

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
GMCA OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY HELD WEDNESDAY 11 FEBRUARY 2026 AT
THE TOOTAL BUILDINGS - BROADHURST HOUSE, 1ST FLOOR, 56 OXFORD
STREET, MANCHESTER, M1 6EU**

PRESENT:

Councillor John Walsh	Bolton Council (Chair)
Councillor Peter Wright	Bolton Council
Councillor Imran Rizvi	Bury Council
Councillor Basil Curley	Manchester City Council
Councillor John Leech	Manchester City Council
Councillor Mandie Shilton Godwin	Manchester City Council
Councillor Colin McLaren	Oldham Council
Councillor Ken Rustidge	Oldham Council
Councillor Dylan Williams	Rochdale Council
Councillor Terry Smith	Rochdale Council
Councillor Tony Davies	Salford City Council
Councillor Lewis Nelson	Salford City Council
Councillor Helen Hibbert	Stockport Council
Councillor Sangita Patel	Tameside Council
Councillor David Sweeton	Tameside Council
Councillor Jill Axford	Trafford Council
Councillor Sean Ennis	Trafford Council
Councillor Nathan Evans	Trafford Council
Councillor Mary Callaghan	Wigan Council

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillor David Molyneux	GM Portfolio Lead for Resources & Investment
---------------------------	--

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Matt Bull	Finance and Corporate Service Director, Transport for Greater Manchester
Karen Chambers	Senior Governance and Scrutiny Officer, GMCA
Alison Chew	Network Director Bus, Transport for Greater Manchester
Karen Macrae	Head of Finance, Transport for Greater Manchester
Steve Warrener	Managing Director, Transport for Greater Manchester
Steve Wilson	Group Chief Finance Officer

O&SC 01/26

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Will Jones (Trafford).

Apologies were also received from Caroline Simpson, Group Chief Executive and Gillian Duckworth, Group Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

O&SC 02/26

CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised on his approach to the format for questions, noting that the Committee would consider each of the five items in turn, following which there would be an opportunity for questions.

The Chair provided an update in relation to a recent meeting of the Combined Authorities Scrutiny Chairs' Forum. He explained that a key topic of discussion was the growing number of Mayoral Development Corporations (MDC's), with three agreed at the last Combined Authority meeting. He advised that, unless scrutiny arrangements were fully embedded written in from the start, there was no formal way for this Committee to be able to provide scrutiny and oversight. He advised

members he had raised this with the GM Mayor and stressed the need for transparency and accountability. He added that the Group Solicitor and Monitoring Officer was looking at how scrutiny could be built into future arrangements.

RESOLVED /-

That the Chair's announcements be noted.

O&SC 03/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

RESOLVED /-

No declarations were received in relation to any item on the agenda.

**O&SC 04/26 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 JANUARY
2026**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2026 were submitted for consideration.

RESOLVED /-

That the minutes of the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 28 January 2026 be approved as a correct and accurate record subject to the following amendment:

Members noted that the proposals represented a 7% increase for the Fire and Rescue Service and a 44% increase for other Mayoral General functions, and sought clarification on whether, given the new three-year funding settlement, similar levels of increase should be expected over the remainder of the period, or whether the proposal frontloaded financial pressures such that lower proportionate increases might be anticipated in future years.

Councillor David Molyneux, GM Portfolio Lead for Resources & Investment, presented a report which provided the Committee with the proposed GMCA budgets for 2026/27. The report summarised the position on the Mayoral General Budget and Precept Proposals, The GMCA General Budget, GMCA Transport budgets including Transport Levy and Statutory Charge and the Greater Manchester (GM) Waste Services Levy. The reports set out the implications of the proposed budgets and the resultant charges on the ten GM local authorities and the Mayoral Precept.

The Group Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the budgets proposals would be presented to the GMCA on Friday 13 February 2026. He advised that the first paper provided a strategic overview, drawing together the key recommendations from the five accompanying reports. He explained that, although presented separately, the reports reflected the Combined Authority's collective legal roles and responsibilities and should not be viewed as operating in isolation. It was noted that the work programme for 2026/27 would continue to align activity across all functions, maintaining a clear link to the Greater Manchester Strategy (GMS) and its Delivery Plan.

