



Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol
Cymru

National
Assembly for
Wales

Cofnod y Trafodion The Record of Proceedings

[Y Pwyllgor Deisebau](#)

[The Petitions Committee](#)

17/10/2017

[Agenda'r Cyfarfod](#)

[Meeting Agenda](#)

[Trawsgrifiadau'r Pwyllgor](#)

[Committee Transcripts](#)

Cynnwys Contents

- 3 Cyflwyniad, Ymddiheuriadau, Dirprwyon a Datganiadau o Fuddiant
Introduction, Apologies, Substitutions and Declarations of Interest
- 4 Deisebau Newydd
New Petitions
- 8 Y Wybodaeth Ddiweddaraf am Ddeisebau Blaenorol
Updates to Previous Petitions
- 15 Papurau i'w Nodi
Papers to Note
- 16 Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i Benderfynu Gwahardd y Cyhoedd o
Weddill y Cyfarfod ac o Ddechrau'r Cyfarfod ar 7 Tachwedd 2017
Motion under Standing Order 17.42 to Resolve to Exclude the Public
from the Remainder of the Meeting and the Start of the Meeting on 7
November 2017

Cofnodir y trafodion yn yr iaith y llofarwyd hwy ynnddi yn y pwyllgor. Yn ogystal, cynhwysir trawsgrifiad o'r cyfieithu ar y pryd. Lle y mae cyfranwyr wedi darparu cywiriadau i'w tystiolaeth, nodir y rheini yn y trawsgrifiad.

The proceedings are reported in the language in which they were spoken in the committee. In addition, a transcription of the simultaneous interpretation is included. Where contributors have supplied corrections to their evidence, these are noted in the transcript.

Aelodau'r pwyllgor yn bresennol
Committee members in attendance

Janet Finch–Saunders Ceidwadwyr Cymreig
[Bywgraffiad](#) | [Biography](#) Welsh Conservatives

Mike Hedges Llafur
[Bywgraffiad](#) | [Biography](#) Labour

David J. Rowlands UKIP Cymru (Cadeirydd y Pwyllgor)
[Bywgraffiad](#) | [Biography](#) UKIP Wales (Committee Chair)

Swyddogion Cynulliad Cenedlaethol Cymru yn bresennol
National Assembly for Wales officials in attendance

Graeme Francis Clerc
 Clerk

Kayleigh Imperato Dirprwy Glerc
 Deputy Clerk

Lisa Salkeld Cynghorydd Cyfreithiol
 Legal Adviser

Kath Thomas Dirprwy Glerc
 Deputy Clerk

Dechreuodd y cyfarfod am 09:02.

The meeting began at 09:02.

Cyflwyniad, Ymddiheuriadau, Dirprwyon a Datganiadau o Fuddiant
Introduction, Apologies, Substitutions and Declarations of Interest

[1] **David J. Rowlands:** Good morning. Bore da. Welcome to everyone. I'll just mention the fact that you are welcome to speak in Welsh or English and headsets are available for translation of Welsh to English. There's no need to turn off your mobile phones, but any devices should be in 'silent' mode. Item 1 is apologies and substitutions. We've had no apologies this morning, so we'll go straight on into the new petitions.

Deisebau Newydd New Petitions

[2] **David J. Rowlands:** The first petition is 'Put an End to the Cross Border and Sub-contracting Taxi Licensing Loophole'. This has been submitted by the taxi drivers of Cardiff, having collected 390 signatures. I think that the idea of this is that there are hundreds of out-of-town taxis who now appear to be descending on Cardiff to work private hire. Some of the points that the taxi drivers have made is that these taxis have no markings on them, which makes a mockery of the standards set by Cardiff council. And the background to this is that an initial response to the petition was received from the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure on 8 September. The petitioner has also provided further comments, which are in the papers for this meeting.

[3] The fact of the matter is that, under the Wales Act 2017, taxi licensing powers have been devolved to the Assembly, and therefore, obviously, this petition is applicable here. It appears that the main problem here is the operation of Uber, which has meant that there has been a great increase in the number of out-of-town taxis being used in Cardiff, and their contention is that journeys should start or end in the area where the vehicle and driver are licensed. Do you have any comments?

