

CABINET

13 July 2016

Present:-

Councillors J Hart (Chairman), S Barker, J Clatworthy, R Croad, A Davis, S Hughes, A Leadbetter, J McInnes and B Parsons

Members attending in accordance with Standing Orders 8 and 25

J Brazil, A Connett, B Greenslade, A Hannan, R Julian, J Owen, R Radford, R Vint, N Way and R Westlake

* 45

Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2016 be signed as a correct record.

* 46

Items Requiring Urgent Attention

There was no item raised as a matter of urgency.

* 47

Chairman's Announcements

There was no announcement by the Chairman at this meeting.

* 48

Petitions

There was no petition received from a Member of the Public or the Council.

* 49

Question(s) from Members of the Council

In accordance with the Cabinet Procedure Rules, the Leader and/or relevant Cabinet Member responded to 3 questions from a Member of the Council on EU Funding, Hinkley Point C and the HotSW LEP responding orally to supplementary questions arising from the above and inviting the Chief Executive to also respond, as appropriate.

[NB: A copy of the questions and answers are appended to these minutes and are also available on the Council's Website at <http://www.devon.gov.uk/dcc/committee/minigifs.html> and any supplementary questions and answers may be observed through the webcast of this meeting – see Notes below]

FRAMEWORK DECISION

50

Heart of the South West Devolution

(Councillors Brazil, Connett, Greenslade, Julian, Owen and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet considered the Report of the Chief Executive (CX/16/20) on continuing discussions between the Leaders of Somerset and Devon County Councils, Somerset and Devon District Councils, Torbay Council, Plymouth City Council, Dartmoor and Exmoor National Parks, the Local Enterprise Partnership and the three Clinical Commissioning Groups and with Government relating to the development of a Devolution Deal to secure greater powers and provide a stronger voice for the Heart of the South West area.

The Report now submitted sought approval to the Council 'signing-up', in principle, to the pursuit of a devolution deal and the creation of a Combined Authority to administer the new powers and funding secured through that deal, to better position Councils to explore and take advantage of the opportunities that might arise through discussions with Government and future developments.

The Cabinet was advised that the progress made and proposals now submitted would require approval by all partner authorities, which would all consider a similar report in this cycle of meetings, to achieve the timetable set out therein.

Members noted the intention that, through continuing negotiation - in which the County Council would continue to take a full and active part - the partnership would strive to secure new powers and control of funding to create new jobs, raise skill levels, improve infrastructure, accelerate the integration of health and care services and secure greater powers over housing. These measures would focus on raising productivity levels in the Heart of the South West and achieving greater prosperity for local people.

The specific impacts and implications of a draft deal would be assessed and considered as part of the negotiation process. The Heart of the South West Partnership would also and necessarily develop an Impact Needs Assessment at the start of the negotiation process which would be updated as specific powers were agreed. It would also reflect the impact of the recommended governance arrangements and a final assessment would be provided alongside the draft deal and the draft governance scheme to inform subsequent decision making.

The Chairman re-affirmed, as previously recognised by Cabinet (Minute 438/9 December 2015) that the concept of double devolution was clearly accepted and would be integral to the development of any Deal, moving forward.

The Chief Executive re-affirmed that any final deal with Government would be subject to the approval/ratification by Council and public consultation. Regular updates on progress and key documents were provided on the Council's web page <https://new.devon.gov.uk/devocracy/how-the-council-works/devolution/>

The matter having been debated and the options and/or alternatives and other relevant factors (e.g. financial, risk management, equality and legal considerations and Public Health impact) set out in the Head of Service's Report and/or referred to above having been considered:

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Hart, **SECONDED** by Councillor Clatworthy, and unanimously

RESOLVED that the County Council be recommended to:

- (a) endorse the Leaders approach to devolution and agree to sign up to the principle of creating a Combined Authority for the Heart of the South West, as set out in the Prospectus for Productivity, as the basis for negotiation with Government towards a Devolution Deal for the area;
- (b) note that giving this endorsement does not commit the Council to entering into a Devolution Deal or becoming a member of a Heart of the South West Combined Authority; that would be subject to future debate and agreement by the Council and subject to negotiations with Government.

