

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ECONOMY

10 November 2011

Present:

Councillor Cole (Chair)

Councillors Prowse, Bialyk, Bull, Morris, Payne, Robson, Thompson and Wardle

Director Economy and Development, Head of Economy and Tourism, Head of Operational Services & Transport, Parking Services Manager, Archaeology Officer and Member Services Officer (SLS)

Also present:

Councillor Rosie Denham
Councillor Rachel Sutton

Portfolio Holder for Economy and Tourism
Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport

Christopher Green
Martin Weiler

Halcrow, Exeter
Environment Agency

47 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2011 were taken as read, and signed by the Chair as correct.

48 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following personal interests were declared:-

COUNCILLOR	MINUTE
Councillor Prowse	49 (known to the questioner)
Councillor Wardle	60 (a Member of the Devon Archaeological Society and the Devonshire Association)

49 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 19**

Councillor Prowse declared a personal interest as he is known to Mr Harry.

In accordance with Standing Order 19, two members of the public submitted questions on the civil parking enforcement process operating in the city, to which the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport replied. Copies of the questions were circulated to Members and made available at the meeting.

The questions and a summary of the replies (in italics) are set out below.

- (1) In accordance with Standing Order 19, Mr Harry addressed the Scrutiny Committee and asked the following question:-

"I recently received a ticket on street in your City for an alleged parking offence. Can the Chairman of your Committee for which this subject is responsible, assure me that the Council has fully complied with its statutory duty, in notifying me of my rights to make representations against a Penalty Charge Notice".

Councillor Sutton (Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport) responded to the question as follows:-

The information set out in the Penalty Charge Notice clearly conveys to the reasonable motorist how to make representations. If any motorist believes otherwise, then the avenue of appeal to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal is of course open to them.

- (2) In accordance with Standing Order 19, Mr Pascoe addressed the Scrutiny Committee and asked the following question:-

Is the Committee able to advise me what expertise was applied to the first and second stage challenges on the penalty tickets issued to drivers parked at what appeared to be a lay-by in Pinn Lane, Pinhoe and also other areas of the City, when tickets have been challenged as to their validity? The reason for my question relates to my disappointment at the level of response I received at both stage one and two of the appeal process employed by the City/County Council. My penalty charge was subsequently overturned following taking it to the third stage (Independent Traffic Penalty Tribunal) however none of my concerns were addressed until this point.

Mr Pascoe made an additional comment stating that he did not feel that he had received a valued response when, in the first instance, he had been sent a standard letter seeking the necessary payment.

Councillor Sutton (Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport) responded to the question as follows:-

Mr Pascoe's Penalty Charge Notice was dealt with by an experienced team who have been dealing with PCN appeals since the start of the civil parking enforcement system in May 2008. All the team have had relevant training and all appeals are dealt with in accordance with set guidance to local authorities by the Department for Transport. This guidance also makes it very clear that Councillors should not, under any circumstances, play a part in deciding the outcome of individual appeals. Councillor Sutton added that the appeal process is an impartial one.

Mr Pascoe's appeal was determined on the basis of the facts presented and the views of the highway authority were sought. On this occasion, the Traffic Penalty Tribunal took a different view to that held by City and County Council officers. That does not mean the City Council's team did not fully and fairly consider all the relevant facts or lack expertise; it simply demonstrates the system worked as it should.

Councillor Mrs Thompson sought further clarification on behalf of the questioner relating to the expertise of the team in terms of the qualifications held by the staff.

Councillor Sutton replied that she did not know the individual qualifications of the staff. She stated that she understood that all staff had the relevant expertise and training.

Mr Pascoe asked a supplementary question as he felt that, in relation to the expertise and also with regard to stages one and two of the appeal process, the points he had raised had not been sufficiently addressed. The appeal process is a lengthy process, possibly taking up to four months to see an appeal overturned, and so he sought clarification of the appeal process when at the third stage. He felt members of the public were having their time wasted by having tickets placed on their vehicles, particularly in his circumstance when he felt he had parked lawfully.

Councillor Sutton reiterated the three stage appeal process. She acknowledged that Mr Pascoe went through stages one, two and three and the process had worked as it should.

