

## **Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee**

A meeting of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee was held on Thursday, 27<sup>th</sup> July 2006.

### **Present:**

Representing Darlington Borough Council: Councillors Johnson(Vice Councillor Richmond), Lyonette and Ruck(Vice Councillor Scott).

Representing Hartlepool Borough Council: Councillors Coward, Preece and R.Waller.

Representing Middlesbrough Borough Council: Councillor Budd.

Representation Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council: Councillors Cherrett, Cook and Lupton.

Representing Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council: Councillors Dunning, Empson, Moody and Smith.

**Officers:** J Lowther (Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit); N Hart (Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council), P Furniss (Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council).

**Apologies for absence** were submitted on behalf of Councillors Brady, Collins, Larkin, Mawston, Richmond, Scott, Teasdale, Thompson, D Waller, M P Waller, Ward, Wallis and Williams.

### **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Cook declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 10 – Tees Valley City Region Development Programme and agenda item 22 - Development Initiative for Chemical Dependent Areas Annual Conference due to his employment in the chemical industry.

Councillor Dunning declared a personal/non-prejudicial interest in respect of agenda item 10 – Tees Valley City Region Development Programme and agenda item 22 - Development Initiative for Chemical Dependent Areas Annual Conference due to his son's employment in the chemical industry.

### **Appointment of Chairman 2006/07**

Consideration was to the appointment of the Chairman for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

RESOLVED that Councillor Cook be appointed Chairman for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

### **Appointment of Vice Chairman 2006/07**

Consideration was to the appointment of the Vice Chairman for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

RESOLVED that Councillor R Waller be appointed Vice Chairman for the Municipal Year 2006/07.

### **Joint Strategy Committee - Revised Political Composition/Membership - 2006/07**

Consideration was given to a report which advised Members of the revised political composition of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee for the 2006/2007 Municipal Year arising from the recent local election and to receive the nominations for membership of the Committee from each of the Tees Valley Authorities.

RESOLVED that:-

1. The political composition of the Joint Strategy Committee for the 2006/2007 Municipal Year be noted.

2. The nominated members and substitutes received from Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton Borough Councils for membership of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee be noted.

### **Tees Valley Rail Group - Appointments - 2006/07**

Consideration was given to a report which requested Members nominate three representatives from the Committee to serve on the Tees Valley Rail Group and to receive the nominations for membership from the five Tees Valley Authorities.

RESOLVED that:-

1. Councillors Cherrett, Lyonette and Lupton of the Joint Strategy Committee be appointed to the Tees Valley Rail Group for the Municipal Year 2006/2007.
2. The nominations received from the Tees Valley Authorities be noted.

### **Appointments to Outside Bodies**

Consideration was given to a report that requested the Committee appoint:

- a) One councillor and non-councillor to the Board of Cleveland Waste Management;
- b) Two representatives to attend the North East of England Programme Monitoring Committee;

RESOLVED that:-

1. Councillor D Waller and Mr Mike Kay be appointed to the Board of Cleveland Waste Management.
2. Councillor Brady and Councillor Cook be appointed to the North East of England Programme Monitoring Committee.

### **Committee Calendar - 2006/07**

Consideration was given to a report that proposed that the Committee meets three times a year for its main meetings. There may be the need for an occasional special meeting to deal with one specific issue such as the Regional Spatial Strategy.

RESOLVED that the Committee meet on the following dates:-

Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2006 at 2:00pm

Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> December 2006 at 2:00pm

Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2007 at 2:00pm

### **Joint Strategy Unit Final Outturn Report 2005/06**

Consideration was given to a report that provided the Unit's final outturn for 2005/2006 and showed an underspend for the year of £179,522. The major element of this (£130,000) comprised an amount set aside to provide match funding for the continuation of the European Legal Service for the period to December 2008. The protracted discussions relating to the management restructuring exercise meant that a number of posts were frozen for some time. This created an underspend of around

£78,000 but was offset by the provision of an additional £50,000 to cover estimated redundancy costs. Whilst the restructuring was agreed during the middle of the year a number of posts were yet to be filled and it was anticipated that all new staff would be in post by autumn 2006. The remaining underspend was primarily due to successful funding claims against expenditure within many of the Unit's project areas.