GMCA Revenue and Capital Budgets 2026/27 Overview – The Group Chief Finance Officer reported that the GMCA budget had been presented differently this year, with proposals structured around the seven workstreams and two cross-cutting priorities of the GMS. He advised that the Combined Authority would be asked to approve the overall budget at its meeting on Friday, including confirmation of the three levies charged to local authorities. He added that the Waste Levy was increasing by an average of 4%, reduced from the previously forecast 7.3% through joint work with districts; the Transport Levy was increasing by 3%, which equated to a 2% rise compared with actual payments in 2025/26 owing to the removal of a 1% non-recurrent element; and the GMCA General Levy was being reduced by £2m as part of an accelerated plan to remove the levy

entirely from April 2026. He further confirmed the associated precept proposals of a £19 increase for the Mayoral General (non-fire) precept and a £6 increase for the Fire precept. He clarified that the police budget was not within the remit of the GMCA, having been scrutinised and approved separately by the Police, Crime and Fire Panel, which had agreed a £15 precept increase in January.

In addition to aligning all budget proposals with the GMS, a key focus across the papers had been to minimise the financial impact on local authorities during a period of significant uncertainty in national funding. He reported that levy increases have been kept as low as possible, particularly within waste, where inflationary pressures linked to the contract continued to be felt, and within transport, where alternative funding sources, including the Mayoral precept, were being used to limit the call on local authorities. He also confirmed that the GMCA running cost levy had been reduced to zero from 2026/27 and highlighted proposals to return waste reserves to local authorities, including an anticipated £10m underspend in 2025/26 and a further £10m of historic reserves in 2026/27. He noted that individual budget papers also contained specific recommendations for approval, particularly within transport and capital.

Members asked for clarification on an expected date of returning the waste underspend to local authorities, given that the early reimbursement would be extremely helpful for local budgets. Officers confirmed that the intention was to return the 2025/26 waste underspend to local authorities (excluding Wigan as they have their own waste arrangements) within the current financial year, with the 2026/27 quarter one amounts to follow thereafter.

Mayoral General Budget & Precept Proposals 2026/27 – The Group Chief Finance Officer advised that the report set out the Mayor’s proposals for the Mayoral General Budget (including Fire and Rescue). He advised that the report was discussed at the last meeting, and the only changes to note were that the final council tax base and the confirmed council tax and business rates surplus/deficit figures had been updated, resulting in an amendment of approximately £400,000. He advised that, aside from the

updated numbers, the budget remained substantively the same as the version scrutinised by the Committee on 28 January 2026.

GMCA Revenue Budget 2023/27 – Delivering the GMS – The Group Chief Finance Officer explained that the GMCA General Revenue Budget covered functions devolved to GM through successive devolution agreements, alongside the corporate costs of the Combined Authority. He noted that this area of the budget was most directly shaped by the new multi-year Integrated Settlement and the GMS, with funding drawn from a mix of integrated settlement grant, other government grants, retained business rates and recharges to other GMCA budgets. He highlighted that corporate costs had reduced in order to support the removal of the district levy and to release funding for future investment, with all departments delivering a 5% efficiency in 2025/26. He advised that detailed workstream budgets aligned to the GMS would continue to come forward through the year as individual programmes developed.

Members asked whether any consideration had been given to reducing property costs, particularly in relation to land and buildings. Officers stated that work was already underway to explore opportunities to reduce property costs across the wider public-sector estate, including GMCA, Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service, and Greater Manchester Police. The work also included assessing options for shared buildings, reduced footprints, and co-location of operational response services. A strategic review of the wider group estate would continue over the coming year, with updates to be brought back to the Committee when appropriate. Existing examples of shared use between partners were highlighted and further opportunities may arise through discussions with local authorities and NHS colleagues as older buildings reach the end of their operational life. Members asked whether the fire and rescue service and the police had moved on from working in silos and now recognised the need to share facilities more effectively, particularly in relation to land and buildings within the wider public-sector estate. Officers confirmed that joint estate planning was already underway across GM, noting that collaboration between services had improved and that the wider GM group, including Fire and Rescue, Greater Manchester Police, and TfGM, was actively

exploring opportunities to share buildings, reduce estate footprints and modernise ageing facilities. They advised that population changes were also influencing future estate requirements and confirmed that a more strategic, cross-organisation estates review would be taken forward in the coming year. Officers also confirmed that while the integrated settlement did not directly change the operational options under discussion, it did provide greater certainty around core GMCA funding. Officers advised that these factors, combined with the evolution of partnership working and the implementation of the GMS, were enabling a more collective and coordinated approach across services.