50 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER
20**

In accordance with Standing Order 20, a number of questions were submitted on the civil parking enforcement regime operating in Exeter, to which the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport replied. Copies of each of the questions were circulated to Members and made available at the meeting.

The questions and a summary of the replies (in italics) are set out below.

- (1) In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Mrs Thompson submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder:-

Recently at a Traffic Penalty Tribunal the Independent Adjudicator decided parking at the layby location in Pinn Lane was lawful, although following this decision it was apparently necessary to await instructions from Devon County Council before refunding the monies to the drivers wrongfully issued penalty tickets at this location.

Is it possible to question how Exeter City Council is able to safeguard its position both in the perception of the public and most importantly within the law when acting for the County Council, if the City Council considers it is at variance with the County Council and is it possible for a review of the Agency Agreement to be carried out if necessary?

Councillor Sutton (Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport) responded to the question as follows:-

She stated that she did not accept that the interests of the City Council were at variance with those of the County Council in relation to Pinn Lane. She was aware that Councillor Mrs Thompson did not agree with the enforcement of restrictions in this location, but others supported enforcement on the grounds of public safety. Councillor Sutton agreed with the latter view. She commented on Councillor Mrs Thompson's interest in this matter as this part of Pinn Lane did not fall immediately in her ward. It would be irresponsible if this Council was to start ignoring the views of the Highway Authority and put the interests of motorists who were parked in contravention of parking restrictions (and have a statutory appeal process open to them) above bigger questions of public safety and highway management. She questioned who would defend the City Council if there was an accident in this location caused by a pedestrian stepping into the road to avoid parked cars, and also if we did not address the situation despite very clear instructions from the County Council to take action.

She did not support acting independently from the views of the County Council in matters of on-street enforcement. In this matter the City Council is simply the agent of the County Council. The Agency Agreement can be reviewed, and there is provision for a review every 18 months in any case, but she did not support any review which blurred the respective responsibilities of the City and County Councils.

Councillor Mrs Thompson stated that her involvement in this matter was due to this issue being raised by a local resident who had contacted her as a Pinhoe councillor. Councillor Mrs Thompson asked a supplementary question:-

In previous correspondence our Head of Legal Services advised:- 'We are obliged to act in accordance with their wishes ('their' being reference to Devon County Council) I note the letter from the Traffic Penalty Tribunal was addressed to Exeter City Council and to our Exeter City Council officer saying 'You must comply with any adjudicator's directions to you'. Following this direction Exeter City Council continued to wait for approval from Devon County Council. A further email dated 19 October 2011, from Devon County Council following rejection of their appeal, stated Exeter City Council act as agents for the County Council – they therefore cannot do whatever they might consider is right'.

On what basis does Exeter City Council consider it feels 'obliged' to delay acting within the instructions which have been given, addressed and sent to our Exeter City Council Authority until approval is received from Devon County Council?

Councillor Sutton reemphasised that the City Council acts as the agent on behalf of Devon County Council and the matter should be addressed to the County Council. The Enforcement Officers have acted entirely properly and will refer matters of on-street enforcement to Devon County Council and act on their instructions.

(2) In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Prowse submitted the following questions to the Portfolio Holder:-

1. Penalty Tickets

On Friday 21 October 2011, I alerted this Council to a potential legal issue regarding the penalty tickets that we issue on behalf of DCC for alleged parking offences.

a) What positive action has this Council taken to confirm the legality of the ticket?

The City Council's legal team is currently looking into the matter. Their preliminary view is that the Penalty Charge Notices are enforceable. We have also sought the views of the County Council, in their capacity as highway authority. I understand they have taken advice from their lawyers and consider that the PCN's comply with the relevant regulations. As such, the County does not consider it appropriate to suspend on-street enforcement.

b) If it is the case then was a suspension notice issued?

c) If not why not?

No suspension notices have been issued because the City Council has to date not received any legal advice that would support such action.

- d) If no suspension notice was issued, then how many tickets were issued in this City for alleged offences from the time of my revelations (approximately 15.00hrs) using tickets that were legally flawed, and until 18.00hrs of the 9 November?

1,170 Penalty Charge Notices have been issued in the time specified by Councillor Prowse.

- e) What is this Council doing (if not already done) to re-order a re-print to include the statutory notice and secondly to omit those words and phrases which are not correct.

