

29 September 2014

Dear Councillor

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Scrutiny Committee will be held at the Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden on Tuesday 7 October 2014 at 7.45pm or at the conclusion of the question and answer session whichever is the earlier.

Yours faithfully

JOHN MITCHELL

Chief Executive

Commencing at 7.30 pm, there will be an opportunity of up to 15 minutes for members of the public to ask questions and make statements, subject to having given two working days prior notice

A G E N D A P A R T I

1	Apologies for absence and declarations of interest.	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2014 (attached).	p.4
3	Business arising.	
4	Consideration of any matter referred to the Committee in relation to call in of a decision (standing item).	
5	Responses of the Executive to reports of the Committee (standing item).	
6	Cabinet Forward Plan.	p.12
7	Scrutiny Forward Plan.	p.15

8	Saffron Walden Museum and Castle site development – presentation by Andrew Taylor and Richard Auty.	
9	Rural broadband update – Simon Jackson.	p.16
10	Tenant Scrutiny Panel update – Paula Evans (verbal).	
11	Any other items that the Chairman considers to be urgent.	

To: Councillors G Barker, P Davies, I Evans, **E Godwin**, S Harris, S Howell, D Morson, E Oliver, J Rich and D Watson.

Lead Officer: Adrian Webb (01799) 510421
Democratic Services Officer: Adam Rees (01799) 510548

MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC

Members of the public are welcome to attend any of the Council's Cabinet or Committee meetings and listen to the debate. All agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed on the Council's website www.uttlesford.gov.uk.

Members of the public and representatives of parish and town councils are now permitted to speak or ask questions at any of these meetings. You will need to register with the Democratic Services Officer by midday two working days before the meeting. An explanatory leaflet has been prepared which details the procedure and is available from the Council offices at Saffron Walden.

A different scheme is applicable to meetings of the Planning Committee and you should refer to the relevant information for further details.

Please note that meetings of working groups and task groups are not held in public and the access to information rules do not apply to these meetings.

The agenda is split into two parts. Most of the business is dealt with in Part 1 which is open to the public. Part II includes items which may be discussed in the absence of the press or public, as they deal with information which is personal or sensitive for some other reason. You will be asked to leave the meeting before Part II items are discussed.

You are entitled to see any of the background papers that are listed at the end of each report.

If you want to inspect background papers or speak before a meeting please contact either Peter Snow on 01799 510430, Maggie Cox on 01799 510369, or Rebecca Dobson 01799 510433 or by fax on 01799 510550.

Agenda and Minutes are available in alternative formats and/or languages. For more information please call 01799 510510.

FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Council Offices has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate.

If you are deaf or have impaired hearing and would like a signer available at a meeting, please contact Peter Snow on 01799 510430 or email psnow@uttlesford.gov.uk as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

FIRE/EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest designated fire exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by a designated officer. It is vital you follow their instructions.

- You should proceed calmly, do not run and do not use the lifts.
- Do not stop to collect personal belongings.
- Once you are outside, please make your way to the flagpole near the visitor car park. Do not wait immediately next to the building. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so.

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30pm on 2 SEPTEMBER 2014**

Present: Councillor E Godwin – Chairman
Councillors G Barker, P Davies, I Evans, D Morson, E Oliver and J Rich.

Officers in attendance: R Auty (Assistant Director Corporate Services), G Bradley (Community Partnerships Manager), R Harborough (Director of Public Services), A Rees (Democratic Services Support Officer), V Taylor (Business Improvement and Performance Officer) and A Webb (Director of Finance and Corporate Services).

Also Present: Councillors S Barker, J Cheetham, A Dean and D Jones. Dr Johnson, Mrs Evans and Mrs Fish (in relation to Item 8).

PUBLIC SPEAKING

Dr Johnson, Mrs Evans, Mrs Fish and Councillor Jones all spoke about matters arising from investigations relating to Cranwellian. Summaries of their speeches are appended to these minutes.

SC14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Howell.

Councillor Godwin declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Planning Committee who had not attended the meetings relating to the planning application at Cranwellian.

Councillor Cheetham declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Planning Committee who had chaired two of the meetings relating to the planning application at Cranwellian.

The Committee agreed to move onto Item 8.

