

GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday 20 January 2021 virtually.

PRESENT:

Cllr Brian Robinson	Cllr Kate Haigh (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Matt Babbage	Cllr Nicky Packer
Cllr Kevin Cromwell (Chair)	Cllr Paul McCloskey
Cllr Stephen Davies	Cllr John Murphy
Cllr Ben Evans	

Officers in attendance: Mike Dawson, David Owen, Sophie Benfield, Simon Excell, Colin Chick, Steve Mawson, Angela Presdee, Rupert Waters and Mally Findlater

Apologies: Cllr Klara Sudbury, Cllr Sajid Patel, Cllr Gina Blomefield and Cllr Simon Pickering

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3. MINUTES

Members were advised that the minutes had not yet been finalised ready for publication in time for the meeting. These would therefore be considered at the Committee meeting in March.

4. WORK PLAN

4.1 Members noted the scheduled items for the March 2021 meeting and the Chair requested any suggestions for future consideration. It was confirmed that any suggestions now would be added to the future items list for the new Committee, after the May 2021 elections, to consider if they wished.

4.2 It was suggested that the next Committee may wish to look at an item on the Additional Restrictions Grant (discretionary scheme) which formed part of central Government's Covid response support package for businesses.

5. DISTRICT MEMBER FEEDBACK

Members noted that Gloucester City Council were due to consider a constitutional change to outline a formal feedback procedure for membership to outside bodies back to the rest of the City Council members. This would therefore cover district membership to this Committee and improve the communication between GCC scrutiny and district councils.

6. GLOUCESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH JOINT COMMITTEE UPDATE

- 6.1 The Chair invited Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Chair of the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGJC), to present this item and Members noted the following points:
- GEGJC members had recognised the importance of developing a digital strategy for the County, which was separate to the Cyber Central project but ran alongside it.
 - The overall direction of the draft Statement of Common Ground was agreed and the Committee asked the Senior Officer Group to have a more detailed look at the content. A final version would then be shared back with GEGJC for agreement.
 - The GCC Covid-19 recovery action plan had now been costed and would be considered at Cabinet on 27 January 2021. It included a funding request of £500k per annum to drive the areas identified for action. The situation remained very fluid with many areas remaining in response mode; however the Committee were satisfied with the progress made so far towards recovery.
 - The County's S151 Officer Group had been considering options for pooling some of the Additional Restrictions Grant (Discretionary scheme), which formed part of central Government's Covid support package to businesses. The group had since received notification from MHCLT that they could only pull grant applications for one of the proposed ideas (helping SMEs online). The Committee therefore stressed that these discretionary funds needed to be used in the most effective way for the businesses that really needed the support to make it through the pandemic.
 - Members approved two SEDF funding requests; one for the City Region Board and the other for Cyber and Digital Growth in Gloucestershire.
 - On the forward plan, there was a request for an update on the initial impacts of Brexit in the county.
- 6.2 Due to the very strong interest of GCC, the district councils and this scrutiny committee in digital connectivity, a member queried whether the development of the digital strategy would be a good piece of work for scrutiny to become involved in.
- 6.3 It was advised that the action taken away from this morning's meeting was for the Senior Officer Group to do some further work on identifying what this strategy would look like, there was still quite a bit of work to be done first, but this Committee would definitely be involved at some point in that process.
- 6.4 It was reinforced that this strategy needed to run alongside but separately to the development of Cyber Central as it went a lot wider than just Cyber. The

Govt. digital strategy for example, contained 7 different strands, one of which was about cyber security. There were 6 other strands focused on the wider issues of digital.

- 6.5 Noting members were due to discuss the governance of the GFirst LEP later in this meeting, it was questioned what the governance arrangements and relationship with scrutiny were for the new City Region Board. Members understood that it had now started to play a role in making significant decisions and spending public money and were therefore keen to be very clear about the transparency and scrutiny of its functions.
- 6.6 In response, members noted that the City Region Board was a partnership that was established by Leadership Gloucestershire and comprised all the districts, GCC, the LEP, the University and wide range of partners to coordinate activity in terms of growth of the county as a single functioning economic unit. At this stage the Board had only met once so it would potentially be better for scrutiny to become involved when the Board was more established.
- 6.7 In terms of its decision making powers and access to funding, it was advised that it was a partnership rather than a statutory committee that had power designated to it, which meant it was unable to make any decisions as a collective, and any decisions made needed to come from one of its partners. Likewise with any funding bids, these would need to be sponsored by one of the partners as a formal body, on behalf of the Board. Its aim was to provide a forum in terms of Gloucestershire's overall economic growth, coordination of activity and contribution to bodies such as Western Gateway.
- 6.8 Officers suggested that the best way to involve scrutiny at this early stage would be to make the Committee one of the consultees on the developing prospectus, which will govern the work and governance arrangements for the Board going forward.