Members stated that it was difficult to understand how budget allocations aligned with the GMS, noting that current reports did not always show whether funding reflected ongoing commitments, one-off pilots or the scale of delivery expected. It was suggested that future reports could present this information in a clearer format, or whether a supplementary report was needed to show how investment mapped against the GMS delivery plan. Officers explained that the paper set out funding for the GMS rather than a delivery report, and that scrutiny would receive in-year deep dives on specific areas demonstrating how spend aligns to one-year and medium-term plans. Updates would also be provided against the GMS Delivery Plan milestones approved in November, and that a medium-term plan covering the three-year settlement period (2026/27–2028/29) would be brought forward to supplement the one-year budget. The Chair confirmed that a GMS quarterly update was scheduled for the Committee meeting taking place on 25 March.

Members emphasised the importance of ensuring that the commitment to creating high-quality jobs was reflected in the programme, noting previous work by the Task and Finish Group on integrated water management and the potential for a joint apprenticeship scheme across GMCA, local authorities, the Environment Agency, and other partners. They expressed concern that the current job allocations did not appear to demonstrate progress on this and asked officers to revisit the issue and report back. The Chair noted that the GMS quarterly update was scheduled for a future meeting, which would provide an opportunity to explore this further.

Members commented that it was difficult to assess the overall impact of certain budget areas without clearer information on the outcomes they delivered. Officers explained that while some programmes sit clearly within individual GMS workstreams, many activities cut across several areas, making it difficult to allocate funding in a strictly linear way. Investment aligned to high-quality jobs, for example, also supported related priorities in environment, place and skills. Officers emphasised that the workstreams were highly interconnected and that forthcoming deep-dives and updates against the GMS Delivery Plan would provide greater clarity on how funding and outcomes were shared across these cross-cutting themes.

Members asked how the GMCA budget integrated with local authority budgets, particularly in relation to compulsory purchase of land. They sought clarification on how GMCA and local authorities worked together on such matters, noting that while collaboration was essential, there might be occasions where differing positions or conflicts arose, and they were keen to understand how these would be managed. Officers confirmed that all GMCA budgets were dependent on activity delivered within the ten local authority areas, and this was particularly true for place-based programmes. Capital investment through the Good Growth Fund was driven entirely by local authority submissions, as projects could only enter the pipeline through a council-led proposal. Officers added that wider spatial planning work, such as Places for Everyone, also guided decisions, alongside other mechanisms including Mayoral Development Corporations and Mayoral Development Zones, which required the right balance of Mayoral and local authority powers. Stockport's Mayoral Development Corporation was highlighted as an example of how combining local capacity with GMCA input, and Mayoral powers where needed, had successfully enabled delivery, stressing that the GM approach was always to optimise joint working rather than operate in isolation.

Members highlighted the importance of ensuring that investment linked to the high-quality jobs workstream translated into collaborative action across GM. They welcomed the positive examples included in the budget papers, such as early years initiatives and support programmes, but stressed that delivery required strong

cross-boundary working between local authorities, as residents moved between areas. Members therefore asked how GMCA and local authorities would work together to ensure a coordinated approach that moved the whole conurbation forward. Officers explained that devolution of functions such as the adult education budget had strengthened alignment with the high-quality jobs workstream, and that programmes like Live Well supported multiple outcomes, linking wellbeing with skills and employment.

Members asked how the Greener Future for Everyone theme could be meaningfully quantified across workstreams, noting that environmental actions and funding were spread throughout the programme rather than contained in a single line, and how GMCA could show what was being spent on environmental priorities when these contributions were embedded across multiple budgets. Officers explained that although the Greener Future for Everyone theme was cross-cutting, it still had a significant dedicated budget, with over £5m allocated in its own right. They highlighted that many environmental measures also sat within other workstreams, such as transport electrification and green space projects, meaning the overall investment was much larger than the standalone figure. Officers added that, as part of GMS delivery, each workstream would be assessed through both an environmental and equalities lens to ensure programmes were planned and delivered in a sustainable and inclusive way.

