## DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

# LICENSING COMMITTEE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 4 JULY 2022

**Councillors Present**: James Cole (Chairman), Phil Barnett (Vice-Chairman), Steve Ardagh-Walter, Jeff Beck, Graham Bridgman, Billy Drummond, Clive Hooker, Tony Linden, David Marsh, Graham Pask and Martha Vickers

**Also Present:** Sean Murphy (Public Protection Manager), Julia O'Brien (Team Manager – Licensing), Moira Fraser (Principal Officer – Policy and Governance), Amanda Ward (Lead Officer Licensing), James Button (James Button & Co Solicitor) and Ben Ryan (Democratic Services Officer).

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Adrian Abbs

#### PART I

#### 3. Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 31 January 2022 and 10 May 2022 were approved as true and correct records and signed by the Chairman.

#### 4. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

# 5. Draft Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4), which looked at the new draft Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy which had been prepared in response to the Department for Transport's guidance on "Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards". This guidance required local authorities to review, revise and update their policies in relation to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing.

The Licensing team were looking for recommendations on several aspects of the policy, prior to consultation and would remain in draft until the consultation had been completed.

Mr James Button introduced the draft policy and highlighted that the purpose of the policy was to enhance public safety. He then worked through some of the areas where clarity from Members was being sought. He discussed the choice laid out on page 30 of the Agenda, which was whether to waive the second and third year licence fees for individuals over the age of 65, as after a certain age it was required that a taxi licence be renewed annually. Mr Button advised that by adding this to the policy, it would remove questions over age discrimination, however this would come at a financial cost to West Berkshire Council.

Councillor Graham Bridgman stated that there would still be administrative costs associated with the renewals and he wondered if a reduced fee should be applied. The Chairman replied that the Public Protection Partnership (PPP) stated that the administrative load and costs would be manageable.

Councillor Graham Pask added that, at a certain age, you had to renew your driver's licence with the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) every three years and that this process was free. He therefore suggested that years two and three be free for renewal and queried whether there was an age limit where drivers would no longer be eligible for a licence. Mr Button replied that there was no upper age limit and that eligibility was usually decided by whether a driver was seen as 'fit and proper'. Mr Button finished by adding that it would be incredibly difficult to add an upper age limit to the policy.

Councillor Jeff Beck explained that the Charity Commission restricted volunteers driving patients to hospital to 80 years of age. The Chairman added that he was not in favour of upper age limits but would instead insist on the provision of insurance documentation during renewal.

Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter asked for clarification on why renewals occurred every year instead of every three years. Mr Button informed the Councillor that it would be possible not to implement a recurring one year renewal, however its implementation had been suggested for safety reasons, because of the potential for new medical issues to arise. Mr Button continued to specify that the one year checks could be done from the age of 70 and that this would be in alignment with DVLA practice. Members agreed that the wording should be amended to read 'From the age of 70 on, licences will only be granted on an annual basis. The licences for the second and third year following the one year grant will be issued at no cost to the driver/applicant to bring the cost to the driver in line with the fee structure for those under the age of 70.' They also agreed that the table at 9.6 (Medical Examination) should be amended to reflect this.

Mr Button discussed the choices highlighted on page 32 of the Agenda (section 8 Application for the renewal of a licence). This laid out the renewal process of a Taxi Licence and whether there should be a one month temporary licence granted after expiry.

Councillor Bridgman asked how long it took for the Licensing Team to process an application for a Taxi Licence, as this would allow for a date to be set where a taxi driver had to start the renewal before the expiry of a licence. Councillor Bridgman added that if a taxi driver had not applied for a licence within that time, then no extension should be provided, however if the licence was not ready due to administrative issues there should be an extension of the licence until the application was processed. Mr Button responded that West Berkshire Council had no ability to extend a licence after expiry and that there had to be a process to issue a new licence. Councillor Bridgman stated that a temporary monthly licence should be issued whilst Officers made a decision and if the decision was not to renew the licence, the current temporary licence would expire.

Councillor Pask questioned whether the authority reminded drivers that their licence was due to expire. Mr Sean Murphy answered that reminders were sent out, although to make this policy work, the Committee needed to agree on a date on which to send those reminders out. Councillor Pask suggested that the Council provide a one month extension, if the delay was due to internal delays.

