

**Minutes of the meeting of the  
Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
held on 19 June 2019**

**Present:**

**Members of the Committee**

Councillors: Alan Cockburn (Chair), Mark Cargill, Corrine Davies, Jenny Fradgley, Seb Gran, Andy Jenns, Keith Kondakor, Bhagwant Singh Pander, Caroline Phillips and Dave Shilton

**Portfolio Holders**

Councillor Andy Crump, Fire & Rescue and Community Safety  
Councillor Kan Kaur, Customer & Transformation  
Councillor Izzi Seccombe, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Heather Timms, Environment and Heritage & Culture

**Other County Councillors**

Councillor Sarah Boad  
Councillor Jonathan Chilvers  
Councillor Nicola Davies  
Councillor Clive Rickhards

**Warwickshire County Council Officers**

David Ayton-Hill, Strategy and Commissioning Manager (Economy & Skills)  
Nicholas Dauncey, Principal Transport Planner  
Ruth Dixon, Waste Strategy and Commissioning Manager  
Alan Law, County Transport Modeller  
Tom McColgan, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Stephen Rumble, Transport Planning Team Leader  
Mark Ryder, Strategic Director for Communities  
Scott Tompkins, Assistant Director for Environment Services

**Also in Attendance**

John Brennan  
James Edwards, Vectos  
Roger Hollerton

**1. General**

**(1) Apologies for absence**

Councillor Wright sent his apologies and Councillor Cargill was present as a substitute. Councillor Chattaway sent his apologies and Councillor C Davies was present as a substitute.

Councillors Clarke and Butlin also sent their apologies for the meeting.

## **(2) Members' Disclosures of Pecuniary and Non-pecuniary Interests**

Councillor C Davies declared that her husband was the owner of Athag which was mentioned in the June 2019 Economic Update.

## **(3) Chair's Announcements**

The Chair provided an update on upcoming member briefing sessions that were relevant to the Committee's remit.

## **(4) Minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2019**

### **Resolved**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **2. Public Question Time**

The Chair invited Mr John Brennan and Mr Roger Hollerton to address the Committee on the subject of the bids submitted to Homes England Infrastructure Fund.

Mr Brennan asked Committee members to bear in mind the environmental impact of the proposed South Western Relief Road when they considered the financial risks laid out in the report. Mr Brennan stated that the road would create a gyratory system encompassing 13 schools with 1,500 pupils who would be exposed to the additional air pollution. Stratford upon Avon was a popular tourist destination and tourism generated a lot of income for the local economy. The proposed relief road that the bid to Homes England sought funding for would harm the appeal of the town by concreting over some of limited open space left in Stratford. The green space that was to be covered was also a flood plain and its loss would increase the risk of flooding to nearby areas. Building on a flood plain also meant that there would be a significant cost to the Council of maintaining the road after it was completed.

Mr Hollerton stated when considering the financial risk associated with the infrastructure bids to Homes England the Committee should also consider the reputational risk to the Council. Mr Hollerton stated that while the A5 formed part of the strategic road network and had served as an established route connecting communities since before the arrival of the Romans in Britain the South Western Relief Road was limited in scope and purpose. The County Council was placing its reputation for good governance at risk by simultaneously supporting two bids of such obviously contrasting merit. Mr Hollerton stated that he felt the County Council need to go back to Stratford-on-Avon District Council and ask; what contingencies had been put in place for the wider Long Marston project, how would the District Council provide the housing identified in local plan if the bid was not successful and how was the District Council going to improve traffic management in the long term in Stratford.

The Chair thanked Mr Brennan and Mr Hollerton for making their representations to the Committee and invited them to say for the discussion of the report on Funding Bids Submitted to the Homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund.

### **3. Questions to Cabinet and Portfolio Holders**

Councillor Kondakor asked Councillor Clarke to ensure that as the County Council adopted the highways infrastructure developed as part of local plans gaps were not left. Councillor Kondakor highlighted two developments in Nuneaton and Bedworth's Borough Plan which were connected by a canal bridge that provided pedestrian and cycle access but which neither the Council nor canal trust had adopted.

Scott Tompkins provided an update on the Nuneaton development on behalf of Councillor Clarke. The developer would be constructing the cycle and footpaths and the Council would maintain the surface and seek an agreement with the Canals trust about maintaining the structure of the bridge.