GMCA Transport Revenue Budget 2026/27 – The Group Chief Finance Officer and officers from Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) explained that the GMCA Transport Budget covered a wider range of responsibilities than those delivered directly by TfGM, as significant transport infrastructure sat on the Combined Authority's balance sheet and was funded through the Transport Levy. Overall transport funding was drawn from four main sources: the Transport Levy and fixed Statutory Charge; Mayoral funding, including the precept; Government funding now consolidated through the Integrated Settlement; and farebox revenue held within operational budgets. The Levy and Statutory Charge together totalled £216.6m for 2026/27 and that the multi-year Integrated Settlement now provided

three years of certainty for transport. This funding stability provided for a clearer medium-term financial strategy for the Bee Network and wider transport system.

Members asked about the sustainability of the transport budget, seeking clarity on three points: whether ongoing Clean Air costs were expected to reduce, and how much related to legacy commitments rather than new vehicle or infrastructure upgrades; when the £6m financing costs, presumed to relate to borrowing for depot and fleet investments, might reduce; and how sustainable the funding model was given that only around 40% of income came from passenger revenue, expressing concern that any reduction in Government funding could increase pressure on district budgets, which currently had no flexibility. Officers confirmed that some Clean Air costs related to closing out older contracts, reducing over time, while the majority of future spend reflected new investment in zero-emission buses and related infrastructure. Some historic TfGM financing costs would fall away as older assets were paid down, though wider CA-level capital financing would remain due to ongoing infrastructure needs. Members were advised that although only around 40% of income was generated via fares, revenue was growing and the multi-year integrated settlement, efficiency measures and a built-in contingency helped stabilise the medium-term financial position.

Members asked when more information on the proposed overnight visitor levy would be available, including information on how the scheme would operate, its impact on businesses, and how any revenue would be used, stressing that early clarity would support informed decision-making. Officers explained that this was still at the Government-consultation stage and that key details, particularly those requiring primary legislation, were awaited. Implementation was unlikely before April 2028, meaning it would not impact the 2026/27 budget and would only marginally likely to affect 2027/28. Once national parameters were set, GMCA would then undertake local design work, with the Committee playing an important role in shaping how the levy would operate across GM.

Members noted that while there was much to welcome in the transport proposals, a major unresolved issue was how the strategy would address the volume of cars and

widespread pavement parking, along with the impact this had on active travel, pedestrian safety, and bus reliability. They questioned whether future budgets would include support for local authorities to enforce forthcoming pavement-parking legislation, particularly in older streets where cars cannot be fully accommodated off-road and asked what provision would be made to manage the practical challenges this would create, including better coordination of roadworks to reduce obstructions for pedestrians and people with disabilities. Officers acknowledged the challenges and confirmed that no specific budget allocation had been made this year for enforcement or support relating to pavement parking but highlighted that GM Leaders had commissioned a new highways review group, chaired by Councillor O'Brien, to examine congestion, governance, pavement parking and wider operational pressures, with updates to be brought to the Committee. Officers added that wider work to coordinate roadworks was already underway and emphasised that increasing public confidence in the safety of the transport network remained a central organisational priority, supported by measures such as the TravelSafe Live Chat system, additional enforcement officers and dedicated work with GMP, particularly on women's and girls' safety, with further improvements to continue wherever possible. Officers acknowledged the necessity for additional deliberation regarding pavement parking and committed to providing an update to the Committee at a later date.