{NB: *The Impact Assessment referred to above will, in due course, be available at: <http://new.devon.gov.uk/impact/>.*

KEY DECISION

* 51 **Post-16 Education Transport Policy for 2017-18 (Minute *7/13 April 2016)**

(Councillors Brazil, Connett, Hannan, Julian, Owen and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

(Councillor Davis declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this matter by virtue of being a parent of a child in receipt of County Council post 16 transport and withdrew from the meeting during its consideration).

The Cabinet considered the Report of the Head of Education & Learning (EL/16/5) on the outcome of consultations on the education travel policy for post 16 students for the 2017/18 academic year, seeking approval to the adoption of a revised policy.

The Council had a statutory duty to provide transport support only where the absence of such support (through, for example, the College Bursary Scheme where schools now received funding direct from Government for such schemes) would prevent a student remaining in education: that statutory duty was enshrined and re-affirmed in the proposed policy now commended to the Cabinet.

A number of responses had been received to the consultation – which were set out in detail in the Appendix to the Head of Service's Report – principally around concerns that students would not be able to get to College without transport provided by the County Council and/or that the level of funding available through the College Bursary scheme would not be sufficient to meet the needs of all students. Members were reminded that, as now, students and parents had the primary responsibility for getting to and from College and they would have to demonstrate that all possible options had been explored before seeking financial assistance either from the Bursary Scheme or from the County Council. The Council was seen as the final 'safety-net' for claimants but where, for instance, students would be able to walk to and from College or public transport was available there would normally be no need for the Council to assist in any way.

Members noted that Government had recently announced it would shortly be undertaking a consultation on post 16 education travel which it was hoped might address the funding issues referred to at the meeting and reflected in the recommendation before the Cabinet.

The Head of Service's Report also incorporated an Impact Assessment relating to the possible impacts of the proposal, which had been circulated previously for the attention of Members at this meeting, in order that as part of its determination of the next steps in the process the Cabinet might have full regard to the responsibilities placed upon it to exercise its Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010, where relevant. The findings of that Assessment was that there would be a very limited impact upon the actions of parents or choice of school or travel arrangements and that, in socio-economic terms, the proposal was regarded a positive one and no unmanageable impacts had been identified.

The matter having been debated and the options and/or alternatives and other relevant factors (e.g. financial, sustainability, carbon impact, risk management, equality and legal considerations and Public Health impact) set out in the Head of Service's Report and/or referred to above having been considered:

It was **MOVED** by Councillor McInnes, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED

(a) that the outcome of consultations undertaken by the County Council be noted and the proposed policy for 2017/18 be endorsed subject to:

(i) increasing the contribution level for all those subject to pay a contribution from £560 to £580 per annum; and

(ii) removing an automatic entitlement to transport support for post-16 students, with support being available from the Local Authority only where students could evidence that they could not access education or training provision without support being given by the County Council.

(b) that the LGA and Devon MPs be made aware of the financial impact upon Councils, parents and students of the Government not having increased funding for post 16 education travel consistent with the increase in the school leaving age and be asked to make representations to Government accordingly.

[NB: The full policy for 2017/18 may be viewed at www.devon.gov.uk/admissionarrangements]

OTHER MATTERS

* 52 Annual Public Health Report 2015/16

(Councillors Connett, Julian, Owen and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet received and welcomed the ninth Annual Public Health Report prepared and commended to the Cabinet by the Director of Public Health reviewing the state of the health of the population of Devon and setting future health and wellbeing priorities for the local population.

The 2015/16 Report looked at the importance of the health of the public in society in relation to fairness, equality and justice - now and in the future - to ensure continuing progress in improving people's health and wellbeing. Members acknowledged that while the health of the public in Devon was broadly favourable (as compared with national indicators or similar geographical areas) there were challenges and areas of concern that had been encapsulated in the priorities and recommendations set out in the Report's Executive Summary, reflective of the County Councils' strategic objectives.