ACTION: Steve Mawson/Mike Dawson

- 6.9 The Chair confirmed that this Committee should have an active role in understanding the relationship between the different economic growth bodies in the county (Western Gateway, Leadership Gloucestershire and the City Region Board), how they all work together, coordinated and were governed.
- 6.10 A question was posed, in relation to the Cyber Central development, that given the current circumstances of most office based companies working from home, should the project be exploring the fundamental question of whether the physical presence of the Cyber Central development in terms of office space etc. had now become outdated.
- 6.11 Officers recognised this was a very valid point in terms of how our office working had changed due to the pandemic. It was understood however from ongoing local and national data that post-Covid, companies were likely to

return to a blended approach of online and in-person working. The hub being developed at Cyber Central offered an opportunity for companies to work and operate from the same space, as well as mixing with others in their sector. Without this development, Gloucestershire as a whole currently had a woeful supply of good quality office space to offer.

- 6.12 Referencing the development of the Statement of Common Ground, a member noted a comment about the Leadership Board and its involvement in this process. It was questioned how this Committee could scrutinise the work of this Board.
- 6.13 Members noted that this was an informal group that came together to discuss the Statement. It was made up of the leaders and lead members for planning at all six councils, and simply provided an opportunity to discuss and make amendments to the Statement. The actual adoption of the Statement, once finalised, would need to be done by the individual councils themselves, it was only being coordinated by the GEGJC. It would therefore lead that each councils own scrutiny function would consider the implications of the Statement.
- 6.14 Again in light of the Covid impacts on businesses, a member questioned how we would be adapting and developing the Growth Hub offer to take account of these changes. Officers advised that the offer continued to evolve all the time. Not only will changes come from the pandemic impacts, but also as the Hubs work with new and different business and trend changes in society. The big opportunity now was for the Hubs to provide that flexible working space previously discussed.
- 6.15 Members heard that there were a whole host of mechanisms in place to make sure information was being shared across the Hub network, and also back to the governance Boards to ensure the projects were performing how expected. It was highlighted that the Committee were due to consider an item on Growth Hub Governance in March.

7. SOCIAL MOBILITY

- 7.1 This item included two separate reports; the Chair first introduced Jon McGinty, Managing Director of Gloucester City Council, to give an update on the social mobility group work. Members viewed a presentation (copy attached) and noted the following points:
- There was no universally accepted definition of what we mean by social mobility. In overall terms, we would describe it as making sure everyone had an opportunity to build a good life for themselves regardless of their background or every individual having a fair chance of reaching their potential.

- Whilst it was generally accepted that some level of social mobility had a positive impact on society, there was also no universally accepted benchmark to measure against in terms of how much was good or bad.
- It was widely acknowledged by society that unfortunately where you start in life still had a big impact on where you ended up e.g. in terms of your income, class or geography.
- The [Social Mobility Commission](#) was a non-departmental public agency of Govt. which had been created under the Life Chances Act 2010.
- In 2017, the Commission produced a report, [Social Mobility in Great Britain](#) which, for the first time, defined a list of 16 indicators to measure social mobility which they used to rank every local authority area in the UK.
- The report showed that only one area in Gloucestershire (Stroud) ranked within the top 20% of authorities for having good social mobility. Three areas in the county ranked in the bottom 20%.
- Following a meeting of Leadership Gloucestershire in 2018, it was agreed that a task group would be set up to look into these findings. A group was formed which included representatives from across the county's authorities and organisations.
- The first slide showed a brief timeline of the work that was undertaken. It was noted however that the progress was slow as all participants were doing so in addition to their normal job.
- Between 2019-2020 the group carried out various pieces of analysis and research, including visiting other areas of the country that had some success in tackling aspects of social mobility.
- Towards the end of 2019, the group were able to secure some resource in the form of a researcher from GCC to start an initial review of all the indicators, with a view of then narrowing in on a smaller set of indicators where the group would carry out a deep dive and produce some recommendations.
- In early 2020, following this initial review, the group agreed to focus on the following three areas:
 - Early years interventions and activities;
 - Key Stage 3 issues in educational terms; and
 - Youth, and progress to higher educational phases.
- Unfortunately, the group met on 11 March 2020 which was when Covid hit and the work had not progressed since then. The researcher from GCC was a public health officer so that support was also lost.
- In September 2020, the Commission produced a new report ([The Long Shadow of Deprivation](#)) which looked at social mobility from a different angle, following where an individual's average earnings had reached 10-20 years after they left education.