Councillor Kondakor stated that he was pleased that an oak tree in Burton Green had been saved that was originally due to be removed as part of the HS2 developments. Councillor Kondakor asked the relevant portfolio holder to look at securing tree protection orders for highways trees to prevent them from being needlessly removed by developers.

Councillor Seccombe responded that she too was delighted that a 200 year old Oak Tree had been saved and thanked Scott Tompkins and his team for acting so quickly and saving the tree.

The Chair thanked David Ayton-Hill for providing the comprehensive economic development update. The Chair stated that he had been shocked by the statistic that 80% of young people with special education needs and disabilities (SEND) wanted to go into employment when they finished school and only 6% managed it and was glad that this was being picked up and the Council would be helping more young people into supported employment.

Councillor Seccombe responded that a group of young people had visited Shire Hall in the last few days to look at the council as a place where they might come and work and three of the group would be undertaking supported apprenticeships in the Council.

Councillor Shilton stated that he welcomed the action being taken on supported education, Councillor Shilton's grandson had special educational needs and he hoped he would be able to benefit from a supported employment opportunity when he left school. Councillor Shilton asked if officers had looked to work with the gardeners employed by the district and borough councils to provide supported employment opportunities as this had been something that was offered in the past.

David Ayton-Hill responded that that would certainly be something officers would consider and there was another supported employment event coming up where his team could seek to make those links with the district and borough councils.

Councillor Kondakor welcomed the innovation centres in Nuneaton mentioned in the report and asked if there was any possibility of similar spaces being incorporated into the Nuneaton town centre transformation plans particularly in the old Co-op building.

Councillor Seccombe agreed that the innovation centres were working well and confirmed that there were plans to develop additional business units as part of the Transforming Nuneaton project but the Co-op building was being planned by the Borough Council and not the County.

#### **4. Funding Bids Submitted to the Homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund**

Stephen Rumble introduced the report which discussed the financial risk to Warwickshire County Council from submitting two infrastructure bids to Housing England in March 2019.

Councillor Seccombe stated that a report had come to Cabinet in March where it was resolved to submit the two bids to Homes England. Councillor Seccombe stated that the Stratford-on-Avon local plan required a development at Long Marston airfield of 3,500 houses and the County Council's advice as the authority responsible for highways in the County was that any development beyond 400 houses would require additional infrastructure to be in place. The local plan had been approved by the Planning Inspector and an outline planning application for 400 houses at the site had been granted permission by the District Council. Councillor Seccombe stated that the Council had been extremely robust in its valuations and lack of acceptance of any liability for the bids. The Council has had to put the bids in to Homes England as only top tier authorities could gain access to the funding. Stratford-on-Avon had been successful in bidding to another fund managed by Homes England to provide funding for onsite works at Long Marston. Councillor Seccombe stated that the County Council had evaluated the project and estimated costs at £127 million. The developer had contributed funding to the cost but it was a long way short of the total costs for what was a difficult project building over a flood plain, disused railway and site of special scientific interest. The County Council was required to help the District and Borough Councils to fulfil their agreed local plans. Councillor Seccombe stated that she believed that the Council's officers had work hard to mitigate any financial risk down to the lowest level possible.

Councillor Seccombe stated that the bid for the A5 scheme had the support of all the local MPs, neighbouring authorities, Midlands Connect and the Mayor for the West Midlands and was recognised as providing a vital improvement to a strategic piece of infrastructure. Councillor Seccombe also clarified that the outcome of either bid had not yet been announced.

Councillor Kondakor stated that the A5 was a really important road that in parts did not have a pavement meaning there was no way to safely cycle or walk the route. Councillor Kondakor stated that if there was funding to improve the road he felt that it should be used to improve the route for non-motorists and invest in sustainable modes of transport rather than duelling one section of the road which would encourage a growth in journeys and create more traffic along the rest of the route meaning that there was pressure to continue the cycle of incremental road expansions. Councillor Kondakor stated Polesworth station was key to the area with only a single train in one direction servicing the station leaving at 7am, residents of the new houses being built in the area would not have any sustainable alternative to car use open to them. Councillor Kondakor stated that the same applied to Stratford upon Avon where there were potentially going to be 3,500 new homes with no readily available sustainable transport options. Councillor Kondakor

stated that the future was in public transport and the County needed to invest in rail, bus and cycle infrastructure before it expanded roads.