SC15 MATTERS ARISING FROM AN INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS 1) TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN ABOUT THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO REPORTS OF UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT AT CRANWELLIAN, IN TAKELEY PARISH, AND ABOUT ITS HANDLING OF A SUBSEQUENT PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A GYPSY SITE IN THE GROUNDS OF CRANWELLIAN, 2) TO THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER ABOUT THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR RELEVANT INFORMATION

Members discussed matters arising from complaints made to the Local Government Ombudsman and the Information Commissioner, about the Council, relating to Cranwellian.

Councillor Rich said he was concerned about the comments that were made by members of the public, both at this meeting and at the Council meeting on 15 July. A number of the allegations were very serious and he felt that the best course of action was an investigation by a task group of the Committee. It was important that the parameters of the investigation were made clear and that the investigation stayed within the remit of the Committee, but also avoided being too narrow in scope. As he was the member who had referred the matter to the Committee, he felt it was inappropriate for him to be a member of a task group.

Councillor G Barker said that in addition to looking at procedure and policy, finding a solution to the complaints was imperative. The environmental issue was significant and pressure should be put on the Environment Agency to remedy this. Evaluating the quality of officers work was not within the remit of the Committee and was the responsibility of Management and the Chief Executive.

Councillor Morson agreed with Councillor Rich that the allegations made by the public were serious. The Committee needed to ensure that the public's faith in the Council and its officers was restored.

Councillor Cheetham suggested that any investigation needed to include information about the site before planning permission was granted, so that all necessary information was considered.

Councillor S Barker said that in instances where the Council had the remit to deal with issues in their entirety it performed well. The Committee needed to examine the relationship between the Council and other statutory authorities.

Members agreed that the task group should consist of three members and began to discuss the terms of reference and methodology of the group. The Director of Finance and Corporate Services said it was important that any terms of reference did not assume fault on behalf of either party and that the terms of reference had to be decided upon at the meeting.

Councillor Rich suggested that the task group should compile a schedule of the allegations made and suggest what remedies, if any, should be made with regard to each allegation.

Councillor Godwin said there should be multiple elements to the investigation. The task group should look at how to correct any mistakes that had been made. It should also look at how the Council's policies and procedures could be changed if any failings were found. An investigation by the task group was likely to take a long period of time. A preliminary report should be brought to the Committee meeting on 25 November. As she was a member of the Planning Committee she did not feel she could be a member of the task group.

RESOLVED that a Task Group should be set up to investigate complaints made about the Council's response to 1) unauthorised development at Cranwellian, 2) a request for relevant information.

The Task Group would comprise of Councillors G Barker, Davies and Morson. A preliminary report would be brought to the meeting of the Committee in November. The Task Group would have the following terms of reference:

- To find out what, if anything, went wrong.
- If something went wrong what, if anything, could be done to remedy it.
- What, if any, further procedures should be put in place.

SC16 MINUTES

The minutes were signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the amendment of Davey to Davies in SC9 – Day Centres – Scoping Report.

SC17 BUSINESS ARISING

(i) Minute SC10 – Saffron Walden Museum Castle Site Development – Scoping Report

The Assistant Director Corporate Services said that due to item 8, the Scrutiny Forward Plan had been rearranged and the review would be discussed at the meeting in October.

SC18 STANDING ITEMS

The Chairman said that she was aware of no matters referred to the Committee in relation to call in of a decision, nor any responses of the Executive to reports of the Committee.

SC19 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

The Forward Plan was noted.

SC20 SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN

The Director of Finance and Corporate Services said in order to accommodate the preliminary report of the newly established Task Group, the Tenant Scrutiny Panel update and the rural broadband update would have to be moved forwards to the meeting in October. Additionally there would not be enough time in the Forward Plan to accommodate an air

quality review, or a NEPT (North Essex Partnership Trust) public and mental health review.

The Forward Plan was noted.

SC21 **AIR QUALITY REVIEW SCOPE**

The Director of Public Services said the air quality report examined the entire district. The figures and the report layout were prescribed by DEFRA and abided by statute.

The Assistant Director Corporate Services said that due to time constraints caused by the Task Group established in Item 8, it would not be possible to accommodate this review in the Scrutiny Forward Plan.