No Penalty Charge Notices are being reprinted at this stage.

2. Residents Parking in Newtown

Ten of the eleven car parks in this area are owned by the Council. Prior to 5 May 2008 they were covered by the City of Exeter (Residents Parking Places) Order 1995; this order was revoked but ceased to be legally enforceable on 5 May 2008. Residents using these car parks have however paid an annual permit of £20 assuming after administration costs, any residue has been passed to Devon County Council.

- a) Under what authority are we taking their money?
- b) Currently as it stands, anyone can park in these car parks and not be liable to a charge or penalty ticket. This situation is untenable. Who took this outrageous decision?

In respect of Residents' Parking in Newtown, the City Council is not taking anyone's money. Residents' parking in Newtown operates entirely under a Devon County Council scheme. Residents pay the County Council and are issued a County Council Zone C permit. The authority therefore resides with the County Council. Residents are also entitled to use the off-street parking areas referred to by Councillor Prowse, and that entitlement still exists. We don't currently enforce the use of off-street parking places by non-permit holders because those areas are not in our 2008 Off Street Order. The City Council's legal team is currently working on a new Order that will rectify this.

In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Prowse asked a supplementary question: -

He referred to the number of people who habitually park in Newtown and under what authority did the City Council collect the revenue on behalf of Devon County Council and how was that revenue used. He would be satisfied with a written reply.

This question should be directed to the County Council.

3. Sandy Park - Residents Parking Zone

For two years I have raised the issue regarding the thousands of pounds of penalty tickets and permits that were issued in this zone from the 5 May 2008. I stressed that all this money had been taken with not one ounce of legal authority from motorists who had committed no offences and were not even legally required to buy a permit. At long last notices went up around this zone issued by this Council announcing that the penalty money could be returned. Who took this decision?

- a) How many tickets and permits were issued during the period 5 May 2008 and 26 August 2010?

In respect of Sandy Park residents' zone – all decisions on this have been made by the County Council, so Councillor Prowse should direct his questions to them. 144 Penalty Charges Notices were issued in the period specified by Councillor Prowse.

Councillor Prowse said he had a copy of the agency agreement and was aware of its contents. He also referred to a Queen's Counsel report which clearly states which authority is responsible for issuing tickets. In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Prowse asked a supplementary question:–

He sought an explanation as to why seven of the eight District Authorities in the County, do not have the statutory paragraph on the back of their Penalty Charge Notices, apart from North Devon District Council. He asked for an explanation from the Portfolio Holder as to why those District Authorities had that omission.

The response can only relate to this Authority's actions. Exeter City Council's Penalty Charge Notices are considered lawful and compliant with the relevant regulations.

4. Residents' Parking Zones Duryard, Regents' Park and Pennsylvania

Between 5 May 2008 and 2 February, this Council issued permits and penalty tickets to the value of just under £21,000. In these zones in this period, 296 penalty tickets were issued.

As a result of my representations the County Council eventually admitted that there was no Traffic Order for these three zones. To date this Council has only refunded four (I repeat four) tickets. This woefully falls short of any evidence of a proactive attempt to return money that does not belong to this or the County Council.

- a) Was the District Auditor made aware of this unlawfully derived revenue?
b) Was the Section 151 Officer of this Council made aware of this situation?
c) Would the Portfolio Holder agree with me that more effort should be made to communicate with these motorists and alert them to their refunds?

In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Prowse asked a supplementary question and said that he would accept a written reply.

He was concerned that the District Authority introducing the agency agreement was also the Authority taking the revenue from those residents in the three zones. He felt the revenue had been unlawfully derived from the residents and Exeter City Council had no power to administer that revenue and send to Devon County Council. He asked under what authority was the revenue taken and directed to Devon County Council?

All decisions on this have been made by the County Council, so Councillor Prowse should direct his questions to them.

5. Residents' Parking Zone – Sandy Park (S1)

Is the Portfolio Holder fully briefed on the full legal implications of the public notice recently attached to a lamppost in the Sandy Park zone?

- a) Was the District Auditor made aware of this unlawfully derived revenue?
- b) Was the Section 151 Officer of this Council made aware of this situation?
- c) Would the Portfolio Holder agree with me that more effort should be made to communicate with these motorists and alert them to their refunds?