Councillor Fradgley noted that the County Council felt comfortable with the financial risk of the two projects but stated that she felt the reputational risks of the project had been underestimated. Councillor Fradgley stated that residents had lost confidence in the Council thanks to the technical issues that had become apparent only after the design for the South Western Relief Road had come forward. Councillor Fradgley stated that there was a prolonged period between residents learning that a road was planned and learning what the design was going to be which had caused a lot of uncertainty. Councillor Fradgley also stated she was concerned about the cost of future maintenance of the road which was a fairly extreme piece of engineering and may present challenges in its upkeep.

Councillor Shilton stated that he had listened to the concerns expressed by speakers but felt that the Council should not pass up on any opportunity to bring funding into the county and improve the infrastructure in Warwickshire. Councillor Shilton stated that he was concerned that the South Western Relief Road was proposed to be built over a flood plain and sought assurances from officers that the road would not cause increased flooding risk in the area.

In response to points raised by committee members, Councillor Seccombe stated that the relief road was required as a result of the Stratford-on-Avon local plan that had been approved and had been through a consultation. Councillor Seccombe stated that the decision about whether to proceed with the relief road was to be made by the District Council and the County could not seek to block or undermine it by refusing to place the bid it had been asked to submit and the report in front of the Committee was only looking at the financial risk. Councillor Seccombe stated that the design of the relief road was elevated to take it over the flood plain and a railway line which the local plan identified as possibly being recommissioned in the long run. Councillor Seccombe stated that she had been clear throughout the process that she did not want Warwickshire County Council be liable for any part of the construction costs for the relief road. The County Council would have to lead on the development of the relief road as even though it was a developer led project they did not have the expertise to take it forward the project. Councillor Seccombe stated that the Housing Infrastructure fund was only available for projects directly related to the provision of housing and it was not to say that the Council would not be seeking to continue to invest in rail infrastructure. Mark Ryder added that there were strong regulatory controls on flooding which ensured that any development including the Long Marston development and any associated roads did not bring any undue flood risk. Mark Ryder also stated that there was a well-established framework that the council used when taking on liability for ongoing maintenance of highways infrastructure and while adopting roads did bring in additional cost to the council it was in support of additional economic development and housing which brought with it an expanded tax base and commuted sums from developers.

Councillor Kondakor stated that while he appreciated the limits on what could be bid for, a project like Polesworth Station was relatively small and he felt it would have been worthwhile including it as part of the bid and the Council should always look for rail infrastructure asks it could make when considering transport infrastructure.

The Chair thanked Members, officers and residents for their contributions and stated that he had also received a briefing from officers on the bids submitted to Homes England. The Chair stated that he was satisfied that the Council had minimised and fully accounted for any financial and reputation risk from the bids it had submitted to the Homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund in March 2019.

Councillor Cargill moved that the Committee agrees:

That the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee is satisfied that any financial and reputational risks incurred as a result of the bids submitted to the Homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund had been fully accounted for and sufficient mitigation had been put in place.

Councillor Shilton seconded the motion.

The Chair called a vote on the motion which passed with 8 votes for and 2 against. Councillor Kondakor requested that his vote against the motion be recorded.

**Resolved:**

That the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee is satisfied that any financial and reputational risks incurred as a result of the bids submitted to the Homes England Housing Infrastructure Fund has been fully accounted for and sufficient mitigation has been put in place.

## **5. Road Repairs**

Scott Tompkins presented a verbal update on the review of road repairs that was ongoing following a notice of motion approved at Full Council.

Councillor Cargill stated that transparency was the key to delivering a better road repairs service both for councillors and residents. When faults were reported it needed to be clear what was happening and when repairs could be expected.

Councillor Kondakor stated that providing easier avenues for residents to report faults and track repairs so they understand when a repair is expected or if it's been rejected was key to improving the service. Councillor Kondakor also stressed that cycle paths and pavements needed to be given equal priority with roads in when repairing faults rather than being treated as an afterthought.

Scott Tompkins responded that it was always best to ask residents to report faults directly to the Council through the Council's website. As the Council's systems improved Scott Tompkins stated that he was hopeful that there would be a joined up system where a resident logging a fault created a work order and on completion the residents received a message telling them the work had been done.

