

MINUTE

‘A&B’

Infrastructure Committee
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Lerwick
Tuesday 24 November 2009 at 10.00am

Present:

| | |
|---------------|---------------|
| I J Hawkins | L Angus |
| L F Baisley | J Budge |
| A J Cluness | A T J Cooper |
| A T Doull | E L Fullerton |
| F B Grains | I J Hawkins |
| R S Henderson | J H Henry |
| A J Hughson | W H Manson |
| C H J Miller | R C Nickerson |
| F A Robertson | G Robinson |
| J G Simpson | C L Smith |
| J W G Wills | A S Wishart |

In Attendance (Officers):

D Clark, Chief Executive
S Cooper, Head of Environment and Building Services
I Halcrow, Head of Roads
M Craigie, Head of Transport
D Macnae, Network and Design Manager, Roads
C Albutt, Management Accountant
Martin Holmes, Coastal Zone Manager
J Rosie, Marine Development Officer
R Leask, Marine Development Officer
R MacLeod, Committee Assistant
L Gair, Committee Officer

Chairperson:

Mrs I J Hawkins, Chairperson of the Committee, presided.

Circular:

The circular calling the meeting was held as read.

Declarations of Interests

Mrs I J Hawkins declared an interest in item 2 and said that she would leave the Chamber.

Minutes of Meeting

The minutes of the Infrastructure Meeting held on 6 October 2009, having been circulated, was confirmed.

Attendance at External Meetings

Mrs I J Hawkins NFLA Scotland, Glasgow, 22 October 2009.

92/09 **Whalsay Transport Link – Choice of Site for Whalsay Ferry Terminal**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Transport, attached as Appendix 1.

The Head of Transport introduced the report and advised that after a further period of

consultation, a detailed report would be presented to the Committee on 2 February 2009, for consideration.

Mr J G Simpson said that he wanted a decision to be made on the ferry terminal, however he agreed with the Head of Transport's proposal and moved the recommendations contained in the report, seconded by Mrs L F Baisley.

Mrs C H J Miller asked that the following points be considered during the consultation period: 1. Appendix 3 – the second ferry shown seems small and with the likelihood that there will be a second larger ferry she asked if there was enough space for it; 2. She requested more information on the Filla and the size of its replacement. 3. Appendix 1 – Is there sufficient room for a super ferry and whatever may be required in the future. 4. Paragraph 2.5 – if there is to be a fixed link in the future, can the structure be used for anything else as it is too shallow for the fishing fleet.

Mr L Angus said that he had heard that the cost of the ferry replacement, including the work required in Whalsay, Laxo and Vidlin was likely to cost in the region of £60m. He said that the whole life cost of the project would be better spent on a fixed link. Mr Angus added that Whalsay was the most populated and most exposed of the islands and required 3 terminals. He said that a serious look into a fixed link had to be an option.

The Head of Transport advised that the Council had already addressed the option of fixed links and priorities had already been established having considered cost, technical challenges and risk. He said that Whalsay was considered over a 60 year term and the ferry service was still the highest performing option. At the suggestion of Mr A S Wishart, the Head of Transport agreed to provide a report to the next meeting of the Committee, on the information gathered during the STAG studies carried out in relation to fixed links.

Some Members spoke in support of the recommendations in the report, and in response to a query from Mr A G L Duncan, the Head of Transport advised that costing the options presented was central to the appraisal process, and this would be detailed in the report to the next meeting of the Committee.

Dr J W G Wills advised that £350,000 had been spent on studying this project so far. He said that the Council's obligation was to provide a ferry terminal not a fishing harbour. Dr Wills said that there had been an enormous amount of communication and a high level of debate in Whalsay with an open and democratic process, for which the community participation had to be commended. He expressed his opinion however, that the proposal from the fishing fleet made the harbour too exposed to northerly winds and he said that he was not confident that the ferry could make the sharp right angle turn in a safe manner. Dr Wills said that the project had been well researched and moved that the Committee follow the recommendations from the STAG process and approve the North Voe as the preferred site of the terminal. No seconder was received.

Mr F A Robertson advised that the fixed link option had been considered some years ago through the STAG process which indicated a cost of £80m-£100m at that time. He said that the fishing industry were looking at value for money out of the development and noted their concern that Symbister may not attract funding in the future. Mr Robertson said that there was an opportunity here, and although the Council's duty was to provide a ferry service, there needed to be clear costs prepared for the terminal and an indication of what the cost of the additional fishery

development would be.