The sum initially set aside to cover costs associated with the restructuring exercise had been largely unspent and a sum of £88,881 was held in the Unit's reserves to cover redundancy costs. The additional £50,000 from the 2005/06 accounts would provide a total of £138,881 for this purpose and may also be needed to cover costs associated with the transfer of staff to the newly created Area Tourism Partnership.

The figures fully incorporated detailed costs with respect to the Joint Waste Management function which transferred to the JSU on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

#### **Minutes – 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006 were given consideration.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2006 be agreed as a correct record.

#### **Tees Valley Region Development Programme: Format and Timetable**

Consideration was given to a detailed presentation by the Director of the Joint Strategy regarding the submission of a business case for the Tees Valley City Region Development Programme (CRDP), together with details of the timetable, prior to the case being submitted to each of the Tees Valley local authorities for their approval.

The business case preparation had followed discussions with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), Government Office for the North East (GONE) and One North East (ONE); and comprised:-

- Definition of the City Region
- Detailed economic profile
- Identifies economic challenges and barriers to growth
- Sets out interventions within our forward strategy
- Examines governance arrangements
- States how Government can help us deliver our objectives

The business case also included what was to be asked of the Government; how the sub region would be required to work together to achieve common objectives; how these arrangements would affect governance and what added value was to be gained from this change in strategic approach to tackling the needs of the Tees Valley.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that agreement be given to the proposed timetable and the approval processes suggested.

(Councillors Cook and Dunning declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in respect of the above item as a result of their employment, or family member's employment, within the chemical industry.)

## **Proposed Northern Gateway Container Terminal**

The Committee's views were asked regarding the planning application and harbour revision order submitted by PD Teesport to construct a deep sea container terminal covering 56 ha of Tees Dock together with a 1000 metres long quay and associated dredging of the River Tees.

The development was to be constructed in two phases – phase 1 to 2010 involves the construction of a 700 metre long quay and phase 2 a 300 metres long quay. The capacity of the terminal would be 1.5 million twenty foot equivalent units (TEUs) a year. The development had the potential to create 5000 jobs by 2029 and double the contribution to GVA.

The project was a key part of the Tees Valley Vision, Tees Valley City Region Development Programme, the Northern Way, the Regional Economic and Regional Spatial Strategies. The transport impact study showed that the road network could accommodate the extra traffic through mitigation measures and that the rail network had capacity to cater for 10 trains/a day generated by the development. There were no significant environmental impacts from the terminal or associated dredging to marine, bird life or water quality in the estuary. The report recommends that the Committee support the proposal.

The Director of the Joint Strategy Unit summarized the factors which emphasized the need for the development within this region; particularly given the 85% growth in freight tonnage movements handled by UK ports since 1993. Capacity constraints in ports in the south east and road traffic congestion in that area had all contributed to the justification that the North region ports should play a more key role in the future. It was noted by members the extent of the forecasted reduction in road mileage should Teesport be chosen to receive future containers at the expense of other ports in the country; thereby reducing CO2 emissions, whereas many of the areas in the south suffered from heavy road congestion. This problem could therefore be exacerbated by similar deep sea container terminals being approved in other areas of the country; such as those already submitted for Felixstowe South, Bathside Bay and London Gateway.

RESOLVED that Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council be informed that the Joint Strategy Committee fully supports the application for the Northern Gateway Container Terminal at Teesport.

## **The Draft National Ports Strategy**

Consideration was given to the Government's draft national ports strategy; upon which this Committee's comments were sought.

The document would eventually become national policy and would guide the Government's response to future proposals to develop the port of Tees and Hartlepool including the Northern Gateway Container Terminal proposal. It was also important in that it dealt with future trends for the import and export of oil, gas, chemicals and energy which form 60% of the traffic through the port.

A proposed response from the Tees Valley; together with the supporting evidence base for the response, was also considered.