[4] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** I agree with the theory that they should be licensed by the authority, and certainly if they're coming in from over the border, that's not good, but I just hope this—. I know there's some confusion, isn't there, with what's going on with Uber in London and things, but I think it's—? I've just had to raise an issue about checks on drivers, because local authorities in north Wales have not been keeping information. So, I think it's critical. Last night, when I got a taxi, there were a couple there with no signage on at all and they were the only ones there, so I had to take one. And I think we need our fare-paying public to know that they're safe when they get in a taxi, and that that taxi is actually abiding by all the conditions that would be applicable to the others. So, I think that we need to support this as much as we can.

[5] **Mike Hedges:** It's not just a Cardiff problem, it's a problem in Swansea, and I assume it would be a problem in Wrexham as well, in that what you have is that in some of the rural areas it's a lot cheaper to license a taxi than it is in the cities. So, consequently, there is what is called 'Swansea's Powys problem', where people were licensing taxis in Powys and

then using them only in Swansea. I feel that the idea that a taxi starts or finishes a journey in the area where it's licensed would appear to be a very reasonable one, but I think all we can do is write to the Cabinet Secretary and ask for his comments and share the concerns of the drivers. I hope we can highlight that we think that they should start or finish a journey where they're licensed. That makes some sense of licensing because if you're living in Tredegar, for example, you may well get a taxi from Tredegar to take you from Cardiff station to Tredegar or a taxi from Tredegar to take you to Cardiff station—it doesn't matter which one, but at least one part of that journey should either start or end where you're getting the taxi from, rather than randomly from, say, Newport.

[6] **David J. Rowlands:** I think that you're absolutely right in that, Mike, and the concerns have been expressed by the taxi drivers both in their submissions and when we received the petition originally. The fact of the matter is that they are licensing them out of town, and they're even pointing out that sometimes these taxis come from afar to Wales as London, Manchester and Birmingham. So, I think the possible actions are: write to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure to share the concerns expressed by the petitioners, and request an update on the views expressed on issues related to cross-border and subcontracting licensing through the recent consultation.

[7] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Okay.

[8] **David J. Rowlands:** The next new petition is 'Application of the Automatic Fire Suppression Systems Legislation within the current Building Regulations for Wales'. This petition was submitted by Nick Harding, having collected 62 signatures. I think the one point that Mr Harding is making here in particular is that when two houses are joined together—so if you have two terraced houses that are knocked into one—then it's deemed that you have to put the fire protection sprinkler system into both those properties. Although the Welsh Government has said that usually the cost is about £1,500 to £2,000, retrospective installation of these sprinkler systems can cost anything between £5,000 and £10,000. And he's also pointed out the upkeep of some of these systems, which can rise to something like £2,000 per year.

[9] An initial response to the petition was received from the Cabinet Secretary for the Environment and Rural Affairs on 5 September. One of the points for discussion is when it involves the creation of a new residence or

amalgamation of multiple residences into one single item, does the present sprinkler legislation cover that particular point? So, possible actions for the committee are to write to the Cabinet Secretary for the Environment and Rural Affairs to ask whether and when the Welsh Government intends to review the impact of the 2013 legislation and its applicability to the projects of the type described by the petitioner.

[10] **Mike Hedges:** I certainly support the action because I think that's what we should do, but I don't have much sympathy with the petitioner. I am a great believer in putting sprinkler systems into buildings, and I think we've seen examples of what not having a sprinkler system is. I think it's about safety. Somebody said if you think that health and safety regulations are expensive, try having an accident, and I think it's the same with a sprinkler system. If you think sprinklers are expensive, try having a fire.

[11] **David J. Rowlands:** Janet, do you have anything to add?

[12] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** I do worry about some of the regulations that we are imposing on house builders, because, clearly, there's a big differential, isn't there, between properties where you expect to have sprinklers, in high-rise and things like that, but of course, this is an across-the-board policy legislation. I have, in the past, been quite concerned, because builders now are saying that they're not building in Wales—and we're desperate for new housing—because of all the regulations, and this is one of them. So, I'm a bit—

[13] **David J Rowlands:** So, are we in agreement to write to the Cabinet Secretary for Environment and Rural Affairs?

[14] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Yes.