Members noted that the Annual Report also recorded achievements against recommendations contained in the previous year's report, the majority of which had been fully achieved.

In recognising the challenges faced by the Council in delivering services and or prioritising services for those most in need and in tackling inequalities – Members felt the suggestion of an alternative role for community Hospitals as *Centres for Public Health* might be worthy of further consideration; as a means also of addressing issues arising from compulsory health checks shortly to be reinstated in Devon. The Chairman of the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee indicated that his Committee would be looking in more detail at the Annual Report and the aforementioned suggestions.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Davis **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED that the Report be welcomed and published.

[NB: The Annual Public Health Report may be viewed at: <http://www.devonhealthandwellbeing.org.uk/aphr/2015-16/>]

53 Pollinators Plan (Minute 13/13 April 2016)

(Councillors Brazil, Connett, Owen and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet considered the Joint Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Environment and the Head of Business Strategy & Support (PTE/16/36) incorporating a proposed *Pollinators Action Plan* which was commended to the Cabinet and County Council. This was in response to the Notice of Motion (set out below) submitted by Councillor Hook having regard, in particular, to the views of the Farms Estate Committee (Farms Estate Committee Minute 15/28 June 2016 and Report BSS/16/11 refer).

The wording of the original Notice of Motion were:

“Bees play an essential role in food production. The Bee population has been in alarming decline in recent years, due to various external influences. One such harmful influence is the use of neonicotinoids, an aggressive pesticide. Devon is heavily reliant on agriculture and this council will therefore prohibit the use of this pesticide on all land that it owns or manages in a proactive effort to reverse the destruction of the Bee community here in Devon. The Council will also explore other ways which, in addition to banning this particular pesticide, will help the survival of the Bee population. A report on other potential actions will be brought to Place Scrutiny”.

The Heads of Service Report summarised representations received on this matter and the earlier considerations and views of the Cabinet on 13 January and 13 April 2016, of the Place Scrutiny on 7 March 2016 (when that Committee heard from the Devon Wildlife Trust) and of the County Farms Estates Committee on 28 April and again 28 June 2016 (when that Committee also heard from a NFU Representative), culminating in the preparation and submission of the Plan now before the Cabinet.

The Cabinet had previously asked the Farms Estate Committee for its views on potentially prohibiting *“the use of neonicotinoids on land under the control or ownership of the County Council including existing and new tenants of the County Farms Estate”* - as part of a wider Pollinators Action Plan - and acknowledged the considered views of that Committee now reported, following a survey of existing tenants.

The production of a *Pollinators Action Plan* had, in principle, previously been agreed and had been supported by the Place Scrutiny Committee recognising, at that time, that the final content of the Plan would be considered by the Cabinet in light of the Farms Estates Committee's views.

The Action Plan now proposed recognised that prohibiting the use of neonicotinoids on land under the control or ownership of the County Council generally would be unnecessary and irrelevant given there was no routine use of such insecticides. Furthermore, and in relation specifically to the Farms Estate, and again given the limited current usage of such products and the legal constraints outlined in Section 8 of the Report, the Plan instead outlined a series of positive actions to further reduce the use of neonicotinoids by tenants together with a range of similarly positive measures in support of pollinators generally.

The Mover of the Notice of Motion had previously spoken at the Cabinet in support of his original proposal and the prohibition of neonicotinoids, and having regard to the views of the Place Scrutiny and Farms Estates Committees, the matter was subsequently debated having regard to the aforementioned, the relevant Head of Services Report and any suggestions or alternatives or any other relevant factors (e.g. public health, financial, environmental, risk management and equality and legal considerations and Public Health impact) and:

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Croad, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED

(a) that the advice of the Farms Estate Committee (Minute 15/28 June 2016) be noted;

(b) that in accordance with Standing Orders 6 and 8, and in response to the original Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Hook, the County Council be recommended to approve the Devon County Council Pollinators' Action Plan appended to Report PTE/16/36.