The Director of the Joint Strategy Unit reported that although it was pleasing to see that the Ports Policy paper recognised the important role of the Port of Tees and Hartlepool played in the national and regional economy, it was disappointing that the Ports Policy paper was not more positive about PD Teesport's Northern Gateway proposal. The case for a deep sea container terminal at Teesport was considered to be overwhelming for a number of reasons and the National Ports Policy should support the proposal or the very least the principle of expanding deep sea container terminal capacity in the North of England. Members had previously commented during consideration of the item on the Northern Gateway Container Terminal at this meeting on the forecasted reduction in road mileage should Teesport be chosen to receive future containers at the expense of other ports in the country; and the resulting environmental benefits arising through a reduction in CO2 emissions. Many of the areas in the south suffered from heavy road congestion and this problem could therefore be exacerbated by similar deep sea container terminals being approved in other areas of the country; such as those already submitted for Felixstowe South, Bathside Bay and London Gateway.

It was therefore proposed that the Director of the Joint Strategy Unit, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, draft a letter of response to the Government incorporating these facts.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and the Director of the Joint Strategy Unit in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, be authorised to draft a letter of response to the Government based on the contents and conclusions set out within the report and incorporating members environmental concerns regarding possible increased port development in the south.

#### **A19/A66/A174 Highways Agency – Transport Innovation Fund Bid**

Members were informed that the above item had been withdrawn.

#### **Tees Valley Bus Network Review**

Consideration was given to the results of the Tees Valley Bus Network Review.

The review highlighted that the Tees Valley bus network was in long-term decline and that passenger numbers, whilst still high (at over 40 million per annum), had been haemorrhaging, although the recent introduction of free concessionary travel and a revised Arriva network appear to have provided some respite. Bus operating costs were increasing at approximately three times the rate of inflation, assisted by escalating traffic congestion and limited, often poorly enforced, priority measures. This translated into unreliable operation and regular fare increases, resulting in further patronage decline. The consequence was an unstable, shrinking, network with an increasing requirement for subsidy.

Government policy placed the bus at the forefront of local public transport provision, with demanding targets for growth, and this was reflected in the recent Second Local Transport Plan (LTP) submissions and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Notwithstanding the development of the rail network, the bus would remain the predominant public transport mode within the Tees Valley. Without an effective network offering a viable alternative to the private car, the regeneration of the Tees Valley may be choked off by congestion.

In view of this, the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (TVJSU) had commissioned consultants, on behalf of the five Local Authorities and with the cooperation of the bus operators, in November 2004 to examine the bus network. They were tasked with determining the network best suited to reversing the long-term patronage decline and enabling future enhancement measures to be coordinated and targeted to maximise their impact. The consultants reported in May 2005, and a key recommendation was for a major package of focused coordinated investment. This had led to the development of a Local Transport Plan Major Scheme Bid to the Department for Transport (DfT) for funding to bring about a step change in the quality of the bus network. Arup were appointed in April 2006 to take the Bid forward and consideration was given to the proposed main elements agreed to date, as well as costs, funding and governance implications.

The Tees Valley Bus Network Review proposed a revised network based on a hierarchy of services ranging from fast, frequent and high quality, commercially operated, urban trunk routes (Super Core) to low frequency, financially supported, Tertiary and Rural services meeting social accessibility needs. The recently introduced 'Viva Tees Valley' network was Arriva's interpretation of this approach. The Stagecoach network had already moved towards this concept and further changes, on the scale of those introduced by Arriva, are considered unlikely. The Major Scheme Bid would focus on those routes in the top two tiers of the hierarchical network, offering the most effective alternative to the car and consequently the greatest potential for modal shift. The routes proposed for development were largely within the urban areas of the Tees Valley, supported by selected inter-urban links that complement, rather than compete with, other rail-based proposals.