Councillor Beck pointed out that it should be clarified that the extension of the existing licence should be without charge.

Mr Button then addressed that the time taken to process an application should be backdated from the date of expiry, as some would look to benefit from any administrative delay.

The Vice-Chairman queried how much time, before the expiry of a licence, would be reasonable to implement a deadline for applications, so that Officers could process applications before the licences expired. Mr Murphy responded that the current process suggested 28 days. Ms Julia O'Brien added that busier periods would require that applications be submitted a month before, however applications at the present time were taking five working days to process. Mr Button argued that it would be reasonable to send reminders two months beforehand, as there was potential for delays with Disclosure and Baring Service (DBS) checks.

Councillor Bridgman suggested an introduction of a timescale where an application had to be made between a maximum of 40 working days and a minimum of 20 working days before expiry. This would lead to several alterations firstly, that if you had not applied within the 20 working days, the application would need to be treated as a brand new application, instead of a renewal and secondly if the Council had not made its decision before the expiry date then a monthly extension would be granted until the application had been processed. Mr Button stated that a High Court judgment (Exeter v Sandle) ruled that you could make a renewal after expiry, however evidence would need to be provided of exceptional circumstances and the application would have to be made within a short period of time after expiry. Members agreed to these changes which would be reflected in the consultation version of the draft policy.

Mr Button then moved on to the frequency of required Safeguarding and Disability Assistance Training. The options laid out were every three or six years, with the former being recommended.

The Chairman began by stating it was his belief that training should occur every three years and that this would be in line with the practice undertaken by Bracknell Forest Council.

Councillor Pask questioned what form the training would take. Ms O'Brien explained that these could take place virtually (for renewals), or in person (for new applications) and usually took around three hours to complete. Furthermore this was a process the PPP were looking to bring in-house. The Chairman probed further by asking whether the training, if run by West Berkshire Council, would be at any cost to the drivers and Ms O'Brien responded that there would be no cost. It had previously been agreed that they would be included in the driver's licence fee. Councillor Martha Vickers enquired whether the training would be interactive or not, of which Ms O'Brien suggested that if the training was brought in-house, it could be something the team would do. Members agreed that the consultation version of the policy should require training to take place every three years.

Mr Button then introduced the issue on page 53, paragraph 4.1 and explained that the wording conflicted with the current policy and suggested that the Council removed the words 'in confidence', to allow Officers to discuss cases with colleagues. He stressed that this should not result in information being readily available for public consumption. The Committee agreed to remove the words 'in confidence'.

Mr Button brought attention to the choice on page 56 of the Agenda, paragraph 5.4. This was in regards to criminal convictions and the granting of taxi licences. The choice was whether or not to grant a licence after the period of time served, or after the original time sentenced.

Councillor Bridgman asserted that the authority should always look for the end of the longest period where a disqualification, fine, or sentence had been imposed.

Councillor Pask questioned whether paragraph 5.4 was in regards to all convictions, or only driving convictions and Mr Button replied confirming the former. Councillor Pask further probed, by providing examples of more extreme crimes. Mr Button answered that in extreme cases the policy stated that a taxi licence would not be issued as the applicant would not be considered a 'fit and proper' person. Members agreed that the current wording should be replaced with 'In relation to single convictions, before a licence will be granted the following time periods should elapse following completion of the sentence. "Sentence" means the period of imprisonment imposed (not simply the time served), the date of conviction if a fine was imposed and completion of any disqualification from driving, or the end of whichever lasted longer if more than one penalty was imposed.'

Mr Button moved on to the Penalty Points Scheme appeals mechanism and asked Members to consider where appeals against penalty points should lie i.e. whether this should just be the Licensing Committee or if it should include a senior officer

The Chairman asked if a Sub-Committee could decide the appeal, of which Mr Button responded that this was up to the Members, but suggested that it did not go to a full Committee.

The Chairman questioned how often appeals occurred within West Berkshire Council. Ms O'Brien replied that there was currently no penalty points system in West Berkshire and therefore it was difficult to say how often this would occur. Ms Amanda Ward estimated no more than ten appeals per annum.