MATTERS REFERRED

* **54 Treasury Management Stewardship Annual Report 2015/16**

(Councillors Connett, Julian and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet considered the Report of the County Treasurer (CT/16/60) outlining the Treasury Management action taken during the last financial year (in line with the CIPFA Code of Practice previously adopted by the Council) which had also been considered and endorsed by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Committee on 27 June 2016.

The Annual Report reviewed performance over the 2015/16 financial year with a view to identifying any issues arising from the Council's Treasury and Debt Management during that period and to provide assurance that agreed policy had been implemented. The Report revealed that:

- no long term borrowing had been undertaken during 2015/16 and only a small number of short term loans had been taken out in one 2 month period to preclude any temporary shortfall in cash;
- investment income targets had been exceeded and prudent management of the Council's short term cash reserves (including the short term loans referred to above) had also delivered a surplus;
- all lending had been carried out in accordance with the Council's Treasury Management Strategy;
- there had been no opportunity to repay any outstanding debt without incurring premium penalties; and
- the change of policy approved previously relating to repayment of borrowing (the Minimum Revenue Provision) had resulted in a reduction of £11.9m in the budget for 2015/16.

The matter having been debated and the options and/or alternatives and other relevant factors (e.g. financial and legal considerations) set out in the County Treasurer's Report and/or referred to above having been considered:

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Clatworthy, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED that the Annual Treasury Management Stewardship Report be noted and welcomed.

* **55 South Hams: Marldon 20 mph Zone (Minute 16/13 April 2016)**

(Councillor Brazil attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet Member for Highway Management & Flood Prevention reported on his meeting with the local County Councillor and representatives of the Parish Council during his visit to this area on 14 June 2016, following the earlier request from the South Hams HATOC for a 20mph Zone as a departure from existing policy.

In acknowledging the concerns expressed locally about traffic speeds, the Cabinet Member re-affirmed that there were no grounds in terms of collision data or speed data for the County Council to change current arrangements or support a departure from existing policy.

However, he suggested that there might be opportunities for the community, if it wished, to take community speed management action and had correspondingly asked the Head of Service to pass on any relevant information to the Parish Council on options for community speed management – which could include community funding of warning signs or interactive speed signs. He further suggested that Officers should advise on the appropriate signage and locations in the interest of complying with signing legislation and road safety.

Members further noted (see also Minute 57 below) that the Council's policy on 20 mph speed limits would be revisited once the Government's Review of 20mph speed limits had been published.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Hughes, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED

(a) that the request for a departure from the County Council's Policy on Local Speed Limits to introduce a blanket 20mph speed limit zone in Marldon Parish be not approved; based on speed data, collision data and the outcome of the site visit undertaken on 14 June 2016;

(b) that, as indicated above, and following the receipt of Government' advice on 20mph speed limits, a review of the County Council's policy on local speed limits be undertaken;

(c) that the Head of Service and Highway Officers be asked to work with Marldon Parish Council to conduct a survey of all posted 30mph signage in the Marldon area and to arrange with local landowners the removal of vegetation that was obscuring signs; and

(d) that the Head of Service also investigate the potential for putting signs near the entrance of the children's play area on Tor Field, Marldon to warn of the possible presence of children/pedestrians in the road.

* **56** **Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee : Torrington Community Hospital Task Group**

(Councillors Greenslade and Westlake attended in accordance with Standing Order 25(2) and spoke to this item).

The Cabinet noted that the Health & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee had, at its meeting on 20 June 2016 (Minute 5), considered the Report of its Task Group (available at: <http://democracy.devon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=130>) reviewing the evidence and processes by which decisions were made about Torrington Community Hospital and had agreed, in line with its statutory delegated powers, to make a referral to the Secretary of State for Health; the Task Group's Final Report (CS/16/5) would be available on the Council's website (<http://democracy.devon.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sched=doc&cat=13627>) following incorporation of drafting revisions.