- This new report however did not show any areas in Gloucestershire as being within the least socially mobile areas, and actually identified the Cotswolds as being one of the most socially mobile areas in the country, when it had previously ranked within the bottom 20%.
 - The task group shared their initial research with the Commission late last year and had now been asked to join a group of local authorities to start some joined up work across the country post-Covid.
 - It remained their ambition to bring a full report back to Leadership Gloucestershire as soon as this was viable.
- 7.2 The Committee thanked Jon for the detailed and very interesting update on work done so far.
- 7.3 It was questioned whether the impact of a reduction in youth work and youth support had been noticed in the initial research. It was advised that the group needed to gather more data to approve or deny this statement, but it was certainly something they anecdotally could see having an impact.
- 7.4 Looking back at the RAG rating against the 16 indicators from the first Commission report, members were advised that there were a lot of red indicators in early years i.e. we were aware that there were a number of children in the county had not reached a good level of development by the time they started primary school.
- 7.5 The indicators then improved at primary school level, which would reflect the fact that most primary schools in the county had good or outstanding Ofsted ratings. The red indicators then returned when reaching secondary school and youth age groups.
- 7.6 Welcoming the research to date, a member questioned what the next stage was, and how the group planned to go from useful and interesting research into something that became transformational for our communities. In response, the Committee noted that the group were very focused on making sure this was a data driven piece of work to give as much weight to the resulting recommendations as possible. It would be key to reinstate a researcher to continue the deeper dive into the three identified areas.
- 7.7 The group appreciated that if there was a simple answer to this, it would have been found by now so they expected the outcomes of this research to be very complex, but with some easier more immediate actions that could be taken as well. These recommendations would then be fed back to the membership of Leadership Gloucestershire to take forward.
- 7.8 On the topic of selective grammar schools in the county, it was queried whether the scope would cover such fundamental questions such as the

effectiveness of selective schooling on social mobility. In response, members noted that one of the representatives on the group was a head teacher from one of the grammar schools, who had reported their shock at the small number of children at the local primary schools that had aspirations to go to one of the county's grammar schools.

ACTION: Share data discussed at the meeting

- 7.9 An officer comment reinforced that even though this issue started with the word 'social' it was actually really couched in the success of the economy and making sure that every resident was able to benefit from and contribute to the success of their own economy. Noting this, it was suggested that the group may want to make a bid to the SEDF for their researcher resource.
- 7.10 The next presentation was received from an organisation called the Power of 3. The Committee were joined by Dawn Barnes (Secretary of the Matson, Robinswood and White City Community Partnership), Bob Allen (Chair of the Matson, Robinswood and White City Community Partnership) and Dr Iain Riddell (advisor/consultant of the partnership). The Committee noted the following points from their presentation:
- The Partnership started as a council initiative in the early 2000 and enabled the communities to coordinate a number of civic society groups and a legacy of community activity, whilst also having a place to discuss issues and opportunities.
 - In 2015/16 the Partnership received a small Govt. grant which enabled them to produce a local community economic plan focused on social mobility and people's wellbeing. The plan brought three very distinct communities together, Matson, Robinswood and White City in Gloucester. It became known as the Power of 3.
 - Slide 4 outlined the first phase of the Power of Three which included aims such as changing how others in the City and the County looked upon the three communities and more importantly, how the communities saw themselves.
 - An example of the Partnership's early work was an awards evening celebrating what was good in the communities, what residents gave to the estate and to each other.
 - Following a successful rollout of phase 1 priorities, the Partnership refocused their efforts from 2019 to phase 2 (detailed on slide 5).
 - The first priority focused on acknowledging the fact that the communities had a wealth of skills, which were often unrecognised and undervalued, as well as many residents only able to live day to day financially and being time poor. The Partnership wanted to provide more doorstep opportunities for training and development.