The proposed routes, recently agreed by the Steering Group, were as follows:

#### Super Core

6	Clavering – Hart Station – Hartlepool – Fens
15/15B	Thornaby – Stockton – Roseworth
17/17A/17B	Middlesbrough – Acklam – Thornaby
23	Skerne Park – Darlington – Harrowgate Hill – Whinfield
27/27A	Netherfields – Middlesbrough – James Cook University Hospital – Marton
36/37/38	Park End – Middlesbrough – Stockton
52	Stockton – Norton – Billingham – Low Grange
58	Stockton – Hardwick/University Hospital of North Tees
63	Middlesbrough – James Cook University Hospital – Eston - Redcar

#### Core

1/1A	High Tunstall – University Hospital of Hartlepool – Hartlepool – Seaton Carew
7	Stockton – Eaglescliffe – Yarm
7/7A	Headland – Hartlepool – Owton Manor
12	Middlesbrough – Acklam – Hemlington – Coulby Newham
20/21	Firthmoor – Darlington – Haughton Road – Whinfield/Springfield
22	Darlington – Brinkburn – Minors Crescent
24	Firthmoor – Darlington – North Road – Springfield
25	Red Hall – Yarm Road – Darlington – Cockerton – Branksome
59	Stockton – Elm Tree – University Hospital of North Tees
61	Stockton – Fairfield – Elton Park
64/64A	Middlesbrough – South Bank – Eston

Subject to a new bus link being constructed between Thornhill and Brookfield, a new service

- 11 Middlesbrough – Acklam – Thornhill – Hemlington – Coulby Newham would be added to the Core network, providing, with service 12, a very simple, high frequency, network in south Middlesbrough.

Concern was expressed by members that additional services incorporating Hartlepool should be included within the core service, including services to Port Clarence/Haverton Hill/James Cook University Hospital; journey times between Hartlepool and Durham etc; and the Director of the Joint Strategy Unit confirmed that he would discuss such requirements with the appropriate officers at Hartlepool Borough Council when the report was placed before them. In this regard, members also suggested that rather than to 'aspire' to extend the core network, as proposed, the report should seek to announce the 'intention' for this development to occur.

RESOLVED that:-

1. The report be noted, and amended to incorporate the member comments regarding extension of the core service; and that agreement be given by this Committee for officers to submit a bid for Local Transport Plan Major Scheme funding by 29 September 2006.
2. The report be taken through the required approvals process in each Local Authority.

### **Tees Valley Metro**

Members noted that for a considerable time, there had been proposals to develop a light rapid transit (metro) system within the Tees Valley to support future regeneration aspirations. Two previous studies had examined such a system, and had concluded that a new network could not be justified on economic grounds alone. However, following recent national policy changes, and in line with the completion of the Second Local Transport Plans (LTPs), and the development of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), there was now the opportunity to assess whether there were wider grounds for pursuing a metro system of some form.

Tees Valley Regeneration (TVR) had commissioned a panel of consultants in December 2004 to take the proposals forward and a considerable amount of work has been done in the intervening period to develop the proposals for the Tees Valley Metro and to make a strong case for its delivery to underpin future regeneration.

The important elements of the work undertaken were summarised as follows:

- Tees Valley Metro Preferred Scheme. Conversion of the Darlington to Saltburn heavy rail line to tram-train technology, resulting in increased frequency and higher quality of service with supporting heavy rail and high frequency bus services providing an enhanced frequency of connection to Hartlepool.
- Costs and Funding. The current capital cost estimate (without Optimism Bias) is £141.9 million, including normal contingencies. If a major scheme business case (MSBC) bid is submitted, £14.4 million would be required as a "local" contribution from a range of sources, including ERDF, RDA grants and LTP funds already allocated, but £6.9 million would also need to be allocated as a

risk item. If an alternative source of funding is sought, "local" contributions would still be required, but their value is unclear at the present time.

- Revenues. Due to reduced operating costs of the new system compared to the existing heavy rail network, and the attractiveness of the system to new trips allied to regeneration, the new system will require fewer subsidies than the existing system for the majority of the mode transfer scenarios modelled. Under the most optimistic scenario (which is still robust), the system could be in premium within 7 years of opening.
- The interim governance arrangements to take the project forward should entail a development of the existing Project Board, but it is suggested that, over time, a new Transport for Tees Valley Board, a sub-Board of the wider Tees Valley governance proposals for the City Region, could become the Scheme Promoter, subject to the approval of the Project Board and the TVR Board.
- The project team required to take the project forward, which should be a bespoke Project Delivery Team, headed by a Project Manager and answerable to the Project Board. The anticipated cost of taking the project forward to July 2007 is around £500,000, and there is the ability to claim 50% of this cost from the Department for Transport (DfT) should the scheme be granted 'Programme Entry' status in 2006. The primary source of this funding should be The Northern Way Transport Compact, allied to work being undertaken relating to Teesport.