[15] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[16] **David J. Rowlands:** The next petition is compulsory scanning of domestic pets for microchips by councils. This has been submitted by the #CatsMatter Campaign, having collected 950 signatures. I think the contention is that there a number of local authorities in Wales—Gwynedd, Anglesey, Cardiff, Newport, Blaenau Gwent and Neath Port Talbot—that don't scan cats and dogs—these are deceased animals—for chips, which means that, obviously, people don't know exactly what's happened to their pets, and, obviously, they're very close to their pets very often. And so they're

asking that Welsh Government does introduce a policy to implement the compulsory scanning of domestic pets by councils.

[17] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** On that point, certainly a lot of councils outsource their dog warden services, if you like, so it wouldn't be the actual authority. I know that kennels—. If a lost pet is taken into shelter, it's scanned. So, if we're talking now just about carcasses and the numbers of cats that are actually killed on the road, and sometimes they're not—. I think this could cause some issues. The fact that they've raised a petition with 900 signatures, I think we should move it to the next stage, in raising their concerns, but the feasibility—. You know what I mean? I've lost animals myself, and I can fully understand—the sympathy is there. But the feasibility of it, in terms of road—. Sometimes, they're not found for days. If they're killed, sometimes they're thrown in hedgerows and things. It's a nice thought, whether it's—

[18] **David J. Rowlands:** They're asking, actually, that the scan be included in new waste disposal contracts. So, it could be contracted through the waste disposal—

[19] **Mike Hedges:** I think we should just follow our normal procedure and we write to the Cabinet Secretary.

[20] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Yes.

[21] **David J. Rowlands:** Fine. Okay. So, that's what we'll do. We'll write to the Cabinet Secretary for Environment and Rural Affairs to ask if she will consider the petition's proposals.

[22] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** It would be good if there was closure for people.

[23] **David J. Rowlands:** That's fine. The next, although it's really not a new petition—I think we've seen it in the past—is to reopen Carno station. This is a petition submitted by the Carno Station Action Group, having collected 877 signatures. The group started this campaign to open the station as far back as 10 years ago, and, as we know, the Welsh Government has been undertaking a review of stations to be opened, and they've had priority lists drawn up. Carno station was not on that first priority list, but, because one of the stations on that list has received funding from the UK Government to go ahead, it's left a vacancy on the list and Carno station are hoping that they

will be accepted onto that list. So, it does seem as if that's what's going to happen. So, a possibility is that we write to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure, but do you have any comments with regard to that?

[24] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Yes, I think we should close it after this, because I think that it's going to be moving up now, isn't it? There has been recognition that it's on the list, so, in a way, previous actions of this committee have worked in driving the agenda forward. So, I think that, once we've done this, dependent on the response of course—

[25] **David J. Rowlands:** Yes, because they've made the further point, obviously, that the Welsh Government is no longer making funds available for improvements to stations. So, it would come under the UK Government to actually provide funding for this. They're asking that the Welsh Government reopens the funding for such stations. Mike.

09:15

[26] **Mike Hedges:** Although there have been petitions on this for some time, this is the first one on this, and I think we should just continue doing what we always do, and write to the Cabinet Secretary. We might want to close it following that response, but I think we should write to the Cabinet Secretary. That's what we do with all new petitions we receive, and it would be both odd and a tad unfair if we don't do the same with this one, even though it's similar to petitions that have come in before.

[27] **David J. Rowlands:** Yes, fine. So, we'll write to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure, to highlight the concerns of the petitioners, and ask for a response.

09:16

Y Wybodaeth Ddiweddaraf am Ddeisebau Blaenorol Updates to Previous Petitions

[28] **David J. Rowlands:** Okay, we now come to a review of petitions that have been brought to us beforehand. The first was 'Move the Welsh Assembly out of Cardiff', submitted by Royston Jones. It was first considered on 27 June, having collected 53 signatures.

[29] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** I propose we close this, Chair. They haven't responded, and, as I say, we do have limited time and resources. And I think, if we are taking these petitions really seriously and trying to move them forward, the one thing that—really it's a given—is that the petitioners have the courtesy to respond. And if they are, I'm sorry—. We should close it.

[30] **David J. Rowlands:** Well, that's right. I'd like to point out the fact that the clerking team tried to contact the petitioner on 13 June, 14 September and 4 October, but no response has been received. So, we decide that we shall close the petition as it is difficult to see how the committee can take the petition forward in the absence of contact from the petitioner.