- The second focused on regeneration, which was seen as more than just about homes, but about parks, open spaces and the opportunities that came with it. It recognised that it was the residents of the communities who were the stakeholders of regenerations in their areas.
- Thirdly, the Partnership were very aware and not shying away from the challenging future in respect of climate change. All of its flagship projects would aim to pave the way for how development can still be done in a carbon neutral environment. It recognised however the need for a joined up policy approach to raising money for retrofitting and restoring existing housing stock and community buildings.
- The fourth priority recognised that many community projects across the ward were not seen for the assets that they were. This social imbalance had been massively brought to the forefront by Covid and had enabled the Partnership to hit the ground running in responding and providing that community support throughout the pandemic.
- It was stressed that community organisations were often left fire fighting to keep their doors open due to being left out of commissioning and funding opportunities. It was felt frustrating and counter productive for groups who knew what they were doing worked for their community, having to change the way they did things just to meet different funding criteria bids. For sustained change, communities needed longer term investment.
- The fifth priority was based around the knowledge that when people were actively involved in their community, it made them stronger.
- Finally, it was recognised that children from poorer backgrounds had worse educational attainment and completed education significantly disadvantaged to others. This also referenced how digital exclusion had been magnified tenfold by Covid and it was vital to address this.
- The final slide focused on the concept of Social Capital.
- Similar to the data presented in the first part of this item, the Partnership had worked through a number of statistics to try and understand the social mobility impacts in data form at ward level.
- It was learnt, among other things, that the primary schools in the ward, did not have enough spaces for all of the children inside the ward. In addition, the level of free school meal uptake was heavily condensed inside the ward's primary schools as opposed to elsewhere in the City.
- What this showed therefore was if parents in the ward could afford to do so, had access to a car etc. they were following a social mobility agenda in terms of taking their child to schools outside the ward.
- The county should be mindful of the relationship between social mobility and its understanding of Adverse Childhood Experiences. Areas in these wards were likely to experience cycles of poverty that families would go

through generation after generation. It was this passage of complex situations that undermined resident's ability to take part in social mobility that needed to be addressed.

- Research showed that economic opportunity was thwarted by a lack of knowledge and understanding. It was vital therefore that when councils were think through policies to assist residents to reach economic potential, that it was not a generic 'one size fits' countywide model but very specific approaches for individual areas.
- Because of the way the economics in the ward were structured, the Partnership were aware that there was a low number of residents who had higher education qualifications, which transpired into a low level of high skilled jobs. Schools in the ward therefore needed to be mindful that a career talk on high skilled jobs would not be enough on its own to support children in understanding and navigating the avenues to reach the higher skills and qualifications needed.
- An example was given of the Partnership trying to organise for a group of children and young people to visit the University of Gloucestershire's art department during the summer holidays to understand what university life might be like, and where a career in arts might take them. Unfortunately this concept never went anywhere due to a lack of understanding of the purpose behind it. The Partnership were now exploring other avenues.

- 7.11 It was questioned whether the Partnership had any initiatives related to numeracy skills, which was acknowledged to be one of the main barriers for moving into many career paths. It was advised that the Partnership did not have any after school work clubs in the community as this was part of a broader issue about effective engagement between the local schools and the community needs.
- 7.12 Reference was also made to the increased pressure on parents, due to the need to emergency home school during the pandemic, of understanding and being able to support their children when they themselves may lack the skill levels to do so. It was mentioned earlier that there was a real need for adult education provisions in the wards, like community colleges used to serve, but this had to be something that would fit with the reality of being a parent working full time etc.
- 7.13 A member asked how the Partnership measured their work. It was noted that producing data at a ward level was not easy and it would be much better if they had a baseline to work from first, but this remained a challenge. They do however work closely with Gloucester Gateway Trust as the ward was one the Trust's target areas. The Trust carried out an annual survey of their areas which helped give the Partnership an idea of progress and the direction they were moving in.