Each of the Tees Valley authorities would receive a report requesting authority for the pursuit of an appropriate funding bid in autumn 2006.

RESOLVED that the content of the report be noted and agreement be given to pursue a funding bid of some sort in autumn 2006, subject to this paper being taken through the required approvals process in each Local Authority.

### **Preparation of Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents**

The Committee was advised that the Joint Strategy Unit was to prepare joint minerals and waste development plan documents on behalf of the Tees Valley local planning authorities; in the same joint working arrangements as existed for the preparation of the Tees Valley Structure Plan will be adopted. The new Development Plan Documents would replace the saved minerals and waste policies in the Tees Valley Structure Plan, adopted in April 2004.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required local planning authorities to prepare a number of local development documents which together comprised the Local Development Framework. Within these were statutory Development Plan Documents (DPDs). Preparation of DPDs jointly by two or more local planning authorities was encouraged in Government guidance. Unitary Authorities were specifically required to prepare up-to-date planning policies and proposals for development involving minerals and waste management which included all waste generated. This was separate from waste management strategies which only addressed municipal waste and which local authorities had to prepare pursuant to other legislation. The aim was to have the minerals and waste DPDs adopted by April 2010.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.



### **Objective 3 – The Territorial Co – Operation Objective 2007 – 2013**

The Committee was advised that the Joint Strategy Unit was to prepare joint minerals and waste development plan documents on behalf of the Tees Valley local planning authorities; in the same joint working arrangements as existed for the preparation of the Tees Valley Structure Plan will be adopted. The new Development Plan Documents would replace the saved minerals and waste policies in the Tees Valley Structure Plan, adopted in April 2004.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required local planning authorities to prepare a number of local development documents which together comprised the Local Development Framework. Within these were statutory Development Plan Documents (DPDs). Preparation of DPDs jointly by two or more local planning authorities was encouraged in Government guidance. Unitary Authorities were specifically required to prepare up-to-date planning policies and proposals for development involving minerals and waste management which included all waste generated. This was separate from waste management strategies which only addressed municipal waste and which local authorities had to prepare pursuant to other legislation. The aim was to have the minerals and waste DPDs adopted by April 2010.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

### **New Competitiveness and Employment Objective (Post 2006)**

Consideration was given to progress on the Competitiveness and Employment Objective of the 2007-2013 Structural Funds. The Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit had been working closely with Government Office for the North East and One North East to compile an operational plan for the programme and to ensure the maximisation of funds for the Tees Valley. A summary of the strategic developments made was submitted.

The Competitiveness and Employment Programme would in 2007, replace the current Objective 2 Programme of the European Structural Funds. The European Union (EU) Structural and Cohesion Funds was the second largest item of EU expenditure, and were used to promote regional development and employment across the EU Member States. The Funds could be used for a wide range of activities including developing transport and communications infrastructure, supporting innovation, enterprise and business development, protecting and enhancing the environment, supporting specific sectors of regional economies, delivering active labour market policies and improving skills. The UK was expected to receive approximately 9.4 billion euros in Structural Funds from the EU budget during the period 2007-2013.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

### **Dti Review of Assisted Areas**

The Committee was advised that the Government had published the draft assisted area map, which would determine in which areas where various grants could be awarded for the period 2007-2013. These grants were Selective Finance for Investment in England (SFIE), which replaced Regional Selective Assistance (RSA) and Enterprise Grants.