Mrs E L Fullerton spoke in support of the recommendations but said that she agreed with Mr L Angus comments. She said that a visionary plan should be prepared in order to develop fixed link options for the future. Mrs Fullerton was of the view that communities would be prepared to accept some inconvenience if they knew there was a clear plan in place. Mrs Fullerton commented that the proposal had been presented late due to the fishing community being at sea. She said that consideration should be given in future to how a community operates, when preparing to consult with them.

Mr J G Simpson clarified for Members that an earlier version of Appendix 3 had been suggested at the beginning of the process, but Symbister had been turned down due to cost. He said that the Appendix had now been modified and the fishermen were simply trying to get the best for both the terminal and the white fish and pelagic fishing fleet. Mr Simpson commented that the Head of Transport had been very accommodating and made it clear that anyone was still welcome to put forward their views. He added that he understood the comments made by Mr Angus and Mrs Fullerton, but explained that the ferries and terminal were on the brink of collapsing and a tunnel was too far into the future. Mr Simpson said that a decision was needed and it had to be progressed.

Mr R C Nickerson expressed his concern that the fishing industry proposal was an Economic Development matter and they should be supported from that service. In response to a further query the Head of Transport advised that the detailed design for Laxo was complete and £1m had been identified from the Capital Programme for the terminal to begin.

Mrs C H J Miller said that she was a supporter of fixed links, but in order to have a programme for this, there needed to be a long-term, possibly 30-year, capital programme and the Chief Executive should take this on board.

Mr A T J Cooper commented that a fixed link to Whalsay was now likely to be 30 years away. He said that Whalsay was an island of commuters who needed a guarantee for getting out to go to work, but the Council could not give them that guarantee.

Mr W H Manson said that he too was a supporter of fixed links but work had to be done on when and how these projects can be integrated into the capital programme. He said that he heard what Mr Simpson said about the condition of the terminals, and said that if these collapse it would leave an inferior or even cut off service.

(Mrs I J Hawkins declared and interest in item 2 and left the Chamber. Mr A S Wishart, Vice-Chairperson, took the Chair)

93/09 **Marine Planning Service**

The Committee considered a report by the Executive Director, Infrastructure, attached as Appendix 2.

The Head of Environment and Building Services introduced the report.

Mr L Angus said that it was important to recall the background to the issuing of Works Licences and the legal requirements that led to a review of the function within the planning service. He said that in essence the review revealed that the Council had failed to meet its statutory obligations in all elements of coastal zone management and

this led to the establishment of Marine Planning Service within the NAFC Marine Centre. Mr Angus made comment on the level of monitoring undertaken, and said that there had been some improvement following the development of a code of practice, however monitoring of fish health, bio mass and disease control was left to SEPA, who in his opinion provided a service below expected standards. Mr Angus said that monitoring remains a statutory obligation and this should continue within the NAFC Marine Centre. Mr Angus said that the Coastal Zone Management and monitoring that exists in the NAFC Marine Centre should not be dismantled and if the Council's Planning Service needs marine skills, then it should source that separately. Mr L Angus moved the recommendations contained in the report with a condition that recommends that the Council continue with Coastal Zone Management at NAFC Marine Centre that can advise the Council on all aspects of the Marine Spatial Plan.

In response to a query, Mr L Angus reiterated that if the planning service needs to recruit these skills they can but he did not want to lose the other scientific work going on at NAFC Marine Centre. He said that monitoring had to be done independently from the Council but that it had to be done properly.

In seconding, Mr W H Manson said that the recommendations were simple with the transfer of 3 personnel. He said it was the right move to make and the staff should be where the planning applications were received. He said that monitoring should be done independently but had never adequately been resourced. Mr Manson said that planning in the marine environment was more and more important with the economic future in marine renewable resources.

Mrs E L Fullerton expressed her concern that the NAFC Marine Centre would lose this expertise, and said that the Council had to be careful about what it was taking away. Mr J H Henry said that the NAFC Marine Centre was a point of contact for all marine matters and that was where everyone went for advice. He said he did not want a little bit taken away and said the expertise should remain at the Marine Centre.

Mr R C Nickerson said he was confused by Mr Angus' motion and sought clarification on it. Mr Angus said that he could not dictate where individuals would or would not work, and if they wanted to transfer to the Planning Service, that could not be stopped. He said however that the posts and resources should remain at the NAFC Marine Centre and the Planning Service could recruit and pay for the skills they needed. He said that the staff could move but the money should not follow them.