Councillor Linden asserted that appeals needed to be determined by Officers first, then if necessary, Members could decide at a separate panel and that this was in-line with the rest of West Berkshire's Appeals processes.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter wanted to know how the points system would be policed. Ms O'Brien asserted that it would be policed through a variety of factors, which would include; complaints, enforcement actions and vehicle inspections.

Councillor Pask enquired whether West Berkshire Council had done this previously and whether it was mandatory for the Council to implement the points system. Ms O'Brien responded that West Berkshire Council did not have a scheme like this and that creating one would lead to a more progressive form of enforcement.

Mr Button added that the legislation gave West Berkshire Council freedom to suspend and revoke Taxi Licences, and that the twelve point system would allow for a fair test to see whether drivers had learned from their mistakes, however if a driver accumulated 12 points and then went to Committee, the Council could suspend the licence for a period of time, of which if the appellant was unhappy, they could appeal to the Court. This process would allow for a gradual escalation of affairs.

Councillor Pask asserted that Members should be the ones that determined appeals, as Members already heard other appeals, including those for Home to School Transport and Council Tax, therefore the continuation of this system would make logical sense.

Mr Murphy stated that it was in-line with other processes within the PPP and that the appeal should go to a Sub-Committee. Councillor Bridgman subtly disagreed with this by stating that there should be a two stage system, with stage one being held by Officer Decision and stage two going to a Sub-Committee, therefore the Officers would be the first port of call for all appeals. Councillor Bridgman pointed to the fact that there was an existing Appeals Committee that should be utilised for the second stage of the appeal, as a result the Licensing Committee should suggest to Council that this would be an issue for the Appeals Panel. If agreed this would need to be reflected in the Scheme of Delegation once the policy had been adopted.

Councillor Clive Hooker queried how long the points stayed active for and Mr Button highlighted that within the draft policy, it stated a period of 12 months from the date they were imposed, or the date of any appeal where they were upheld, or increased, would be the date of expiry. Members agreed to the two stage process and that the Appeals Panel should be used to determine appeals.

Mr Button moved onto the final point of contention within the draft Taxi Licensing Policy. West Berkshire Council was historically split into two zones for granting licences, however all licences in recent history had been granted for both zones, therefore it was recommended that the Council remove the zoning entirely.

Councillor Pask highlighted that this was a historic issue which occurred during the creation of West Berkshire Council, where taxi drivers wanted to keep hold of the Newbury territory, however after 20 years it made no sense to continue with the division of territory.

Mr Button added that even if it was not within the Licensing Committee's remit, that the issue be taken to Council at a later date. Councillor Bridgman added that as this was a draft copy for consultation and that it was not a definitive choice on the policy, it would not need to go to Council at this stage.

Councillor Hooker enquired why there was no mention of automatic locking doors within the draft policy. Mr Button responded, saying there was no mention of automatic door locking as it would be difficult to address within the policy. On one hand, it would help drivers prevent bilking and would help safeguard individuals within the Town Centre, however on the other hand, it could be dangerous if the driver was ill-intentioned. Councillor Hooker clarified that he was looking at whether this could be added, of which Mr Button said it would be a struggle to make it; comprehensible, comprehensive, enforceable, but if it became a huge problem it could be re-visited.

The Chairman requested further information on why the emissions standards section of the policy had no mention of standards being applied to stretch limos, whereas there were exceptions for vintage cars. Mr Button responded that limos were elderly vehicles and made up a tiny fraction of the entire fleet, as a result it would be unfair to apply these standards to limos. Councillor Bridgman added that vintage, by definition, encompassed cars built before 1930. Mr Button emphasised that classic cars would also be included and that within the policy it stated that enforcement was optional.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter pondered why the draft policy set Euro 5 standards on eligible cars and not Euro 6. Mr Button delved into the fact that Euro 6 standards were applied to cars from 2018 onwards and that Euro 5 was applied from 2012. If Euro 5 emission standards were enforced, the policy would be fairer on drivers and the policy could be revisited in the future to apply Euro 6. Councillor Ardagh-Walter then asserted that the Council should signpost a year in advance of when they aimed to phase out Euro 5 standards. Councillor Bridgman put forward that Euro 6 standards were actually applied to cars from 1 September 2015. The Chairman highlighted that this could end up excluding a lot of people which Councillor Pask furthered by emphasising the need for a realistic introduction, as the shortage of supply for cars could be problematic.