Members stated that it was difficult to judge whether the budget aligned with the GM Transport Strategy and asked for a benchmarked view to show if spend was on target. They also sought assurance on volatility and stress-testing, particularly the risk to passenger revenue if the £2 fare cap ended, and the implications for reserves and potential pressure on local authority budgets. Officers confirmed that the budget represented a step towards the longer-term ambitions set out in the GMS, with funding in this year's plan contributing to commitments such as progressing towards a zero-emission fleet. Members were assured that budgets were fully risk-assessed and stress-tested, noting that reserves and contingency plans were in place to manage volatility, although no budget could fully account for extreme events such as COVID. Officers added that future GMS updates to the Committee would show more clearly how transport activity supported wider

outcomes across the strategy. Members stated that it was particularly difficult to judge progress against the GM Transport Strategy without clear indicators showing how current spending matched the scale of commitments, such as the Mayor's ambition for expanded bus routes by 2025. They suggested that, similar to the annual Green Summit, headline data showing whether transport delivery was on track would greatly support effective scrutiny.

Members stressed that while the report was welcomed, safety, affordability and sustained investment were essential if more people were to shift from cars to public transport. They highlighted the importance of maintaining initiatives such as the £2 fare cap and removing pre-9:30 restrictions, noting the value of these measures to residents, particularly during the ongoing cost-of-living pressures, and expressed a desire to see fares potentially reduced further in future years. Officers responded that safety remained a significant barrier to public transport use and outlined recent improvements, including the TravelSafe Live Chat system, increased Transport Safety Enforcement Officers on the network, and the creation of a dedicated 11th GMP district for the Bee Network, funded through the Mayoral precept, to strengthen policing and passenger confidence. Officers also noted the availability of other good-value ticketing options, such as day, weekly, monthly, and annual passes, including those accessed via credit unions, and suggested these products required wider promotion, with support from local authorities, to ensure residents could access the best value available.

Members asked why the budget line for traffic signals remained unchanged, noting that signal failures affected buses and public transport as much as general traffic. They also sought clarification on what was included within the scheme development budget line. Officers explained that the traffic signals budget was an operational cost that TfGM managed through efficiencies, with any additional pressures handled through contingency. The scheme development line referred to the revenue needed to design and prepare future capital projects.

GM Waste and Resources – Budget and Levy 2026/27 - The Group Chief Finance Officer reported that the GMCA delivered the waste disposal function, with

household waste recycling centres operated under the extended SUEZ contract and noted that 2026/27 was the first full year of the new contractual arrangements. They explained that cost increases arising from the contract and inflationary indexation had been mitigated through revised capital profiling, operational efficiencies, and updated forecasts for income from recycled materials and from energy generation at the Runcom facility, enabling the levy increase to be contained at an average of 4%. He also highlighted the volatility of both recycled material income and energy-from-waste revenues and drew attention to the implications of national Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) reforms, which were expected to provide around £21m in 2026/27, with the majority expected to be passed to districts and the balance held in reserve. He further advised that the sector faced future cost pressures from the planned introduction of the Emissions Trading Scheme in 2028, which would impose carbon-related costs on energy-from-waste operations. It was noted that it was unclear whether Government would provide new burdens funding to offset these additional costs and that reserves were being managed to help prepare for the potential financial impact, which could broadly offset the value of EPR income if no such funding was provided.

Members asked about the level of risk within the new SUEZ waste contract, noting that it is indexed to RPI and CPI, and raised concerns about the growing number of problematic materials, such as vapes, batteries and nitrous oxide canisters, entering the waste stream. They queried how such hazards were being managed and what implications they could have for local authorities' operational and cost pressures. Officers explained that changes to the new contract allowed GMCA to take a different approach to its insurance reserve, with as much of the insurance risk now sitting with SUEZ rather than GMCA. However, some detailed elements remained and agreed to seek further clarification from the Waste team.

Members raised significant concerns about fly-tipping across GM, noting that local authorities operated varying approaches to waste disposal and enforcement, leading to inconsistent outcomes. They highlighted barriers for residents without cars, pressures created by Household Waste and Recycling Centre restrictions or

closures in neighbouring areas, and the impact this had on neighbouring local authorities. Members also referenced increasing problems with illegal waste sites and criminal dumping activity and asked whether a more coordinated GM-wide approach could be developed, including options such as neighbourhood skip days or joint enforcement. They welcomed the Chair's commitment to raise these issues directly with GM Leaders at the next Combined Authority meeting.