Mr F A Robertson advised that the review of the Works Licence function was necessary at the time. He said that the college provided an excellent service and monitoring was carried out. Mr Robertson said that there was a complete overhaul of the Planning Act, which tagged on control of aquaculture. He said that terrestrial planning goes 12 miles out to sea and the Council's planners now have total responsibility for aquaculture. Mr Robertson explained that the ZCC Act still exists and works licences are issued for installations fixed to the seabed. He added that there are various groups and meetings taking place on the subject of the Marine Bill, and expertise is required within the Planning Service, to represent the Council at these meetings. He said that currently the expertise lies with NAFC and is known as the best in Scotland and is a shining example of marine management in Scotland. He said that as the Council does not employ the staff, they cannot represent the Council. Mr Robertson said that in order for the Council to be able to award licences through the Planning Board, it has to deal with a situation where there may be conflicts between developments considered by the NAFC and advice given to particular applicants. He said that was one of the main reasons for considering a transfer of

staff. He said that members of staff dealing with aquaculture within the remit of the service should not be at arms length. Mr Robertson moved as an amendment that the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report as they stand. In seconding, Mrs L F Baisley said that the report made it clear that there was no financial implication as the Council already pay for the Marine Planning Service.

Mr W H Manson advised that he had not fully grasped all of Mr Angus' motion and withdrew his support as seconder.

Mr Robertson's amendment therefore became the motion.

Mr J H Henry seconded Mr Angus' original motion, which now became the amendment.

Mr A T J Cooper said that the Council had to be sure what they were leaving and taking away from the NAFC Marine Centre and said that he agreed that the enforcement and links to Marine Spatial Planning should stay with the college. He said that this had not been properly thought through and should be deferred for one cycle. Mr Cooper gave notice of a further amendment.

Mr A J Cluness said that he agreed with Mr Cooper's comments and said that he would have liked to have heard the views of the Directors of the NAFC Marine Centre. He said that if employees are moved from one service, it will lighten that existing structure but if we are to continue, additional employees are needed for the Council. He said that he had been in favour of the service being independently administered by NAFC. He said that this had been debated for years and therefore he would be inclined to agree that it should be deferred for another cycle.

Mr J G Simpson agreed with Mr Robertson's comments and said that the Planning Act had taken the decision out of the Council's hands and the service should be allowed to transfer so that they can continue to do a good job.

Mr W H Manson said that marine planning permission now lay with the Council's Planning Service and the expertise should be moved, but a report should be prepared in early course on contracting in the monitoring service and how that would be resourced.

Mr R C Nickerson said that the legal duty for issuing works licences remained with the Council as did the duty for enforcement and monitoring. He said that it was a decision for the Council whether to contract in the monitoring service and suggested that a report should be prepared on enforcement to consider whether it is robust or whether it should be reviewed.

Mr L Angus, with the support of his seconder, said that he would withdraw his amendment. He said that he understood that the Planning Act had supremacy here but it did not absolve the Council from its duty for controlling, monitoring and enforcing the ZCC Act, and that was where his concern lay. He said that was why a service level agreement had been implemented and if that was taken away from the NAFC, Members had to be clear about their duty.

Mr A T J Cooper moved as an amendment that the monitoring side needed to be clarified and a decision should be deferred for one cycle so that it could be properly sorted out before the end of the financial year. Mr A J Cluness seconded.

After summing up, voting took place with a show of hands and the results were as follows:

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Amendment (A T J Cooper) | 10 |
| Motion (F A Robertson) | 9 |

(Mrs I J Hawkins returned to the Chamber and resumed the Chair)

94/09 **Schemes to Construct New Footways**
Proposed System of Prioritisation

The Committee considered a report by the Network and Design Manager, Roads, attached as Appendix 3.

(Mr L Angus left the Chamber)

The Network and Design Manager introduced the report.