[31] The next petition is 'Asbestos in Schools'. The petition was submitted by Cenric Clement–Evans, having collected 448 signatures, and was first considered on 10 December and, we have to note, in 2013. The petition was last considered on 11 July, when the committee agreed to await further comments from the petitioner on the information provided by the Cabinet Secretary. A response from the petitioner was received on 2 October and is included in the meeting. It appears that he is quite happy with the procedures that are now in place with regard to this, but the possible actions are: to write to the Cabinet Secretary for Education to ask whether and how the Welsh Government intends to share the results of its data collection into schools with asbestos plans, and for an update on when the asbestos in schools working group will be holding discussions to consider the recent developments in England and their applicability to schools in Wales.

[32] **Mike Hedges:** I move we do that.

[33] **David J. Rowlands:** Yes, right.

[34] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Just on that point, it says here the Cabinet Secretary's previous response states she does not intend to require local authorities to make information about asbestos management available online if the information is already available. I've tried to get this in the past, and it's not the easiest information to get. And I think parents have a right, and we have a duty to ensure that people are informed as to—. We've got a lot of schools out there that are still carrying asbestos and, unless it's identified—the scale of the problem—this is going to just affect people in later years.

[35] **David J. Rowlands:** I think the petitioner made the point that he is happy with the fact that they have an asbestos in schools working group, but

he's asked how the information should be shared.

[36] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Yes, definitely, and how we are updating it. Absolutely.

[37] **David J. Rowlands:** So, I think we take the possible action to write to the Cabinet Secretary for Education, and ask those questions. Fine.

[38] The next petition was 'Teachers' Training must include Statutory Training in Autism.' The petition was submitted by Tim Thomas and first considered in October 2016, having collected 316 signatures. It now appears that education needs, including autism, will be a key part of teacher training in England. The committee last considered the petition on 27 June and agreed to await the views of the petitioner on the information provided by the Cabinet Secretary for Education. The clerking team wrote to the petitioner on 30 June, 13 September and 4 October, but no response has been received.

[39] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Close, Chairman, please.

[40] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[41] **David J. Rowlands:** Yes. I think the possible action is that we will close this petition, given the previous satisfaction expressed by the petitioner and the fact that no response has recently been received.

[42] The next petition is 'Make the foundation phase more effective for our children, provide more teachers and abolish yr 2 Sats'. It was submitted by Tamsin Osborne and first considered by the committee in February 2017, having collected 14 signatures. The committee last considered the petition on 9 May and agreed to write to the petitioner to seek their views on the response received from the Welsh Government. The clerking team wrote on 12 May, 29 June, 14 September and 4 October, but no response has been received.

[43] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Close.

[44] **David J. Rowlands:** Possible action is to close the petition. Mike, are you in agreement with that?

[45] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[46] **David J. Rowlands:** We'll close the petition as it's difficult to see how the committee can take the petition forward in the absence of contact from the petitioner.

[47] The next petition is 'Building Resilience To Cyber-Bullying In Children'. The petition was submitted by Jamie Denyer and was first considered in May 2017, having collected 421 signatures. The committee first considered the petition on 9 May and agreed to await the views of the petitioner on the information provided by the Cabinet Secretary for Education before deciding whether to take further action on the petition. The clerking team subsequently wrote to the petitioner on 26 June, 14 September and 4 October, but no response has been received.

[48] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Close.

[49] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[50] **David J. Rowlands:** So, we'll close the petition, as it's difficult to see how the committee can take the petition forward in the absence of contact from the petitioner.

[51] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Could I also just make a recommendation that when we write the first time—I don't know whether we could see the letter—that we actually do make it quite clear that a response is required, or else we will be closing it? Do we say that in there?

[52] **Mr Francis:** The correspondence that we send to petitioners makes it clear that the committee values their input in deciding how to take the petition forward and, in the absence of that—

[53] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** We will close.

[54] **Mr Francis:**—sometimes there's no choice but to close the petition.

[55] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** Yes, as long as—

[56] **Mr Francis:** We strengthen that wording—

[57] **Janet Finch-Saunders:** As you go along.

[58] **Mr Francis:**—as we go. So, if we think it's right.

[59] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** So, on the third one, do you say to them we will be closing the petition?

[60] **Mr Francis:** We say it's likely that committee will close the petition.