Mr Murphy finished off by stating that the draft policy would incorporate a 'greening of the fleet' policy to review Euro 5 each year. This would be included in the annual report on helping the taxi trade go greener.

The Committee **RESOLVED** that within the draft policy:

(1) Yearly renewals of taxi licences would be in place, after the age of 70, with no charge for the second or third year, within a three year period.

- (2) Officers would deal with the changes in phrasing within the policy, due to the changes made by the Committee.
- (3) Safeguarding and Disability Assistance training to be mandatory every three years.
- (4) On page 53, paragraph 4.1, the words 'in confidence' were to be removed.
- (5) A two-stage appeal process would be implemented for the new 12 Point Penalty System. Stage one being held by Officer Decision and Stage two being held by a Member appointed Appeals Panel.
- (6) The taxi zones within West Berkshire were to be removed.

#### The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- (1) Subject to the above changes, Officers would consult on the draft Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy set out in Appendix A.
- (2) The consultation would run from the 6 July to the 28 September 2022 and that it would be promoted as set out in paragraph 5.12.
- (3) On conclusion of consultation and consideration of responses, the matter would return for further consideration to the 7 November 2022 Licensing Committee for potential adoption.

## 6. Helping West Berkshire Taxi Trade Go Greener (EX4215)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 5), which outlined several options available to the Council to assist the West Berkshire Taxi Trade to 'go greener' and provided incentives to the trade to encourage them to switch to ultra-low emission vehicles. This included suggestions such as free parking with charging points and subsidising the purchase of Electric Vehicles (EVs). This report was in response to a Motion submitted to Council by Councillor Adrian Abbs which sought to introduce a fee based incentive scheme to help all forms of vehicles licensed by West Berkshire for public transport to go green.

The Chairman emphasised that West Berkshire Council should not become a money lender.

Councillor David Marsh questioned whether there was a fully electric cab within West Berkshire and Moira Fraser confirmed there was at least one.

Councillor Marsh believed there should be a fee based incentive, which included a full discount for EVs and a 50% reduction for hybrid vehicles. Councillor Marsh did not support the capping of EV charge points, as it was too complex and he emphasised the Committee should aim for simplicity. Councillor Marsh thought offering free parking was a valid option, but only during overnight hours and he favoured cash grants over loaning, as providing loans could be complicated and would slow down how quickly the Council could implement the policy. Councillor Marsh also noted that the Council needed to consider that the Government already provided a £1500 grant for the purchase of EVs, and Oxford City Council provided a £5000 grant for the same. Councillor Marsh surmised that moving in a more eco-friendly direction would benefit the Taxi Trade, as customers would favour using the greener option, however the Trade would need help to offer this service.

Councillor Pask explained that it would not be right to provide large grants, especially as market forces were working in favour of consumers that had switched to EVs, because of the rise in fuel prices. Councillor Marsh added that loaning and grants were two separate processes, as grants were easier to distribute and would encourage people to buy EVs.

Councillor Bridgman fully agreed that a grant could be used to encourage the purchase of EVs, especially due to the expensive nature of these vehicles.

Councillor Bridgman noted that there were two issues with EVs brought up by the Taxi Trade; firstly, the expense of the vehicles and secondly, the distance that could be covered by EVs. Councillor Bridgman wanted to see the potential figures for the fee system, so the implications of the system on the Council budget could be reviewed. He did not agree with the capping of the costs of EV charging points and agreed with Councillor Marsh on the issue of overnight parking. Councillor Bridgman finalised that grants should not take on a lender model and that £5000 would be too much money to give as a grant.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter averred that he would be in favour of a reasonable grant, with an annual review and with a view to taper away. The Chairman asked for clarification over a potential time limited response for the grants of which, Councillor Ardagh-Walter responded that this would depend on a review of market trends and the uptake of the grant.

Councillor Vickers then stressed that the EV parking spaces had to be dedicated, so they were not used as free parking spaces, which could prevent other EV drivers from charging their vehicles.

Moira Fraser then asked Members to go through each of the recommendations.

The Chairman started with the first recommendation on whether a fee based incentive, such as that set out in paragraph 5.3, should be introduced to the 2023-24 budget, if so; should it be introduced for hybrid and EVs, what the level of subsidy should be and how long the subsidy should be in place for.

