variety of locations.
- **Members were concerned that the leaflets alone were not sufficient to provide visitors with all the information they needed. A Member commented that on a recent visit to France, the museums and visitor attractions were all interlinked and discounted multiple trips and information on other places of interest in the area were also offered. This was the kind of approach that Waveney should have been taking in order to inspire visitors to visit a variety of places.** The EDM explained that there were valid points and that the Economic Development team were looking at a wayfinding scheme as mentioned in the report. Digital methods were unavoidable as this was the way that the world mainly operated, however the Council was looking at all ways to attract visitors. He agreed that getting the larger venues on board was key and that opportunities to create multiple tickets for visits to different venues were being considered.
- **A Member commented that many people did not use the internet, particularly in Halesworth and that getting the information out to people regarding town events had been difficult. She said that information on what was going on within the various towns needed to be out in the public domain, possibly via an events diary, so people knew what was going on and when.** The EDM explained that traditionally people had been informed via leaflet drops or newspaper notices, however this was no longer the case. The Economic Development team were doing a piece of work around neighbourhood plans for each town and village in Waveney. This was a national issue for which the most cost effective way of dealing with it was via digital methods. The Chairman advised that organisers were able to promote events via the Waveney website in order to publicise their events, and that she had found this to an effective way of publicising events.
- **A Member commented that he had conducted a google map search of the VIPs and had been unable to identify them. Was there an icon which identified them? The businesses were all displayed, however there was nothing to suggest that they were a VIP.** The EDM advised that VIP's displayed on Google maps were tagged with an "i" icon.
- **A Member said he was concerned that the Council had been over reliant on Take 1 Media, the third party distribution service, as they were not minded to promoting local events and attractions.** The EDM advised he would look into this matter further and report back to the Committee.

The Chairman thanked the EDM for attending the meeting and answering the Committees questions, and asked that a six month information bulletin be provided on what was new for the coming season.

RESOLVED

1. That the VIP point service continued to be supported by the Economic Development Service and the £5,000 budget was retained to support the VIP network and the Customer Services department continue to take visitor telephone enquiries.
2. That an annual review was completed each spring to ensure the service was monitored and continually improved in line with need.

10 EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the ground that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

11 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on 9 November 2017 (part 2) were approved as a correct record subject to the requested amendments to the wording on page 52, paragraph 2 and page 53, paragraph 3 and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting was concluded at 7.40pm

Chairman