* **57** **Place Scrutiny Committee: Department of Transport Review of 20mph Speed Limits**

The Cabinet noted that the Place Scrutiny Committee had, at its meeting on 14 June 2016 (Minute *3), acknowledged the postponement of the review of the Council's current *Devon Traffic Policy and Devon Traffic Advice Note on Local Speed Limits* because the Department for Transport's (DfT) review of 20mph limits had now been delayed until 2017 and had resolved '*that ... the Cabinet be recommended to make representations to the Department for Transport expressing the Council's disappointment at the continuing delay in publication of the DfT's new guidance on 20mph limits;*' and '*that Devon MPs be also urged to exert pressure on the DfT for early publication*'.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor McInnes, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hart, and

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Committee's suggestions be endorsed.

* **58 Question(s) from Members of the Public**

In accordance with the Council's Public Participation Rules, the relevant Cabinet Member responded to a question from a Member of the public on speed limits; responding orally to a supplementary question arising from the above.

[NB: A copy of the questions and answers are appended to these minutes and are also available on the Council's Website at <http://www.devon.gov.uk/dcc/committee/minutes.html> and any supplementary questions and answers may be observed through the webcast of this meeting – see Notes below]

* **59 Minutes**

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Hart, **SECONDED** by Councillor Clatworthy, and

RESOLVED that that subject to Minute 53 above, the Minutes of the following and any recommendations therein be approved:

- (a) SACRE - 7 June 2016,
- (b) Devon Education (Schools) Forum – 22 June 2016,
- (c) Farms Estate Committee – 28 June 2016.

* **60 Delegated Action/Urgent Matters**

The Registers of Decisions taken by Members and under the urgency provisions or delegated powers were available for inspection at the meeting in line with the Council's Constitution and Regulation 13 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012; a summary of decisions taken since the last meeting had been published with the Agenda for this meeting. Decisions taken by Officers under any express authorisation of the Cabinet or other Committee or under any general authorisation within the Council's Scheme of Delegation set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution may be viewed at <https://new.devon.gov.uk/democracy/officer-decisions/>.

* **61 Forward Plan**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Cabinet reviewed the Forward Plan and determined those items of business to be defined as key and framework decisions and included in the Plan from the date of this meeting onwards reflecting the requirements of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (at <http://democracy.devon.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RPId=133&RD=0>).

NOTES:

1. These Minutes should be read in association with any Reports or documents referred to therein, for a complete record.
2. Notice of the decisions taken by the Cabinet will be sent by email to all Members of the Council within 2 working days of their being made and will, in the case of key decisions, come into force 5 working days after that date unless 'called-in' or referred back in line with the provisions of the Council's Constitution.
3. The Minutes of the Cabinet are published on the County Council's website.
4. A recording of the webcast of this meeting will also be available to view for up to 12 months from the date of the meeting, at <http://www.devoncc.public-tv/core/portal/home>

***DENOTES DELEGATED MATTER WITH POWER TO ACT**

The Meeting started at 10.30 am and finished at 12.50 pm



QUESTION(S) FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 13 July 2016

1. QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR VINT
Re: EU Funding

How much funding does Devon and its small and medium-sized enterprises receive from the EU via the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), European Social Fund (ESF), European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and other funding sources - and how (and by whom) is the likely impact on Devon of any changes to funding following the EU referendum being evaluated? How could this affect the HOTSW Devolution Bid?

REPLY BY COUNCILLOR HART

As Councillor Vint acknowledges, the majority of EU funding received in Devon comes through a variety of EU funds and the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) also has an ESIF Strategy for determining how the existing €137m allocation for Devon, Plymouth, Torbay and Somerset will be invested for the current budget period 2014-2020. However, while that programme has started and applications have been issued or submitted there are no definitive funding agreements yet. There are also some centrally-administered EU programmes which can benefit businesses and economic activity in Devon but information about any activities funded through those is not readily available. For these reasons, it is not easy to determine the precise levels of funding which have gone to businesses in Devon in the time available, but I will ask Officers to prepare a summary of whatever information they have, which may give him an indication of how businesses in Devon have benefitted.