Moira Fraser stated that there seemed to be a general agreement in the room over the fee based incentive, however she needed to know several items from the Committee:

- Whether the grant would be for hybrid and EVs or just EVs and the suggestion in the room, at the time, was that there would be a 100% reduction for EVs and 50% for hybrid vehicles.
- Whether the incentive would be for three years or one year.
- A form of criteria for hybrid vehicles.

Moira Fraser quoted a possible criteria which had been provided by Jenny Graham based on other local authority policies "zero emission capable, which included plug-in hybrid vehicles, must be able to drive without any exhaust emissions, as well as a maximum GCO2 per kilometre, in terms of the minimum distance", of which Jenny Graham recommended "50 grams per kilometre and would be able to travel at least 70 miles or 112 kilometres without the production of any emissions at all".

Councillor Pask raised concerns that only the more expensive models could reach up to 70 miles without emissions, with most models only achieving 30-40 miles without any emissions and that most cars did not achieve the range advertised. The Chairman asked whether the Committee should base this on manufacturer's claims and Councillor Pask advised that this would have to be the case, due to the driver being a factor that could affect the mileage.

Councillor Bridgman expressed that the proposal fleshed out within paragraph 5.10 was for the first ten adopters each year to have the reduction and that this was in contrast to the 100% for EVs and 50% for hybrids. It was also asked for Officers to give guidance on when the fees would be paid. The Chairman queried whether it was necessary to restrict the number to ten, of which Councillor Bridgman replied that he was thinking of the

potential cost if the entire fleet wanted to apply. Mr Murphy stated the Council would not want to implement the removal of fees, if or when, the entire fleet would be using EVs.

Moira Fraser added that there were in total, 138 Private Hire and 123 Hackney Carriages with licences as of the 01 April 2022 and if this was multiplied by the fee of £250 that would be the cost of the scheme if everyone was to apply. Councillor Ardagh-Walter explained that there was a bigger risk being taken by Adult Social Care and that the Committee did not know how many would take up the scheme, therefore the Committee should not cap the fees and that Officers should take that on board when setting the budget. This was met with a general consensus.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter would have liked to see a criteria set out for the eligibility of vehicles due to recent green washing.

It was agreed that the Committee would recommend to the Executive that a 100% subsidy should be applied to full electric vehicles and a 50% reduction for hybrid vehicles. The number should not be limited, but this should be revisited annually. Officers were asked to revisit the criteria in light of the discussion on the range of hybrid vehicles.

The Chairman moved onto the next recommendation in regard to the capping of the cost of EV charges for taxi licences, which Moira Fraser stated, that what she heard from the room, was that Members were not in favour of that proposal. The Committee was in agreement.

The Chairman moved onto recommendation three over free parking for EV charging and Moira Fraser pointed out that there seemed to be an agreement over this, with the caveat of it being restricted to overnight parking. Councillor Hooker wanted to know how overnight would be defined. Moira Fraser responded that the parking team would need to be consulted about timings and locations where this could be achieved. Councillor Linden highlighted the issues around the closing times of some of the car parks and how this would restrict taxi drivers, which the Chairman responded, that this would be applicable to some, but not others and that the Committee was looking at the issue in principle.

The Chairman then asked for councillors views on distributing cash grants for the purchase of EVs (recommendation four).

Councillor Bridgman emphasised that it would depend on the budget, as the more money that would be offered, the more attractive buying an EV would become. The Chairman added that it would be better to ask Officers to come back with a costed proposal. Councillor Pask stated that the Council had to be fiscally responsible with tax payer's money.

The Chairman then moved on to whether Members would support a budget bid to purchase EVs (recommendation five), which would then be loaned to the trade and stated that, from the previous conversation, this was not felt to be an option. The Committee was in agreement.

The Chairman felt that the same could be said of West Berkshire Council setting up a fund, so the Council could act as a lender to the trade to purchase EVs (recommendation six). The Chairman then highlighted that he would have been interested, if this fund was set up in conjunction with a private lender and Councillor Beck highlighted that there were some companies in West Berkshire that leased vehicles to businesses. Councillor Ardagh-Walter stated there were already companies that would lease to private individuals and that due to the time restrictions on Officers, this was not an option the Council should follow. Councillor Beck responded by stating that perhaps the Council could signpost the trade to the options available to them.