RESOLVED that an Air Quality Review would not be included in the Scrutiny Forward Plan.

SC22 **ACTIVE UTTLESFORD SPORTS FACILITY PROVISION REVIEW**

The Community Partnerships Manager said questionnaires had been sent out to sports groups throughout the district. The deadline for responses was mid-December. The Council had identified money to hire consultants for a sports needs assessment. It was hoped that they would produce documents by the end of December.

Councillor Davies said he and Councillor Ranger had productive discussions with members of sports groups. It was important to look at clubs which had been displaced, as some clubs had moved out of the district.

In response to questions from members, the Community Partnerships Manager said she had been given lists of sports clubs by both the Tourist Information Centre and from Active Uttlesford. She would write to parish councils in order to try and find sports clubs that were not on the lists. The Saffron Walden Sports Lobby Group had been disbanded.

SC23 **DAY DENTRE REVIEW UPDATE**

Councillor Evans said that of the five day centres included in the review, three had been visited so far. A checklist had been made in order to help review the day centres using the terms of reference that had been set. Those who used the day centres were happy with them.

Councillor Morson re-iterated that user feedback had been positive and that there were few comments on how to improve the centres. There appeared to be some ways in which engagement with day centres could be improved.

Councillor Godwin said that day centres were a crucial point of contact for many people and there were a large number of people who tried to get to day centres at every opportunity they could

Councillor G Barker said one of the purposes of the review was to understand why the Council had day centres. The review needed to determine whether the running of day centres was a statutory duty of the Council.

In response to the comments made by members, Councillor Morson said that whilst the terms of reference included establishing whether provision of day centres was a statutory requirement of the Council, changing the organisational structure of day centres could adversely impact on the people who used them. Day Centres were keen to try and attract people of all ages to attend.

Councillor Evans said it was unclear whether the focus of the review should be financial or not. The review had broadened its focus from the terms of reference that had been agreed. The Day Centre task group would present its recommendations to the Committee in November.

RESOLVED that a report on the Day Centre review would be brought to the Committee at the meeting in November

SC24

NORTH ESSEX PARTNERSHIP TRUST (NEPT) PUBLIC AND MENTAL HEALTH REVIEW SCOPE

The Assistant Director Corporate Services said that due to time constraints relating to consideration of the matters discussed earlier under Item 8, it would not be possible to accommodate the NEPT public and mental health review in the Scrutiny Forward Plan at present.

RESOLVED that the NEPT Public and Mental Health Review would not be included in the Scrutiny Forward Plan.

The meeting ended at 9.20pm.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Dr Johnson

Dr Johnson said she wanted to thank councillors for referring her concerns to the Committee. The residents of Stane Cottages and herself had numerous issues with the conduct of the Council and its Officers.

The Terms of Reference on the scoping report suggested scrutinising the investigations of the Ombudsman and the judge appointed by the Information Commissioner. The Council should be the focus of scrutiny, not the Ombudsman or the Commissioner.

The report stated the Ombudsman concluded that the complaint was mainly unfounded. This was not true and the Ombudsman had written to her to say that he wished he was able to achieve more.

The information in the report relating to the Information Commissioner was also misleading. It had been proven that the Council had withheld vital information. Michael Perry, the Assistant Chief Executive – Legal, had written to the Commissioner on 8 January and admit that redactions had been made which shouldn't have and hoped this would prevent a hearing from being required. This was not a finding in the Council's favour which had been claimed in the report.

There were too many discrepancies in the report to mention all of them, however the claim in the risk analysis was false. Residents were not seeking compensation, only to recover costs. If there was an independent enquiry residents would not seek to recover costs or compensation for their actions to date.

Mrs Fish

Mrs Fish said she hoped that following the meeting, residents could believe that Officers would listen to them and stop treating them as a nuisance.

The amount of mistakes made was remarkable and although some mistakes were inevitable, the number of errors meant the case had to be scrutinised. It needed to be established if this was a one-off instance or not.

Residents had a right to information, but at times it felt as though information was deliberately withheld. The Information Commissioner's findings confirmed this. Although policies had been put in place to improve, it was unclear why it had happened in the first place.