The new map reduced coverage in the Tees Valley by 17%, but the reduction was not even. All but one ward in Darlington was excluded from the draft map, whereas coverage in Hartlepool remains at 100%. Stockton, Redcar and Cleveland and Middlesbrough had all lost less than 7% coverage. The DTI had confirmed that:-

1. The contiguous zones that the Government had constructed were basically the same ones previously used (which explains why one ward in Darlington is still in, i.e. it's in a different contiguous zone to the rest of Darlington).
2. The data analysis for the four measures was based on the contiguous zones. The Darlington wards that had been dropped from the map were dropped because of this analysis,
3. The DTI was open to suggestions for improvements (i.e. the idea of swapping wards for those with similar population levels'), but would have to examine them in the light of the contiguous zones.
4. The contiguous zones would be made public when the data is sent to the Commission.

The JSU had asked the DTI to release details of the North East contiguous zones to Government Office North East (GO-NE), since the make up of these zones would be crucial if wards could be swapped.

The second stage of the consultation was now open and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) had indicated that they may still have room for manoeuvre; however a case would have to be made to DTI to change the map. The Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU) was leading on this consultation on behalf of the districts to ensure that coverage is maximized within the Tees Valley region.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

### **Tees Valley Objective 2 Priority 4 Delegated Grants Scheme**

Consideration was given to details of the success of the 2005 bidding round of the Tees Valley Delegated Grants Scheme set up through funding received from the Objective 2 European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and Single Programme.

The Tees Valley Delegated Grants scheme was set up to provide 100% grant funding to projects benefiting the Objective 2 Priority 4 target communities of the Tees Valley. For the purposes of the Objective 2 Programme the Priority 4 target wards are those, which are ranked as the most disadvantaged in the region.

Community/voluntary groups could receive one capital grant up to £25,000 or one revenue grant up to £25,000 in any one year. Once they had received both a capital and a revenue grant (of any amount), they become ineligible for a further grant. Priority was being given to those groups that had not previously received a Tees Valley Delegated Grant and did not have the capacity to access mainstream European Funding.

There was an overwhelming response to the 2005 bidding round under the scheme with a total of 67 project applications being received - 16 capital, 11 revenue and 3 combination applications. A total of 31 projects were to deliver training activities, offer counselling services or had beneficiaries under 13 years of age, which are

ineligible for support under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). The 6 remaining projects were withdrawn by project sponsors.

The Appraisal Panel – a sub-group comprising Steering Group membership, considered a total of 30 applications. Of the original 67 applications submitted 31 were found to be ineligible for support and 6 were withdrawn by project sponsors. Individual projects were appraised against eligibility criteria agreed by the Steering Group and scored on the basis of information provided by the applicant. Following endorsement by the Steering Group the delegated grants scheme awarded grants to those projects scoring above the agreed threshold.

The initial capital and revenue allocation of £400,000, consisting of £200,000 capital and £200,000 revenue funding was fully allocated in this bidding round of the delegated grant scheme. This funding supports a total of 21 community organisations in the Objective 2, Priority 4 target communities of the Tees Valley. The 2006 Bidding Round would be announced on 29 August 2006 and applications would be accepted until 22 September 2006. In this bidding round community/voluntary groups could apply for a capital grant up to £25,000. Priority would be given to those groups that had not previously received a Tees Valley Delegated Grant and did not have the capacity to access mainstream European Funding.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

### **Accessing Additional European Funding**

Consideration was given to a report providing members with background information on Transnational European Funding; together with details of how the European Policy Team was ensuring that all opportunities were fully exploited within the Tees Valley.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

### **Development Initiative for Chemical Dependent Areas (DICIDA) Annual Conference**

Consideration was given to member representation at the forthcoming DICIDA Conference on 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> October 2006 in Humberside.

RESOLVED that Councillors Cook, Dunning and Richmond, and appropriate officers, represent the Joint Strategy Committee at the above conference.

(Councillors Cook and Dunning each declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in respect of the above item as a result of their employment, or family members' employment, within the chemical industry.)

### **List of Meetings**

Members received a comprehensive list of the meetings that had been attended by officers of the Joint Strategy Unit from 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006 to 27<sup>th</sup> July 2006.

RESOLVED that the list of meetings be noted.