Moira Fraser focused on paragraph 5.48 in the report and stated the Committee had covered the majority of the points, but she needed clarification over the installation of EV charging points.

The Chairman stated that he believed the Committee would be in favour of the installation of EV charging points. Moira Fraser added that feasibility studies would be conducted towards the end of the year and Councillor Pask was in favour of these studies, but did not want to pick random figures for the charging points until there had been a professional study.

Councillor Linden asked whether the charge points were to be installed in car parks, or on the streets and Councillor Bridgman clarified this was in regard to taxi bays.

The Chairman concluded by asking that the PPP continue with the study and then return to the Committee when further information was available.

Mr Murphy added that the team would go back and look at grants available to the trade.

#### The Committee **RESOLVED** that:

- (1) In response to the Motion they would recommend to the Executive that a 100% subsidy be afforded for fully electric vehicles and 50% subsidy for hybrid vehicles and that the number of subsidies should not be capped but that this should be revisited on an annual basis.
- (2) Capping the cost of EV rapid charges for taxis licensed on the West Berkshire network was not supported.
- (3) Free parking for the trade needing to charge their business vehicles should be provided overnight in eligible car parks following discussions about suitable locations and timeframes with the Parking Team.
- (4) In regards to cash grants the Committee agreed that Officers come back with a range of costed options for the Committee to consider.
- (5) Loaning and leasing of EVs were not seen as viable options for West Berkshire Council at the current time albeit that they could signpost the trade to options available.

# 7. Statutory Consultation on Hackney Carriage Tariffs 2022

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 6), which set out options to increase the taxi tariffs as a result of the recent increase in fuel prices. Members were asked to consider whether or not they would recommend a variation to the Executive and if so if they would support an increase of five percent, eight percent or ten percent.

The Taxi Trade had been consulted informally over the potential tariff changes, of which those that had responded; three opted for no increase, 23 were in favour of the five percent increase and 22 in favour of a ten percent increase, as a result Officers recommended an increase of eight percent. Both proposed fee increases included an increased flag charge and the potential addition of a fouling charge for the first time.

Councillor Bridgman asked what the new flag distance would be and Moira Fraser confirmed that it was 1489.235 yards or every 11 out of 13 units in a mile.

Councillor Bridgman then suggested that the Committee go for the eight percent given the split amongst the trade. Councillor Barnett and Councillor Pask agreed.

The Chairman moved onto the fouling charge, of which Councillor Bridgman stated that in London the charge was at £60 for fouling, which would reflect the cost of cleaning, as

well as the amount of time the cabs were off the road. It was suggested that interior damage would be £75 and exterior £15.

The Chairman queried how much a car wash costed and Councillor Linden replied in Reading it would cost around £15, however the interior would be a huge problem, but £75 would be more than generous. Moira Fraser added that it was £50 interior, £10 exterior for Bracknell Forest Council taxis.

Moira Fraser asked about the length of the consultation period and gave the Committee the choice of either, 14 days (statutory minimum) or 28 days.

Councillor Bridgman argued that due to the urgency of the matter, because of the rise in fuel prices and the fact that a table of tariffs had already been created, the Committee should vote for the 14 day consultation period.

The Committee **RESOLVED** that that:

- (1) An eight percent increase in taxi tariffs would be recommended to the Executive.
- (2) A fouling charge of £75 pounds for interior damage and £25 for exterior damage be recommended to the Executive.
- (3) There should be a period of 14 days for consultation on the tariffs running from the 14 to the 28 July 2022.

## 8. West Berkshire Council Licensing Annual Report 2021/22

The Committee considered the Annual Report for 2021 to 2022 (Agenda Item 7)

There were no questions or comments from Members.

(The meeting commenced at 4:30pm and closed at 19:15pm)

The Committee **RESOLVED** to note the contents of the report.

# 9. Licensing Committee Forward Plan

The Committee considered the Forward Plan for July 2022 to July 2023 (Agenda Item 8).

The Chairman mentioned that he would like the 'green' policies to be revisited in 12 months' time.

(The modaling comments	sa at neopin and crosse at remopiny	
CHAIRMAN		
Date of Signature		