Councillor Cargill stated that in the past he had had experience of contractors rolling small works commissioned through member delegated budgets together and leaving them until the end of the year as minor projects were less desirable to contractors. Councillor Cargill also asked about the possibility of having a rolling budget for road repairs.

Scott Tompkins agreed with Councillor Cargill about the issues around programming works and stated that he would like to work with the contractor to develop a timetable for completion of works commissioned through delegated budgets at the beginning of the year and to hold the contractor to this with the aim of having the majority of work completed in year. This would only be achievable if the works to be delivered could be established early enough in the year.

Councillor Shilton stated that an area which generated a lot of complaints from his residents were utility companies failing to properly backfill holes that they had dug in the course of their work. Councillor Shilton also reported that resident had complained about utility companies putting temporary traffic lights in place and then failing to actually start work for several days or leaving them up after works had been completed and he asked officers to investigate a better system of monitoring the works done by utility companies on the highway.

## **6. Waste Reduction and Recycling Campaigns**

Ruth Dixon presented the report on the Council's waste reduction and recycling campaigns highlighting the work done through social media and the partnership working with the collection authorities.

The Chair thanked Ruth Dixon for the presentation and asked how long the Council had been undertaking campaigns designed to change residents' attitudes towards waste and how the success of these campaigns was measured.

Ruth Dixon responded that campaigns had been going for at least the last ten years alongside the municipal waste strategy which had always contained aspirations to drive recycling and composting rates. Success was difficult to measure as there were lot of factors that influenced residents' recycling habits. Broadly recycling rates had been stable or increasing and where they had fallen there were clear reasons for this such as a very hot summer in 2018 meant that there was less green waste. In Warwickshire recycling rates and overall waste had remained stable which went against the national trend which had seen overall waste increasing while recycling rates fell.

Councillor Cargill stated that one area where the Council could lead by example was paperless working, Council meetings generated a huge amount of waste paper and there were software packages readily available that offered paperless solutions.

Councillor C Davies welcomed the recycling initiatives in the report and stated that in the first instance it was always best to reduce the amount of waste created. There was already a shop in Nuneaton that refilled washing up liquid bottles, shampoo bottles, and more to save having to recycle the empty bottle and buy a new. Councillor C Davies asked what pressure the Council could put on business to offer packaging free options to help residents cut down on the amount of waste they were producing. Councillor C Davies also stated that there was a lot more that could be recycled and gave the example of the Barker family in Nuneaton who are collecting difficult to recycle materials that are not collected from the kerbside such as crisp packets and toothpaste tubes.

Councillor C Davies suggested that the Council could look at removing single use plastic from its buildings and maintained schools. Councillor C Davies stated that the head cook at one of the schools in her division had told her they still use plastic cutlery as alternatives were not financially viable.

In response to Councillor Fradgley and C Davies, Ruth Dixon stated that the recyclable waste collected by the Council at Household Recycling Centres tended to be treated in Europe but not necessarily in Britain with recyclable material going to the Netherlands and Spain. Some material from the districts and boroughs went to Turkey and a very small amount went further to Pakistan, Indonesia and Malaysia. Ruth Dixon stated that there was no stipulation in any of the Council's current waste contracts that material had to be processed in Britain or Europe and she stated that adding this as a condition would likely make it difficult for the Council to attract providers.

Councillor Kondakor stated that it was really good to see the community recycling initiatives but a lot of the County's residents who lived in flats had no access to recycling facilities to recycle even simple things and more effort was needed to ensure that facilities were in place for residents. Councillor Kondakor also congratulated officer for their performance as over the last 13 years the amount of waste generated in Warwickshire had fallen by around 13,000 tonnes despite the population increasing.

Councillor Shilton stated that there had recently been press coverage of the substantial increase in textile waste which could be reused or recycled and stated that this was an area where the Council would have a role in encouraging residents to donate unwanted clothes to charity and providing facilities to dispose of textiles to be recycled; keeping textile waste out of residual waste bins.

## **Resolved**

That the Committee:

- 1) Note the valuable waste communications activities going on across the county, the successes to date and the progress of delivering outcomes in waste behaviour change; and
- 2) Promote the campaigns through the communications channels they have available.