- 7.14 It was suggested that social mobility in the past had been seen to increase when society experienced episodes that disrupted the normal process. It may therefore be that the current pandemic had a positive impact in the long terms on some aspects such as the lack of school examinations. This may mean businesses in the future could refocus on who they want to employ, rather than relying on examination certificates.
- 7.15 Members acknowledged that cross-county communication of similar community groups was vital. Sharing knowledge and experience between different wards would avoid duplicating work loads and community groups forming a much stronger base. This cross working also needed to include county partners such as GCC, the LEP and the City Region Board.

8. LOCAL HOUSING

- 8.1 Mike Dawson, Chair of the GEGJC Senior Officer Group, advised members that the attached report was an annual update which drew together states of play across all districts in terms of strategic plan positions and future developments, covering a wide range of issues from housing to transport. It was the same report that the GEGJC considered at their last meeting so members were mindful some of the information may be out of date.
- 8.2 The Committee noted the report, but it was highlighted that the table under 7.1 of the report was now incorrect due to the newly issued housing numbers from Government.

9. TAXI LICENSING TASK GROUP REPORT

- 9.1 Cllr Kate Haigh, as Chair of the Taxi Licensing Task Group, introduced the report and members noted the following points:
- The task group was set up by this Committee and the report had been considered at the GEGJC meeting this morning. As scrutiny would normally consider task group reports first, members of the GEGJC were aware that if there were any comments or amendments coming out of this meeting, it would be fed back to them before any recommendations were acted on.
 - As taxi and vehicle licensing in the county was a responsibility of the district council, the GEGJC seemed the most appropriate platform for the recommendations to be presented, as all the leaders of the districts were members of the GEGJC and could therefore take the recommendations back to their respective council. There were some recommendations that came within GCC's responsibility so this report would also be presented to Cabinet the following week.
 - The task group had some very wide ranging discussions as taxi and vehicle licensing affected a number of areas, not just the licensing

aspects and these were always considered in a Gloucestershire-wide context.

- The ambition of the task group arose from the economic contribution of in the taxi and licensing trade and the potential major impacts of changes coming through the system on how that trade worked in the future, for example, app based private hire.
- District councils were within their right to have different approaches to how they manage this process but there was experience around the country of some authorities who suffered from neighbouring authorities having different standards for example, allowing licenses where they had been revoke under another local authority, but drivers returning to operate in the town/city where they had been disqualified.
- There were increasing examples in other parts of the country where drivers were working in larger cities that were sometimes thousands of miles away from where they had been awarded their license.
- The group tried to adopt a medium pressure approach across the areas considered, in order to not disadvantage the more rural areas who suffered different impacts compared to the urban towns.
- An example was given here of the inevitable move to electric vehicles within the trade that may have a bigger impact in our rural communities who already suffered from a lack of availability.
- The recommendation for all authorities to sign up to the NR3 offered a really good tool for licensing officers to see if there were any red flags when considering new drivers for licenses.
- The group hoped these recommendations were a good step to having a joined up approach across the county that would benefit our economy and residents.

9.2 Another member of the task group informed the Committee that the work undertaken really highlighted to the differing challenges across our urban and rural areas, and also the need to take some of the existing initiatives even further, such as disability access and electric vehicle take up. It was also appreciated that all of these changes cost drivers money, which made it difficult to invest in if they operated in a low level activity area.

9.3 In addition, it was viewed that as a society, we do undervalue the cost of travel. We tend to make a comparison with travelling in a private car and assume a taxi trade should be operating at a small multiplier of that. But when you add up all the costs of transport, it simply was not viable for the trade to do so. We needed to better appreciate that transport should reflect the true cost of travel, including all environmental and safety factors. It was felt that the task group meetings alone had moved towards greater cooperation across the county in this area.

- 9.4 At this morning's GEGJC meeting, it was agreed that the Chief Executives from all six districts would identify a senior officer to support the licensing group in exploring these recommendations, recognising that if they were going to be implemented, there was a need for senior support to do so. At member level, this was the first example of a piece of cross-county work in this area which was very positive.
- 9.5 The Committee approved for the report to go forward to the districts to explore the recommendations.