The biggest concern of residents was that they had no idea what was buried underneath the site and what enters their gardens from the site. Residents were led to believe that an investigation was taking place and that they would be informed of progress, however the Council did nothing.

The Council held a report from the Environment Agency for years. Regardless of what was now known about the site, the Council had failed to act despite a request from the

Environment Agency. The Council refused to meet residents about their concerns and wrongly told the Planning Committee that nothing was found.

Officers eventually called a closed meeting of the Planning Committee so that Officers could give their own explanation about the removal of a planning condition and get the Committee to vote the way they wanted. Residents were excluded and it was not understood why this happened.

Everything already said had been well documented and this matter was beyond the remit of the Ombudsman. It was the actions of Council Officers that needed to be examined by the Committee.

Mrs Evans

Mrs Evans said that residents wanted to know why the possibility of an independent enquiry was not listed as a course of action in the report. A task group was unlikely to be impartial.

Residents brought the case to the Ombudsman and the Commissioner as they believed there were systemic failings in the Council that needed resolving. The Council needed to answer the following questions; Why could officers locate certain documents for the Ombudsman, but under FOI or for the Commissioner; Why were shortened versions of documents given to the Ombudsman; Why did officers wrongly redact information under FOI, but provide all information to the Ombudsman; Why did the Ombudsman report state that the enforcement for the burying of waste was open, when the Head of Enforcement stated it was closed?

The risks identified in the risk analysis of the report are not the real risks to the Council. The real risk is that lessons won't be learnt and further challenges will be made. The documents provided for the meeting were selective in the details they were used.

The documents provided implied that it was not the Council that should be under scrutiny, when it should be. This appeared to be another attempt at influencing councillors, or a white wash.

The goal of residents was never compensation, but merely to recover costs that resulted from the Council dismissing the original concerns of residents.

Councillor Jones

Councillor Jones called upon the Council to disclose all the findings of the Information Commissioner and Local Government Ombudsman to all Councillors. The Committee should appoint a sub-committee or other relevant body to view the findings of the Ombudsman and the Commissioner. This group should ensure check that remedies are in place to prevent similar cases in the future.

The Council should take all means possible to engage with the relevant statutory authorities in order to resolve the problems caused by filling in the drainage ditch, the

raising of the land and the pollutants introduced onto the land. Residents should be involved in any discussions.

The Council should aim to improve the experience of residents by bringing greater clarity to procedures and exchanges between parties.

**UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
FORWARD PLAN**

KEY DECISIONS

Decision	Decision maker	Date of decision	Documents submitted to the decision maker for consideration	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained
Contractual arrangements for co-mingled dry recycle	Cabinet	28 October 2014		Cllr Barker	cllrbarker@uttlesford.gov.uk
Development Sites	Cabinet	ongoing		Cllr J Redfern	Roz Millership, Assistant Director Housing and Environmental Services rmillership@uttlesford.gov.uk
Localism Act 2011 Community Empowerment	Cabinet	Ongoing		Cllr H Rolfe	John Mitchell, Chief Executive jmitchell@uttlesford.gov.uk

DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE

Decision	Decision maker	Date of decision	Reason for decision to be taken in private	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained
Contractual arrangements for co-mingled dry recycle	Cabinet	28 October 2014	The information contained in the report is exempt from publication. The public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information because the report relates to matters that are commercially sensitive and if discussed in public the council's interests in procuring the recycling of comingled dry materials would likely be prejudiced.	Cllr Barker	cllrbarker@uttlesford.gov.uk

OTHER DECISIONS

Non-Key Decision	Decision to be taken in private? (reason)	Decision maker	Date of decision	Documents submitted to the decision maker for consideration	Portfolio Holder	Contact officer from where the documents can be obtained
Conservation Area Appraisal	N	Cabinet	28 October 2014	Page 13	Cllr Barker	Principal Research Officer btice@uttlesford.gov.uk