## **7. One Organisational Plan Quarterly Progress Report – April to December 2018**

Scott Tompkins introduced the report and stated that on page 6 of the report the graph showing household waste data needed to be updated to read 51.4 instead of 53.4 for 2017/18 and the 2018/19 figure should read 51.7. Scott Tompkins also highlighted the visual inspections reported in the paper were generated by individuals making reports and some of the change was likely down to the subjective reporting inherent in the process.

Councillor Kondakor stated that the Warwickshire employment data was generated using rolling average survey data which meant that it would take a while for any



changes in employment figures to be evident in the survey data. Councillor Kondakor also stated that the change in pension age for women had meant that a lot of women were having to stay in employment passed the point where they had expected to be able to retire and he asked officers if they had any data on whether the employment rates for those aged 16-60 were increasing or whether the increase in employment seen in the data was due to an increase in those aged 60+ being in work.

Mark Ryder responded that the employment rate graph was a high level indicator and that would not be used to determine where the Council intervened in the local economy. Mark Ryder stated that he could provide more detail about the ages of those in work in Warwickshire.

### **Resolved**

That the Committee considers the progress of the delivery of the One Organisational Plan 2020 for the period as contained in the report.

## **8. Work Programme**

Councillor Kondakor stated that the Cycling Infrastructure Task and Finish was meeting on 5 July to discuss the progress made toward the recommendations of the group and may seek to bring an update back to committee.

Members agreed to establish of a climate adaptation task and finish group which had been proposed by Councillor Fradgley.

## **9. Any Urgent Items**

The Chair stated that a request had been received from a number of Councillors to consider a report on Warwickshire Major Road Network (MRN) - Proposed Programme and Priorities which had been previously considered by Cabinet on 11 June 2019 as an urgent item.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted that the schemes approved by Cabinet were vital to ensuring the road network had enough capacity to account for the expected growth in traffic resulting from development both within and outside the County. Without the additional lanes the A46 could see potentially 100 – 800 metres of queuing beyond the length of the slip lane in the morning rush hour by 2028 and 650 – 900 metres in the afternoon; rendering the A46 effectively blocked at peak travel times. This would cause issues for any emergency vehicles trying to use the route and would encourage drivers to take alternative routes through residential areas causing air quality and safety issues.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and stated that as a local member representing Kenilworth he welcomed the scheme and could see the potential benefits for Kenilworth. There had been a long held ambition for a Kenilworth to Leamington cycle route which had been delayed due to the expense of building a bridge over the river and bringing this forward as part of the A46/ A452 scheme was a great step in the right direction.

Councillor Kondakor stated that there were numerous schemes outlined in the report all of which had the potential to drive modal shift but could also create more traffic. Councillor Kondakor stated that he was concerned that if schemes did create more trips it would increase pressure on other parts of the network which in turn would create the need for more road expansions. There was a need for Councillors to take a strategic view of the Major Road Network and to scrutinise schemes to ensure that they aligned with the priorities that had been identified in the Local Transport Plan 3.

Councillor Kondakor proposed two recommendations:

That the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends that Cabinet:

- 1) Commissions a report that considers how the Major Road Network proposals fit into Warwickshire County Council's wider transport strategy, including how Major Road Network Projects will contribute towards meeting the goals of Warwickshire County Council's Local Transport Plan in particular to reduce climate change emissions and encourage modal shift.
- 2) Publishes all supporting evidence for each scheme as soon as possible and if necessary re-evaluate the prioritisation of the schemes and investigate alternatives.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Fradgley.

Councillor Kondakor stated that the motion he had proposed was not designed to stop Major Road Network proposals but rather to ensure that the schemes were done in a way which supported the goals of the Local Transport Plan in the best way possible.

Councillor Seccombe asked if Councillor Kondakor and Fradgley would be willing to change the wording of the second recommendation in the proposed motion to delete the word 'all' and replace it with 'appropriate' as there may be some commercially sensitive and confidential information included as part of the evidence base for schemes which would not be suitable for publication.

Councillor Kondakor stated that he was happy to accept the change as a friendly amendment.