10. GOVERNANCE OF THE LEP

- 10.1 David Owen, Chief Executive of the GFirst LEP, took the report as read and added that the LEP had enjoyed a really excellent relationship with GCC as the Accountable Body for a number of years now. It effectively ensures the money of the LEP Board was being spent in the right way, and the Section 151 officer now attended the LEP Board meeting which was a positive step.
- 10.2 It was relatively unusual for LEP's to have the level of engagement we have in Gloucestershire through different bodies such as the Health and Wellbeing Board, the City Region Board and Leadership Gloucestershire. This had a really positive impact on cross working throughout the county and allowed the LEP to have early understanding and engagement on economic growth issues.
- 10.3 A member raised concern regarding a project that had been awarded EU funding facilitated by the LEP that had not delivered what it had set out to. It was reassured that the LEP held all of its projects to account monthly, quarterly and annually in great detail, right from the beginning. The member was asked to contact the officer offline to look further into the specific project they were concerned about. The programme management group also met very regularly and a lot of its work focused on holding projects to account and dealing with any arising issues.

ACTION: Mally Findlater

***Post meeting note:** Following the meeting the member emailed the LEP with the details of the project she was asking about. It was confirmed that this was one funded under the EAFRD strand of ESIF funding. In this strand, the LEP has a very limited role in commenting on the strategic fit and value for money of projects that come forward for consideration. They do not select, fund or monitor any projects thereafter. This is done by MHCLG. Contact details were provided.*

- 10.4 LEP officers asked for the Committee to provide a direction on what they would like to look into on this topic as there was a plethora of information that could be shared. The Chair confirmed that an executive summary would be useful on how the LEP performed over the last financial year with its allocated funding.

- 10.5 A member advised that a growing concern among many was the concept of ethical investing (which manifested itself in a philosophy called Economic Social Governance) i.e. people did not want their money being investment in fossil fuels for example. It was questioned whether this issue was on the LEP's radar in terms of their partnership in projects and also encouraging other businesses in Gloucestershire to do the same.
- 10.6 In response, members noted that the LEP did not hold any money or directly invest any itself. The funding from Govt. for projects was held by the Accountable Body. The Board was however actively looking into how its decision making, and its ability to influence other businesses making their decisions, could be improved by further knowledge and understanding of the impacts. Going forward, this work would help better inform the LEP to make ethically and environmentally sound decisions.

11. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- 11.1 The Committee noted that given the magnitude of the recent flood events in the county (over the 2020 festive period), the flood team at GCC responded incredibly well and were then non-stop right through January as well, due to the increased need for gritting afterwards.
- 11.2 The flooding experienced was of a very different nature to what Gloucestershire normally had as it resulted from surface water run off, not fluvial flooding from overflowing rivers. Four weeks worth of rain for that time of year fell in 24 hours, on top of some of the wettest months beforehand, meaning the ground was just too saturated to absorb anymore rainfall. The team were currently building up a database of where the flooding happened, to look at how and where they could carry out improvements for the future. This would not however provide an easy or predictable solution for the future due to the 'perfect storm' circumstances that were at play and the fact the flooding was largely due to surface water run-off which with the right conditions can occur almost anywhere.

CHAIR

Meeting concluded at 16:00.

This page is intentionally left blank

Timeline

Social Mobility
Commission
report

2018

Analysis and
Research

2021

Page 1



2017

Leadership
Gloucestershire
discussion

2019-20

Next steps?

Minute Item 7



Social Mobility
Commission

State of the Nation 2017: Social Mobility in Great Britain



November 2017

Social mobility task group

County Council:

Public Health (Zoe Clifford)

Education (Pete Carr, Sarah Hylton,
Jane Lloyd-Davies)

Page

District Councils:

Gloucester (Jon McGinty, Anne Brinkhoff)

Cheltenham (Richard Gibson, Tracy Brown)

Cotswold/Forest of Dean (Christine Gore)

Stroud (Steve Miles)

Schools:

- G15 (Peter Rowland)
- Ribston Hall (Sarah Colombini)

Further and Higher Education:

- Uni of Glos (Becky Tomkin)
- GlosCol (Matt Burgess)

Gfirst LEP: Katie Jenkins

OPCC: Chris Brierley/Damon Blanchford

This page is intentionally left blank