The questions relating to residents' parking are all matters for the County Council, not the City Council. This Council simply acts as the County's agent in matters of on-street enforcement and Councillor Prowse should direct his questions to the County Council.

In accordance with Standing Order 20, Councillor Prowse asked a supplementary question – he noted the reply in relation to Duryard, Regents Park and Pennsylvania, but did not feel this addressed the Sandy Park element. Exeter City Council is the agency that deals with the enforcement and he had been aware that there is no authority for enforcement?

These matters were for Devon County Council – the City Council acts as the County agent in this matter and the question should be directed to the County Council.

The Chair acknowledged that it would be beneficial to receive a report covering a number of issues concerning civil parking enforcement as soon as is practicable. Councillor Prowse asked that a report be considered at the next meeting and that appropriate officers including those from Devon County Council be present at the meeting. The Chair agreed to consult with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport to discuss the matter, including the attendance of appropriate officers. The Director Economy and Development welcomed an opportunity for a thorough explanation on a number of points of detail and assured Members that every effort would be made to ensure that a report was considered at the earliest opportunity, but the process should not be rushed. He thought it was unlikely that a report would be ready for the January cycle, given the complexity of some of the issues that have been raised and the deadline for producing reports. The Chair agreed to a request from Councillor Mrs Thompson that matters surrounding the agency agreement and also the questions submitted

to the Portfolio Holder for this meeting would be included and addressed in the report.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy supported that a report on all aspects of civil parking enforcement in Exeter be considered at the earliest practicable opportunity to scrutinise the matter and ensure all of the necessary information and relevant advice was available to Members.

MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ECONOMY

51 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY PRESENTATION

The Head of Operational Services and Transport introduced Christopher Green, Design Manager and Head Consultant from Halcrow, Exeter and Martin Weiler, Devon and Cornwall Area Manager from the Environment Agency who attended the meeting and presented details of the River Exe Flood Risk Management Scheme. They outlined the Environment Agency's current proposals.

Martin Weiler referred to Exeter's susceptibility to flooding and the urgent need for an upgrade of the scheme was now required. The way in which flood defences are funded is due to change from 1 April 2012 and, from that date, major schemes will require an element of local funding. This significant change in funding needs to be addressed with the cooperation of good partnership working with local stakeholders.

Chris Green showed a map of the city and the areas that would be most affected by a serious flooding incident, such as a one in a hundred years event. The extent of the flooding would be over the top of the city's current defences with the Exe Bridges area being the most vulnerable. Exeter is recognised as an important urban area and the flood plan is worthy of particular attention as flooding in this area would have a dramatic effect on the economy of the whole of the south west. He outlined a number of design options with the preferred design raising the flood defences at Bonhay Road and Okehampton Street which might include an innovative pop up defence. The Environment Agency is expected to team up with other public bodies to explore partnership schemes. Mr Green outlined what this would mean for Exeter. He suggested that a scheme for Exeter would cost in the region of £25 million, with a local contribution of £13 million being required.

The Chair clarified that this presentation provided an opportunity to receive information and debate the issues and there was no expectation from the City Council at this time. The Director Economy and Development confirmed that a report would be made to the January meeting of this Scrutiny Committee setting out the issues.

The Chair thanked Martin Weiler and Christopher Green for their presentation.

52 PORTFOLIO HOLDERS HALF YEAR REPORT

Councillor Denham presented the following priorities within the Economy and Tourism Portfolio for the forthcoming year, and covered the following topics of Economic Development, Estates and Exeter Archaeology.

A copy of the briefing note, together with a brief explanation on each priority and the progress made was attached as an appendix to these minutes.

Councillor Denham gave the following response to Members' questions on the Bus and Coach Station site, stating that every effort was being made to produce a re-

development scheme for the Bus and Coach Station site, but it was important to find the right scheme and ensure that the most appropriate and viable solution was found. The Director advised that a report on the future of the site will be made to a forthcoming Executive.

Councillor Sutton presented the following priorities within the Transport and Sustainable Development Portfolio for the forthcoming year, and covered the following topics: the Core Strategy, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Localism Bill, Affordable Housing, Climate Change, City Centre and Bus and Coach Station Site, City Centre Enhancements, Parking, Waterways and Flood Prevention.