[61] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Right, and they still don't respond.

[62] **Mr Francis:** No, not in all cases.

[63] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Fine. Okay, close.

[64] **Mike Hedges:** I think, probably in quite a number of cases, they've achieved what they wanted to achieve.

[65] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Yes.

[66] **David J. Rowlands:** Right, the next petition was 'Food in Welsh Hospitals', and the petition was submitted by Rachel Flint and was first considered in January 2016, having collected 40 signatures. The committee last considered the petition on 17 January, when it agreed to await the Public Accounts Committee report on hospital catering and patient nutrition, and to seek the views of the petitioner at that point.

[67] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Have we had that? Have we had that report?

[68] **Mr Francis:** It's been published, and the Government has responded, accepting the 10 recommendations in there.

[69] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Yes. Oh, good, good. So, we can close this one.

[70] **David J. Rowlands:** Absolutely. The clerking team wrote to the petitioner on 26 June, 13 September and 3 October, but no response has been received. We note that the Welsh Government took on the 12 points raised in the report submitted to them, and it would seem that the petitioner is happy with the contents of that report.

[71] **Mr Francis:** Just to add, Chair, we received comments from the petitioner over the weekend—so, after the papers were published—saying, essentially, that she apologised for not having been in touch before and was

pleased with the work that the Public Accounts Committee had done.

[72] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Good.

[73] **David J. Rowlands:** Fine. So, we agree to close that petition.

[74] The next petition is ‘Give Every Child in Wales the Meningitis B Vaccine for Free’. The petition was submitted by Rhian Cecil and was first considered in July 2016, having collected 1,195 signatures. The committee last considered the petition on 9 May and agreed to seek the views of the petitioner on the recent correspondence before agreeing a further course of action. The clerking team wrote to the petitioner on 12 May, 29 June, 13 September and 4 October, but no response has been received. It appears that the committee has considered written evidence from the petitioner, Meningitis Now, the Meningitis Research Foundation and the Minister for Social Services and Public Health. The possible action, given that we’ve had no response from the petitioner, is to close the petition.

[75] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Yes, just close.

[76] **David J. Rowlands:** We’ll close the petition.

[77] Next petition is ‘A call for the return of 24 hour Consultant led Obstetrics, Paediatrics and SCBU to Wthybush DGH’—that’s special care baby unit. The petition was submitted by SWAT—Save Wthybush Action Team—and was first considered in July 2017 having collected 3,532 signatures. The committee last considered the petition on 11 July and agreed to give the petitioner further time to comment on the response from the Cabinet Secretary for Health, Well-being and Sport, given it was received shortly before the papers were published, and to write to Hywel Dda university health board to ask what assessment they’ve made of the impact of the changes to obstetrics and the services in the area since they were centralised at Glangwili. The petitioner has submitted further comments in response to the letters from the Cabinet Secretary and Hywel Dda UHB.

[78] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** I move that we write to them again.

[79] **David J. Rowlands:** So, we agree that we’ll write to Hywel Dda. So, we will write to Hywel Dda university health board to request their response to the latest concerns raised by the petitioner and request details about how the dedicated ambulance vehicle has been used for the emergency transfer of

women and children from Withybush to Glangwili hospital.

[80] ‘No to Flint Castle’s planned Iron Ring’—this was submitted by Gerwyn David Evans on 19 September 2017 having collected 11,091 signatures. Now, it appears that in correspondence, but not in direct correspondence to ourselves, the Cabinet Secretary has more or less said that this is not going ahead. But, I think that we ought to write to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure to ask for confirmation that the proposed iron ring sculpture at Flint castle is not to be included—

[81] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Okay, we can send a quick letter, that’s fine.

[82] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[83] The next petition is ‘Penegoes Speed Limit Petition’. The petition was submitted by Isabel Bottoms, Peter Bottoms and Sarah Holgate and was first considered in December 2016 having collected 298 signatures. The committee last considered the petition on 9 May and agreed to await the outcome of the speed limit review, due to commence in summer 2017. The petitioner has contacted the clerking term to seek an update on developments since this time. Our possible actions are to write to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure to ask for further details on the timescale in which the speed limit review will be conducted. Are we happy to do that?

[84] **Mike Hedges:** Yes.