Members raised numerous points and concerns, summarised as follows:

- Paragraph 3.1 – it was questioned whether the 10 projects listed were on an official list, as several appeared to be missing.
- Paragraph 4.1 – Verge width and condition – most people would be happy with a gravel footpath to walk on.
- Paragraph 4.1 – Verge width and condition – some rural areas do not have a verge to provide refuge, and in summer where verges exist, the grass is not cut for environmental reasons.
- Paragraph 5.1 - the criteria for pedestrian and traffic numbers could mean that Lerwick projects score higher and that rural ones may be put on the back burner.
- Paragraph 5.1 - the number of near misses can not be determined therefore “the number of relevant accidents” should be moved to a lower priority, under “verge width and condition”, and “whether there is a need for street lighting” should be added.
- Burra and Trondra Community Council had written with specific areas of concern and footpaths had been discussed, but these concerns had not been taken on board.
- Cycling Paths should also be considered
- Impact of lights on the environment should also be considered
- Health Benefits should be added to the criteria
- If it is not a statutory requirement paths should not be lit, thus saving on carbon emissions, and not polluting the night sky.
- that the variety of pavement and footpath specifications had not been addressed in the report
- Brae Community Council had written several times over a 7 year period requesting a footpath and it was not yet on a prioritisation list.
- The opportunity should not be missed to construct footpaths, while larger projects, including private developments, are being undertaken in the area.
- That in the Gulberwick area the Community Council should be the first point of contact for consultation purposes, and projects should not appear on a list before they have been discussed at the Community Council.
- That hard verges should be considered as part of the process.
- That an urgent safety issue exists at the Millbrae in Scalloway where the existing pavement is too narrow for parents walking to school with prams

and small children.

- That lights should not be removed where they already exist.
- Community Councils should be consulted on the need for lights.

The Network and Design Manager advised that a table would be drawn up using a points system and that would be brought to the Member/Officer Working Group (Roads). He said that recognition would be given to issues in rural areas such as no street lighting, faster moving traffic etc.

Mrs C H J Miller moved that the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report with the following amendment to 5.1: the number of relevant accidents” should be moved under “verge width and condition” and whether there is a need for street lighting or not should be added, seconded by Mr F A Robertson.

Mrs E L Fullerton asked that Mrs Miller include within her motion the addition of Burra and Trondra’s list of concerns, accept a red chipped path at the roadside would be a big improvement, that we do not want all foot paths to be lit up and that a paragraph 5.3 be added to address health improvement benefits to encourage walking.

Mrs C H J Miller said that she was unsure of the location of the footpaths in Burra, and if a prioritisation system were agreed they should be looked at at the same time as all the other projects.

The Network and Design Manager advised that the use of the words “official list” was incorrect. He explained that the 10 schemes on the list were from a list of general road improvements and that other Community Councils had identified projects within their areas, as suggested in the last bullet point. The Network and Design Manager said the point was that the list was very long and needed to be prioritised. He said that the rural debate on whether paths should be lit indicated that most of the individuals who used the pavements would look to have them lit, and added that gravel verges were difficult for the service to maintain.

Mr R C Nickerson referred to the title of the report and said that it was necessary to go back and look at the pavement requirements in urban areas. He said that there were different footpaths used in Europe, using asphalt, a metre away from the road, which provided a safety margin, but he recognised that this was not appropriate in all areas. Mr Nickerson moved as an amendment that officers bring back a report on a brand new scheme. Mrs L F Baisley seconded.

Mr A T J Cooper provided the background to a request for a footpath, from Brae Community Council, following the completion of a housing development in 2002. He said that there had been several letters written to the Roads Service on the issue of road safety, and only a reduction of the speed limit was then implemented. Mr Cooper expressed his disappointment that after 7 years, the footpath was not yet on a prioritisation list, and that an opportunity had been missed to construct the footpath along side a larger job that was carried out recently in the area.

(Mr W H Manson left the Chamber)

Mr A S Wishart said that the report was about establishing a scheme for prioritising projects and was not about prioritising the projects today. He said that it had been valuable to hear from every district, but in order to move forward a further report was required Mr A S Wishart gave notice of a further amendment.

The Network and Design Engineer advised that the Roads Service already took account of the different types of footpaths and said that they were working with no prioritisation scheme at the moment, and one would be required to get the projects onto the 5 year capital programme. He said that he required direction from the Committee.

(Mr C L Smith left the Chamber)

After summing up, voting took place with a show of hands and the results were as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Amendment (R C Nickerson) | 8 |
| Motion (C H J Miller) | 10 |

Mr G Robinson gave notice of a further amendment.

Mr A S Wishart said that the report had been too rushed for Members to agree upon the criteria. He said that the report should be deferred for another cycle and that it should encompass everything said and take on board the rural and urban issues. Mr A J Cluness seconded.

After brief summing up, voting took place with a show of hands and the results were as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------|----|
| Amendment (A S Wishart) | 15 |
| Motion (C H J Miller) | 4 |

Mr G Robinson withdrew his notice of motion.