A copy of the briefing note, together with a brief explanation on each priority and the progress made was attached as an appendix to these minutes.

A Member referred to the use of the city's 4,604 off-street car parking spaces including those in Newtown and was concerned that the Council did not benefit from any revenue from the Newtown car parks.

Councillor Sutton gave the following response to a Member's question stating that details of the ever-changing housing landscape were still emerging from the Localism Bill, and that the Council's Housing Service was working hard to address the 'affordable rent' changes.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the priorities presented for the Economy and Tourism and Sustainable Development and Transport Portfolios for the forthcoming year.

53 CAR PARKING TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Head of Operational Services and Transport presented a verbal report on the formulation of a Task and Finish Group to look at the city's car parks which had been discussed at the Scrutiny Committee – Economy meeting held on 8 September. Nominations were sought from each of the Groups represented on the Scrutiny Committee and Councillors Crow, Morris and Ruffle were duly nominated from their Groups. The Group also included the Scrutiny Chair, Councillor Cole and Councillor Sutton, as Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development and Transport. The Group met on 25 October and completed an initial scoping exercise and identified the remit and terms of reference. The general consensus was that whilst the tariff policy remained in the domain of the Executive, the Task Group would focus on looking at additional ways of developing the income stream derived from car parking. Following a request from Councillor Prowse, the Chair agreed to address the issues of potentially raising revenue from Newtown car parks as part of the Task and Finish Group's discussions.

The Group anticipated having a number of meetings when they would receive more detailed information on the individual car parks as well as consider 'guest speakers' to provide additional information before a final report is presented to the March meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

The Group were next due to meet on the 5 December.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

54 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING

The Director Economy and Development presented a report which advised the current position with regard to the 2011/12 capital programme for the Economy and Development Directorate. The report also contained a summary of the position at the end of September 2011, together with an appendix which contained a list of capital projects.

The Director highlighted a number of schemes including the refurbishment of the King William Car Park and he confirmed that the contract for works was currently out to tender. Work was due to commence on site in the middle of March and was scheduled to be completed by the end of summer 2012. The refurbishment of the Old Electricity Building was substantially completed, and a new lease would be granted shortly along with consideration of an alternative delivery of the scheme.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the report.

(Report circulated)

55 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ECONOMY FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP TO SEPTEMBER 2011

The Director Economy and Development presented a report which detailed the forecast variations of the budget, based on the first six months of the financial year 2011/12. The report highlighted any differences by management unit to the outturn forecast for the first six months of the financial year up to 30 September 2011 compared with the annual approved budget. During this period the total of the variances for overall net expenditure for this Committee would increase by £445,500 and included supplementary budgets of £125,170.

The Director highlighted a number of areas including the income derived from off street car park fees and season tickets which were 4.9% below the budgeted income figure and it was hoped that the busy Christmas period would bring some recovery. There also remained a number of uncertainties regarding the closure of the Archaeological Field Unit which were being closely monitored.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the report.

(Report circulated)

56 HALF YEAR RESULTS OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING 2011/12

The Director Economy and Development presented a report which set out the half year figures for those statutory and local performance indicators that relate to services provided by the Economy and Development Directorate. The national and local indicators were attached as an appendix to the report and included details of any variance from targets and remedial action taken.

The Director stated that the performance for the Exeter Visitor Information and Tickets Centre remained solid, but the increasing volume of traffic on the website may have an impact on future years. He responded to a Member's question on meeting the target for processing minor planning applications in the eight week period and whether there were enough staff, and confirmed that the target for this

period had been met, but the performance was slightly down overall at this half yearly stage. The position has been noted.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the report.

(Report circulated)

57 **RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Director Economy and Development presented a report which identified the risks relating to the areas within the remit of the Economy and Development Directorate and this Scrutiny Committee, and of the actions proposed and taken to mitigate the risks concerned. The following significant new risks were identified in the latest review - Environmental (Flooding); Financial (Planning Appeals) and Partnership/Contractual (Archaeological Field Unit).