Bentfield Green						
Conservation Area Appraisal Hazel End	N	Cabinet	28 October 2014		Cllr Barker	Principal Research Officer btice@uttlesford.gov.uk
Conservation Area Appraisal Elmdon	N	Cabinet	4 December 2014		Cllr Barker	Principal Research Officer btice@uttlesford.gov.uk
Housing Allocations Policy	N	Cabinet	4 December 2014		Cllr Redfern	Roz Millership, Assistant Director Housing and Environmental Services rmillership@uttlesford.gov.uk
Conservation Area Appraisal Rickling	N	Cabinet	4 December 2014		Cllr Barker	Principal Research Officer btice@uttlesford.gov.uk
Bridge End Garden Culvert	N	Cabinet	on-going		Cllr Chambers	Director of Corporate Services awebb@uttlesford.gov.uk
Essex Energy Consortium	N	Cabinet	On going		Cllr Redfern	Director of Public Services rharborough@uttlesford.gov.uk

Work Programme 2014/15

Date	24 June 2014	2 September 2014	October 2014	25 November 2014	10 February 2015	24 March 2015
Standard agenda items	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in	Consideration of any decisions called in
	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee	Responses of the reports of the scrutiny committee
	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan	Leaders forward plan
	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan	Scrutiny forward plan
Agenda items	Annual Report from the Leader	Cranwellian	Saffron Walden Museum and Castle Site Development	Budget Process – Preparatory report and briefing. Cabinet Member presentations	Budget	Health and Wellbeing Update – Peter Fentem
	Saffron Walden Museum and Castle Site Development – Scoping report	Active Uttlesford sports facility provision review – Gaynor Bradley	Rural Broadband Update – Simon Jackson	Day Centres – final report		NHS England and West Essex CCG
	Day Centres – scope	Day centre review update – Cllr Evans	Tenant Scrutiny Panel update			
	Review of swimming pool scope to include sport facility provision	Air Quality Review Scope - verbal				
	East of England Ambulance Service – Invite questions	NEPT (North Essex Partnership Trust)Public and Mental Health Review Scope - verbal				2014/15 Scrutiny review and forward plan
	Planning review scope – Verbal					

Committee: Scrutiny Committee

Agenda Item

Date: 7 October 2014

9

Title: Rural Broadband

**Author: Simon Jackson, Economic
Development Officer 01799 510521**

Item for decision

Summary

1. At the scrutiny committee meeting on 26 November 2013 Members considered a report on rural broadband. This report updates members on progress.

Recommendations

2. This report recommends:
 - a. Officers continue to monitor the progress of the wireless superfast broadband service provided by Buzcom in the District
 - b. Officers continue to work closely with the Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) Superfast Essex programme
 - c. Officers continue to implement the District Council's Strategic Initiatives Fund investment in the further roll out of superfast broadband within Uttlesford

Financial Implications

3. Recommendations have costs but these are already budgeted as follows:

A grant of £30,000 was given to Buzcom from the 2009/10 Local Authority Business Growth Initiative monies, which are held in the Business Development Reserve, as follows:

- a. £15,000 on going live - paid in September 2011
- b. £5,000 when the lease for use of High Garrett Police Tower is signed
- c. £10,000 when the company can demonstrate they have achieved a minimum of 40 installations per week for a continuous period of 8 weeks

At its meeting held on 25 June 2014 Cabinet approved a budget of £100,000 to invest in the further roll out of superfast broadband across the district

Background Papers

4. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

- a. Report to Environment Committee, Radio Broadband, 17 March 2011
- b. Uttlesford Economic Development Strategy 2014-16
- c. Report to Cabinet, Strategic Initiatives Fund, 25 June 2014

Impact

5.

Communication/Consultation	Consultation on superfast broadband undertaken as part of the Uttlesford 2014-16 Economic Development .
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	Enabling sustainable economic growth in rural areas.
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Situation

6. At the scrutiny committee meeting on 26 November 2013 Members considered a report that responded to a number of questions on rural broadband and this report updates members on progress.

6.1 What is the current situation within the District regarding wireless broadband availability? What areas of the District are still without broadband?

It remains that some areas along the eastern side of the District in particular are still unable to access wireless broadband due to continuing delays in acquiring a lease at High Garrett tower that will enable Buzcom to serve this area.

6.2 Has Buzcom been launched to all areas?

A waiting list remains of those people requiring access to superfast broadband in areas where the Buzcom service is not currently available.

Where there has been a request received from business customers in these areas Buzcom has been successful in providing access for a number of these utilising local repeater sites.