Councillor Boad stated that as a councillor representing Leamington Spa she considered herself to be a local member for the A46 scheme and yet she had not been notified of or consulted on the scheme before it went to Cabinet nor had any of the Leamington Spa councillors. Councillor Boad stated that she agreed with Councillor Kondakor's comments about a need for modal shift, she was concerned that all the proposed A46/A452 scheme would achieve was to move congestion down the road while not actually addressing any of the underlying causes.

Officers responded that the A46/A452 scheme had been developed as part of the Warwick District Local Plan and was seen as necessary to support the housing development identified in Kenilworth, without the scheme the adopted local plan would not be achievable. The A46 was part of the strategic road network and the majority of traffic on the road was generated by strategic journeys which were long

distance and were not trips that could be switched to walking or cycling. The congestion on the A46 created a real safety concern in the short term that needed to be addressed. Officers stated that the evidence base suggested that the scheme would not simply move traffic further down the road as the dual carriage way would allow cars to move to the Thickthorn Island at which point traffic would begin to dissipate with less vehicles moving onto the single lane road beyond.

Councillor N Davies reiterated the points raised by Councillor Boad about consulting with local members. Councillor N Davies stated that as a Leamington Spa councillor she did not necessarily object to the A46/A452 scheme but without any briefing prior to the report coming to Cabinet she had had to join other members in bringing the report in for additional scrutiny. Councillor N Davies asked officers to provide an expected timescale for the completion of the entire length of the Leamington to Kenilworth cycle route as a few hundred metres of safe route on an otherwise perilous cycle path did not help to drive modal shift.

Scott Tompkins apologised that local Kenilworth and Leamington Spa members had not be consulted on the report prior to it coming to Cabinet and stated that he would arrange a briefing session for councillors. Stephen Rumble added that the bridge across the river was the main barrier to completing the Leamington to Kenilworth cycle route and the Council would seek to complete the entire length of the route once a suitable bridge could be delivered. Officers were mindful that the road scheme did not have a set timeframe and so were seeking to deliver an interim solution in the short term with a temporary bridge structure for pedestrians and cyclists.

Councillor Chilvers stated that he was concerned about the structure of the report as a whole as well as the specifics of the A46/ A452 scheme as a Leamington Spa member. Councillor Chilvers stated that the report laid out a series of projects for the major road network that could be read as the equivalent to a transport strategy that was being agreed without first being scrutinised against the priorities identified in the Local Transport Plan by Councillors.

Councillor Seccombe stated that she did not see any issues with the motion proposed by Councillor Kondakor coming back to Cabinet should the Committee be minded to agree it. Councillor Seccombe stated that the A426/A4071 scheme had been identified by Midlands Connect and there was a fast approaching deadline to apply for funding and she was keen to avoid any delays which would prevent the Council from securing funding for the project. Councillor Seccombe stated that for the two other projects identified in the Cabinet report the Council would be seeking to apply for funding that the Department for Transport had made available for improvements to major road networks. Councillor Seccombe agreed that it was important to drive modal shift but for strategic roads people would always chose a car or bus or rail link and it was important to look at how the strategic roads could be kept free to enable those strategic journeys.

Scott Tompkins clarified that the major road network in Warwickshire had been defined by the Government and the Department for Transport's fund was only open to schemes on the major road network that helped to bring forward housing and deal with congestion issues.

Councillor Rickhards stated that he would like to support the motion proposed by Councillor Kondakor and in particular recommendation 2 which suggested a re-evaluation of the prioritisation of schemes. Councillor Rickhards stated that he felt residents in his division and neighbouring divisions would be disappointed with the lack of priority given to the A435 scheme. There had been a long running campaign in the area to increase major road capacity and with developments in Redditch and Alcester along with an already acknowledged air quality issue in Studley there was an even greater demand now for increased capacity on the A435.

The Chair called a vote on the motion proposed by Councillor Kondakor and seconded by Councillor Fradgley which was carried unanimously.

## **Resolved**

That the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends to Cabinet that it:

- 1) Commissions a report that considers how the Major Road Network proposals fit into Warwickshire County Council's wider transport strategy, including how Major Road Network Projects will contribute towards meeting the goals of Warwickshire County Council's Local Transport Plan in particular to reduce climate change emissions and encourage modal shift.
- 2) Publishes appropriate supporting evidence for each scheme as soon as possible and if necessary re-evaluate the prioritisation of the schemes and investigate alternatives.

The meeting rose at 16:35 pm

.....  
Chair