The Chairperson said that it would be useful if Community Councils would write in and identify where most people are walking in their areas.

95/09 **Acquisition of Land for Roads and Transport Improvement Schemes Proposed Amendment to Policy Covering the Use of Compulsory Purchase Orders**

The Committee considered a report by the Network and Design Manager, Roads, attached as Appendix 4.

Mr G Robinson moved that the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report, seconded by Mr F A Robertson.

(Mrs C H J Miller left the Chamber)

In response to concerns raised by Mrs F B Grains regarding paragraph 5.1 the Network and Design Manager said that to apply Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) immediately across the board may cause a delay for some projects. Instead, we would expect to do this only with the more urgent schemes. When asked what constituted an “urgent scheme”, the Network and Design Engineer said that a project in next years capital programme or the opportunity to link in with a developer might require an urgent CPO. He added that it would not stop the Council seeking voluntary agreement at the same time.

(Mrs C H J Miller returned to the Chamber)

Mr F A Robertson referred to the West Side road and advised that even with no objections to the CPO, the process took 2 years. He said it was important to initiate the CPO process for urgent projects.

96/09 **A971 Haggersta to Cova – Report on Progress, November 2009**

The Committee Considered a report by the Network and Design Manager, Roads, attached as Appendix 5.

Mr G Robinson referred to paragraph 4.7 “Additional Works” and urged Officers to ensure that they are particularly thorough when gaining permission from the landowners. He also advised that works carried out to fill in the inner corner of the road, where it had deteriorated, now meant that there was no verge or drain. He said that there was now no verge for pedestrians to seek refuge on when walking on that side of the road and stressed the urgency of getting on with the project. Mr Robinson also advised that a school bus had lost a wing mirror when having a near collision with an oncoming lorry. He said that it was anticipated that the project would not start until summer 2012, and pressure must be kept on so that it takes place.

In response to a query, the Network and Design Manager gave a summary of the work involved and advertising period required. He advised that it may be 4 months before the Compulsory Purchase Order is sent to Scottish Ministers.

Mr G Robinson moved that the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report, taking on board the comments of the Committee, seconded by Mr F A Robertson.

97/09 **20 MPH Speed Limits at Schools – Progress Report, November 2009**

The Committee considered a report by the Road Safety Engineer, Roads, attached as Appendix 6.

Mr J G Simpson moved that the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report, seconded by Mrs E L Fullerton.

In response to queries from Members, the Network and Design Manager advised that 4 of the sets of signs which had been installed were not working. He said that one unit had been sent away and a further fault had been found. He said that he was aware that other counties had similar problems with this type of signs, and advised that he would continue to pressure the company for a conclusion. Members queried whether there was only one firm that made the signs, and suggested that if another firm could be identified that should be considered. Mr A J Hughson questioned why the system had to be so complicated and that he did not understand why the signs could not be switched on manually.

The Network and Design Manager advised Mr A T J Cooper that the footway lighting at Lunnasting was not on the programme for the next financial year. He advised that the road humps, street lights and 20mph permanent limit had been offered but the community had indicated that they preferred to wait for the larger project to be done. Mr Cooper said that he was disappointed as he understood that the community believed it would be going ahead in 2010/11.

98/09 **Capital Projects Update – Infrastructure Services Projects**

The Committee noted a report by the Capital Programme Services Manager, attached as Appendix 7.

Mrs L F Baisley referred to Appendix 1 page 2 – “B9081 Mid Yell Link” and said that the community had been looking forward to this, however a car at the junction had to reverse to allow a large vehicle to enter the junction and articulated lorries had to mount the pavement to enter which was dangerous for anyone walking. She asked what was going to be done about it. The Head of Roads advised that the engineers had not expected articulated lorries to be making that turn. He said that it was unsatisfactory for lorries to have to mount the pavement. Mr R S Henderson added that the junction was simply wrong and that any new junction should be able to accommodate all types of vehicles. The Head of Roads said that his staff would look at the options available for improvement and would speak with local Members to find a solution and report on any necessary options and costs to the Committee.

Mrs C H J Miller moved the recommendations contained in the report with the addition of a paragraph 7.2 That a report be brought to infrastructure on the long terms costs of ferry replacement and terminals over the next 30 years with a view to best value compared with a 30 year fixed link programme. In seconding, Mr G Robinson asked that Officers engage with the Scottish Government for a financial contribution.