GMCA Capital Programme 2025-26 – 2028/29 – The Group Chief Finance Officer reported that the capital programme was presented as a single, consolidated programme covering investment across waste facilities, fire and rescue estates, operational transport assets, and long-term transformational infrastructure. The programme now aligned closely with the emerging Good Growth Fund, which forms part of the Integrated Investment Pipeline and supports major regeneration, housing, transport, and economic development projects across GM. He highlighted that the programme therefore served two purposes: delivering essential renewal of operational assets and driving forward the 10-year pipeline of strategic growth and infrastructure schemes. He explained that section 2.10.7 of the capital programme set out how highways maintenance funding from the Integrated Settlement flowed through GMCA to local authorities. It was noted that this included core maintenance, strategic highways allocations, and minor works/road safety funding, with the table in section 2.10.7 showing the amounts distributed to each local authority.

The Chair commented that, given national pressure to increase housebuilding and the need to protect greenfield sites, the reduction in the Brownfield Land Fund was concerning, as this funding had been crucial for supporting development. He noted that although other funding streams were available, the loss of this specific pot, previously used successfully across GM, was disappointing and placed additional pressure on future regeneration and housing delivery. Officers explained that changes to the Brownfield Land Fund in 2026/27 reflected revised phasing within the Integrated Settlement rather than a withdrawal of support. With this type of funding regime remained the most effective tool for addressing viability gaps, this would now sit alongside other resources, such as the £150m Good Growth Fund

borrowing, allowing a blended approach to continue supporting brownfield development across GM.

Members highlighted the importance of Project Skyline, noting its potential to deliver substantial savings for local authorities by increasing local placement capacity. There were some concerns that the reported £0.2m reduction in the 2025/26 forecast might indicate the project was being deprioritised and stressed the need for continued focus to ensure timely delivery. Officers explained that the change in the Project Skyline capital line reflected the timing of property purchases rather than a reduction in provision, as the capital budget covered only initial acquisitions. The programme remained a proof-of-concept with significant potential to improve outcomes and reduce out-of-area placements, supported by both borrowing and government grant, and that careful evaluation would continue as the model developed. It was agreed that Project Skyline would be added to the Committee's future work programme, in recognition of its importance across GM and its potential to deliver significant benefits for local authorities.

Members stressed the importance of addressing clean air across GM, noting that legal air-quality limits remained far above World Health Organisation guidelines and that poor air quality is driving serious health problems, particularly in densely populated areas. As the city-region grows, reducing car use and ensuring reliable public transport would be essential, and urged that future planning and investment reflected the need to protect residents' health. Officers noted measures were being delivered as part of the Clean Air Plan. Members welcomed the additional investment in highways maintenance, noting the very poor condition of many roads across GM and the benefits this funding would bring. They also raised concerns about pollution, commenting that slow progress in electric-vehicle technology and adoption continued to affect public health.

RESOLVED /-

1. That the comments of the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the GMCA Revenue and Capital Budgets 2026/27 Overview, Mayoral General

Budget & Precept Proposals 2026/27, GMCA Revenue Budget 2023/27 – Delivering the GMS, GMCA Transport Revenue Budget 2026/27, GM Waste and Resources – Budget and Levy 2026/27 and the GMCA Capital Programme 2025-26 – 2028/29 be received and noted

2. That an update on the strategic review of the GMCA estate would be provided to the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee as the work progresses.
3. That an update on the overnight visitor levy be provided to the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in order to enable the Committee to help shape how the levy operates across GM.
4. That an update on the GM highways review group be brought to the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee as work progresses.
5. That an update on pavement parking be provided to the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee as work progresses.
6. That Officers would seek further clarification from the Waste team on changes to the new contract and the implications for GMCA's insurance reserve.
7. That the Chair would raise the concerns of the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee about illegal waste sites and criminal dumping with GM Leaders at the Combined Authority meeting, including the request for a more coordinated GM-wide approach.
8. That Project Skyline be added to the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee's future work programme.

O&SC 07/26

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME &
FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

RESOLVED /-

1. That the proposed Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme be noted.
2. That Members use the Forward Plan of Key Decisions to identify any potential areas for further scrutiny.

O&SC 08/26

FUTURE MEETING DATES

RESOLVED /-

That the following dates for the rest of the municipal year be noted:

- Wednesday 25 February 2026
- Wednesday 25 March 2026