As to the second part of the question it is far too early to say with any certainty what the impact of the referendum will be on the Council going forward and I am not prepared to speculate on what may or may not happen over the coming months and years.

The strength of the Heart of the South West Devolution Partnership is the commitment of all to work together to bring powers and decision making closer to local people. The ability to show consensus through this process, at a time when many other areas have fractured, was the main reason why colleagues and I were recently invited to a meeting with the Secretary of State to discuss terms on taking our bid forward. The partners believe that showing unity and providing local leadership during this period of uncertainty is as important as ever to protect the interests of local people. In essence we are stronger together to campaign as a single voice for our area and our people over the coming years.

2. QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR VINT
Re: Hinkley Point C

What is the Council's (or HOTSW's) latest assessment of the likelihood of the Hinkley Point C project proceeding as originally envisaged in the HOTSW Devolution Prospectus? Is there a "Plan B" if the proposed "Enterprise Zone" at "Huntspill Energy Park near Bridgwater to support the growth of a new nuclear cluster catalysed by investment in Hinkley" cannot proceed, and are discussions now underway or planned with RegenSW about other ways of retaining and creating local employment in the energy sector in Devon?

Minute Item 49

REPLY BY COUNCILLOR HART

My response to the previous question equally applies. I am not prepared to speculate on what decisions the Government may or may not take over the coming months and years and how that may impact on this or other major projects planned for the south west.

The Heart of the South West Devolution Partnership is a long term programme that will look at the opportunities for the area over a 30 year trajectory. As part of this work the Partnership will be developing a Productivity Plan that will explore all options and opportunities to improve the productivity of this part of the South West as one of the key economic challenges of our area and the country as a whole.

3. QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR VINT

Re: The Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership

According to the latest “Cities and Local Growth” Report of the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts (pp14-16) “the Federation of Small Businesses raised concerns with us that LEPs can be dominated by vested interests, and that there is insufficient involvement of the small business sector” (<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmpubacc/296/296.pdf>).

To provide assurance that this has not occurred in Devon and Somerset has the HOTSW LEP published a conflict of interest policy and does it publish a register of interests of its Board of Directors and of members of its sub-groups, as recommended by this Report?

REPLY BY COUNCILLOR LEADBETTER

Cabinet Members can only reply to questions about matters for which they have responsibility and, however one may wish, the County Council is not responsible for the management and administration of the Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership. However, and having been in touch with the LEP, I can confirm that as an independent community interest company it has adopted an open-style Board recruitment policy, consistent with Nolan Principles and has a Conflicts of Interest policy and makes public the declared interests of its Board Directors which is available on its website at:<http://www.heartofswlep.co.uk/board-members%E2%80%99-conflicts-interest>.



QUESTION(S) FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC Wednesday, 13 July 2016

1. QUESTION FROM MR P ALLAN Re: 20 mph Speed Limits

I have been told that DCC's speed limit policy is based solely on collision data, in line with Government guidance. The Department for Transport's current guidance specifies other factors to be considered: road function; mix of road users; road geometry; engineering and environment; actual traffic speeds. I therefore ask Cabinet to explain why current DCC speed limit policy is not in line with existing DfT guidance?

REPLY BY COUNCILLOR HUGHES

I believe Mr Allan attended the recent Place Scrutiny Committee when this matter was discussed and the policy was explained. That discussion led to the reference to Cabinet considered earlier in this meeting.

However, for the sake of clarity, County Council Policy on Local Speed Limits is not based solely on collision data. The policy takes account of all of the factors in DfT's Guidance, for example the policy includes for the following criteria:

- Significant vulnerable road user activity,*
- Measured traffic speed,*
- Density of dwellings fronting a road,*
- The strategic function of a road,*
- The distance between communities.*

The County Council's policy is therefore in line with DfT guidance and as was explained at the Scrutiny Committee, when DfT publishes its study findings on 20mph speed limits or when it issues revised Guidance on setting local speed limits, Officers will review existing County Council policy and if necessary, prepare recommendations for Cabinet to consider on policy revisions.