An example of where Buzcom has been successful in providing a superfast broadband service is Carver Barracks. The Barracks is a British Army base near Saffron Walden and home to 33 Engineer Regiment (EOD), 101 (City of London) Engineer Regiment (Explosive Ordnance Disposal), Headquarters Essex Wing, Air Training Corps and Saffron Walden Detachment, B Company, and Essex Army Cadet Force.

The soldiers and their families in and around the Barracks had suffered for years with inadequate communications due to poor broadband speeds and non-existent mobile phone signals.

Early in 2013 the Council called a meeting at the Barracks attended by Buzcom and Superfast Essex. Over the following twelve months Buzcom installed its high speed radio broadband equipment across the site resulting in soldiers being able to dispense with their slow copper phone line broadband which was giving them speeds of less than 2Mb/s at cost of more than £30 a month, and they are now able to connect to Buzcom for just £12 a month on a 30 day contract with just a £40 set up fee.

The network has transformed the life of the soldiers, in the past they would need to hang out of a window in order to receive a mobile phone signal, now they can connect in common and private areas.

Major A S MacGill, Second in Command 33 Engineer Regiment (EOD) Carver Barracks commented, "We have 4 Buzcom Wifi Hotspots within Carver Barracks and they have proved to be exceptionally good. The capacity has seen us get well above 12 Mbps and up to 20 Mbps. Other companies could only offer 1-3 Mbps. The cost is exceptionally affordable and on balance it was deemed a very competitive and affordable solution."

As of September 2014 there are forty individual users at the Barracks plus hundreds of users per week of the hotspots installed by Buzcom.

6.3 How many masts cover Uttlesford and are there plans to bring others online to enhance the coverage.

Negotiations concerning the remaining tower at High Garrett are ongoing and may not ultimately be successful.

6.4 What is the take up, has there been any issues with the system since the launch? What can be done to improve on any issues?

In the District there are currently in excess of 900 subscribers, both companies and households, to the Buzcom service.

Feedback regarding the service Buzcom provides is positive and is proving technically robust.

6.5 Have the proposed savings through the cancellation of broadband contracts been made?

The cancellation of broadband contracts will be looked into when Buzcom has cleared its waiting lists.

6.6 Has free internet access been provided within sheltered units and if so how has this been promoted?

Not as yet. But will be when Buzcom had cleared its waiting lists.

6.7 What is the progress concerning The Essex County Council BDUK "Superfast Essex" project?

Essex County Council is rolling out a fibre based Superfast Broadband service across the county, working in partnership with British Telecom. This project is estimated to take a couple more years to complete. It is anticipated that at the end of the project 90% of Essex residents will have access to the fibre based service through providers such as BT Infinity and Virgin.

In order to cover as much of the remaining 10% as possible Superfast Essex through its Broadband Extension project are issuing a tender to seek a partner to utilise innovative technology to achieve an appropriate combination of affordable infrastructure deployment cost and widespread coverage.

In summary,

- a. By 2015, everyone in Essex will get access to basic, 2Megabits per second (Mbps) broadband – this basic level of speed allows one computer or device in a household to access the internet, carry out on-line services and tasks; banking, road fund licence renewal etc. and will allow streaming of videos and other on-line content.
- b. By 2015, at least 90% of Essex will gain access to Superfast broadband. Superfast broadband allows several users to be on-line simultaneously, downloading content, playing games or researching schoolwork.

6.8 How does the Council's £100,000 investment in superfast broadband and Buzcom's service compliment/compete with the Superfast Essex project?

The Council's investment and the Buzcom service compliment the Superfast Essex project because they provide superfast broadband now or can do so quickly into rural areas that may take up to 2/3 years for the Superfast Essex project to reach.

In addition, whoever the Council contracts with using its £100,000 investment and the Buzcom service will both provide additional competition for the other main private sector providers such as BT Infinity and Virgin and therefore provide more choice for the end user.

Risk Analysis

7. In addition to the risks identified in the report to the Environment Committee, Radio Broadband, 17 March 2011

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Buzcom failing to deliver the wireless broadband service across the District	2 Negotiations have been ongoing for over two years regarding the High Garrett tower	2 The service along the east of the District would be compromised	Officers ensure close monitoring of Buzcom

- 1 = Little or no risk or impact
- 2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
- 3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
- 4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.