A Member referred to the availability of free car parking in Newton Abbot in the run up to Christmas and whether this was something that the BID project could promote. The Director suggested that whilst free car parking could be considered, there was an expectation that Exeter offered a quality retail experience including events, performances and activities that helped increase footfall and the income derived from car parking maintained the public realm which attracted shoppers and visitors to Exeter. He referred to the presentation on the Rive Exe Management Scheme made earlier in the meeting, which reinforced an increased risk of flooding in the city. The technical and funding challenges from a change in the policy landscape and an expectation that future contributions for flood prevention would be made by local stakeholders would have to be fully debated.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy:-

- (1) noted the report and risks relating to its areas, and
- (2) supported ongoing monitoring of its own areas to ensure that the risk register remains current and risk assessments are valid, that proposed mitigating action are taken by the agreed target dates.

(Report circulated)

58 **PROPERTY VOIDS AND DEBTS**

The Director Economy and Development presented a report which informed Members of the position regarding void properties as at 30 September 2011 and commercial rent debts for the four quarters ending on the September 2011. The report identified key local indicators including both long and short term vacant property levels against a relatively robust performance of the portfolio against national and regional trends.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the report and the performance of the portfolio.

(Report circulated)

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - ECONOMY

59 ANNUAL FESTIVALS AND EVENTS REVIEW 2011

The Head of Economy and Tourism presented a report which reviewed the performance of the festivals and events portfolio, including the Autumn Festival 2010 and in 2011, Animated Exeter, Vibraphonic, Respect and Summer in the City. He summarised the main characteristics of each of the festivals as well as providing a detailed breakdown of the marketing and financial implications.

The Head of Economy and Tourism replied to a Member's comment about developing a more 'grass roots' approach, working with local schools and churches, stating that the proposed approach involving those organisations grant funded by the Council should provide the opportunity to encourage wider participation. He also responded to an enquiry about the timing of the Summer in the City Festival which would take place in September 2012. Members considered that choosing a date following the very busy summer period could make booking more diverse and the engagement of quality acts easier. A Member requested that the efforts of City Council staff who were coordinating the proposed 'Theatre in the City' project be acknowledged in the minutes.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy noted the report and the future development of the arts and events portfolio in 2012/13.

(Report circulated)

60 WINDING DOWN OF EXETER ARCHAEOLOGY

Councillor Wardle declared a personal interest as a Member of the Devon Archaeological Society and the Devonshire Association.

The Director Economy and Development submitted a report which set out the measures taken to close down Exeter Archaeology responsibly and manage their archive in the run up to, and following, the closure of the service in March 2012. The report detailed the progress made to fulfill the Unit's remaining commercial commitments, and the remaining staff were optimistic that the majority of these would have been processed by March.

A Member referred to the historic buildings records, surveys and maps which might be accessed into the County Records Office in Exeter, and queried whether they would have the space given their reorganisation, and suggested that the Devonshire Association be contacted as they may have some storage capacity. The Archaeology Officer advised that he understood that the Records Office were happy in principle to take the material, but that the Devonshire Association could also be contacted if needs be. In response to another query about digitising the archive and reports, he informed Members that although he had just heard that the bid made by the University of York for money to digitise the Unit's reports had not been successful, the University had offered to take as many of the reports as they could themselves, using their students on placement. He assured Members that no useful report would be destroyed until at the very least an on-line record was made.

In response to a further query as to whether there would be a list of which archives were deposited where, he confirmed that there was already such a list, and that it would be put on the web once the work of the Archives Officer was completed. He noted that whilst the Exeter material was due to be accessed into the RAMM's collection, there was a large amount that has gone and was due to go to other

Museums elsewhere in the region. If there were any remaining issues then discussions would be had with English Heritage, who were being kept updated.

Scrutiny Committee – Economy:-

- (1) noted the considerable progress made by the former and remaining Exeter Archaeology staff in reducing the outstanding commitments and maximising the retrieval of income from their commercial clients;
- (2) supported the contribution to the city's national profile and reputation that will be made by the publication of many of the important discoveries made during the 40 year life of the Archaeological Field Unit and Exeter Archaeology) as evidenced in the media coverage); and
- (3) supported the proposals as set out in section 7 of the circulated report as part of the conclusion of this work.

(Report circulated)

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 8.00 pm

Chair