Mr J H Henry referred to Appendix 1 and commented that the tick box format was very helpful.

{In response to a query from Mr A J Hughson with regard to Strand Loch Bridge on page 3 of Appendix 1, the Network and Design Manager advised that the project had been promoted for inclusion in the proposed new 5 years programme but had not been included in the current draft programme. He also said that he would recommend that a number of structural projects be added. The Chief Executive advised that the 5 year capital programme would be flexible and any emergency work would be subject to review.

Mrs E L Fullerton commented that the Burn Beach seawall should be done in conjunction with the adjacent development to achieve economy of scale and to minimise disruption to the community in carrying out two separate projects. In response to a query regarding the Burra and Trondra bridge walkways, the Network and Design Manager explained that the bridges are currently inspected yearly, but walkways would make it easier to inspect them more regularly. This would help to detect any problems sooner. He said that the walkways could also make the annual inspection cheaper or more effective.

(Mr F A Robertson left the Chamber)

99/09 **Infrastructure Revenue Management Accounts – General Ledger and Reserve Fund for the period 1 April 2009 to 30 September 2009**

The Committee noted a report by the Head of Finance, attached as Appendix 8.

The Head of Environment and Building Services briefly introduced the report. In response to queries from Members, he advised that the budget headed “other Employee Costs” was a summary of all costs, but he did not have the detail of how it was made up. He advised that there was an overspend under the Directorate budget but all other Head of Service were likely to come in on budget at the end of the year.

The Head of Environment and Building Services advised that the Fuel Poverty Grant was showing as an under spend, however he was aware that the fund was fully committed and once all invoices were in, the budget would be fully spent. He also

confirmed that the Environmental Health budget variance of £18,000 would be spent by the year end.

The Head of Transport advised that the docking costs for the Daggri and Dagalien were higher than expected but that would be offset with the rest of the budget. He said that this would be resolved in the remainder of the year.

100/09 **Review of Shetland Islands Council Vehicle Fleet – Update**

The Committee noted a report by the Head of Transport, attached as Appendix 9.

Mrs L F Baisley said that she welcomed this report and said that this was a better system. She took the opportunity to raise the matter of Council employees driving with dipped headlights at this time of year and asked if this instruction could be re-issued. Following some discussion the Head of Environment and Building Services said that the issue could be raised through departmental safety forums, but it was acknowledged that it would take some time. Mr A S Wishart said that he would ensure that the matter was raised at the Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting being held in the afternoon.

In response to queries from Mr A G L Duncan, the Head of Transport advised that the Council participate in a 3 year tendering exercise because of the relationship they have with Scotland Excel. He advised that any package that the Council engages in with Scotland Excel is for a period of 3 years. The Head of Transport advised that previous vehicles were sold through an advert in the paper, but if it was felt that auctions or lots over a period of time may increase income. He said that the service wanted to avoid flooding the market. Referring to paragraph 4.6 the Head of Transport confirmed that the service would be within the £1.08m budget at the year end and advised that all aspirations beyond that were fulfilled through other means. The Head of Transport confirmed that Council vehicles had consumed 8.3% less fuel. He said that he did not know if that was due to driver behaviour or changes in management of the fleet, but they were working on providing a higher level of detail. The Head of Transport explained that sufficient work had been done on whether it was cost effective for employees to take vehicles home, and the Council established that in general vehicles should go with the users. He said that work would be done in the second half of next year to re-determine whether this remained the case.

Mrs C H J Miller said that Officers should be congratulated for the work involved in achieving a £900,000 cost reduction. The Committee agreed.

The Head of Transport advised Mrs E L Fullerton that he acknowledged that fuel additives are different, and confirmed that only where they worked they would be used.

(Mr G Robinson and Mrs C H J Miller left the Chamber)

101/09 **Note of Infrastructure and Environment Forum – 4 November 2009**

The Committee noted the note of the Infrastructure and Environment Forum held on 4 November 2009, attached as Appendix 10.

102/09 **Minutes of ZetTrans Meeting – 9 November 2009**

The Committee noted the minutes of the ZetTrans Meeting held on 9 November 2009, attached as Appendix 11.

103/09 **Minutes of the Inter Island Ferries Board – 12 November 2009**

The Committee noted the minutes of the Inter Island Ferries Board held on 12

November 2009, attached as Appendix 12.

The meeting concluded at 12.30pm.

I J Hawkins
Chairperson