[85] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** Yes. I mean, this is an issue for all local authorities and they’re all doing their own surveys. Conwy did theirs two years ago. So, they could also lobby their councillors and the cabinet there.

[86] **David J. Rowlands:** That’s right.

[87] The next petition is: ‘Free School Transport for All Children in Wales’. It was submitted by Rachel Griffiths and was first considered in September 2016 having collected 194 signatures. The committee first considered the petition on 21 March and agreed to await the petitioner’s views on the response from the Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure before considering how to progress the petition. The clerking team wrote to the petitioner on 29 March, 31 May, 12 June and 4 October but no response has been received. We may therefore draw from that the conclusion that,

perhaps, she is—

09:30

[88] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** I propose that we close.

[89] **David J. Rowlands:** —happy with the answer she’s received. So, we agree to close that petition.

[90] The next petition is ‘Increased provision for off road motorsports.’ This was submitted by Jonathan Barrett and was first considered on 21 March 2017, having collected 318 signatures. The Committee first considered the petition on 21 March and agreed to await the outcome of the petitioner’s meeting with Welsh Government officials before considering how to progress the petition. We are not absolutely certain that that meeting ever took place, but the clerking team wrote to the petitioner on 29 March, 22 June, 13 September and 4 October to seek an update, but no response has been received. A member of the team has also spoken to the petitioner by phone. It appears that, obviously, the meeting may have taken place and he’s happy with the outcome of that.

[91] **Janet Finch–Saunders:** I propose we close it.

[92] **David J. Rowlands:** So, close the petition. We agree to close the petition.

09:31

Papurau i’w Nodi Papers to Note

[93] **David J. Rowlands:** There are some papers to note. I’m under item 4. We’ve dealt with all the petitions at present in front of us. So, the papers to note: correspondence from the Llywydd to the committee Chairs in relation to Senedd@Delyn. The committee could discuss whether it wished to hold an activity in the area during Senedd@Delyn, but I think the clerk would perhaps like to give us some information with regard to that. There may be difficulties at this moment in time.

[94] **Mr Francis:** Yes. The week of Senedd@Delyn, events in north–east Wales will be taking place during the week of the 13 November. The

committee is not due to meet that week. If the committee did want to do something to feature as part of that week, we would therefore have to request an additional meeting date from the Business Committee and likely do it a different day of the week, because of the issues in travelling down in time for Plenary if we met on a Tuesday morning.

[95] **Mike Hedges:** The other two difficulties are that most of us are in committee on Wednesdays and Thursdays anyway. Really, the only people who are going to be meeting in Delyn during that week are the ones who are meeting on a Thursday because they have got the whole day in which to have that meeting. Unless they have a Plenary session in Delyn, it's impossible for those meeting on a Tuesday or Wednesday to do it.

[96] **David J. Rowlands:** Okay. So, what we'll do is just note that.

09:32

**Cynnig o dan Reol Sefydlog 17.42 i Benderfynu Gwahardd y Cyhoedd o
Weddill y Cyfarfod ac o Ddechrau'r Cyfarfod ar 7 Tachwedd 2017
Motion under Standing Order 17.42 to Resolve to Exclude the Public
from the Remainder of the Meeting and the Start of the Meeting on 7
November 2017**

Cynnig:

Motion:

*bod y pwyllgor yn penderfynu that the committee resolves to
gwahardd y cyhoedd o weddill y exclude the public from the
cyfarfod ac o ddechrau'r cyfarfod ar remainder of the meeting and the
7 Tachwedd 2017, yn unol â Rheol start of the meeting on 7 November
Sefydlog 17.42(iv).*

*2017, in accordance with Standing
Order 17.42(iv).*

Cynigiwyd y cynnig.

Motion moved.

[97] **David J. Rowlands:** The next item, item 5, is a motion under Standing Order 17.42 to resolve to exclude the public from the remainder of the meeting and the start of the meeting on 7 November 2017, which will commence at 09:45. Are we in agreement? As the Chair, I propose, in accordance with Standing Order 17.42(iv), that the committee resolves to

meet in private for the remainder of the meeting and the start of the meeting on 7 November 2017. Are the Members all content?

[98] **Mike Hedges:** Content.

[99] **David J. Rowlands:** Fine.

Derbyniwyd y cynnig.

Motion agreed.

Daeth rhan gyhoeddus y cyfarfod i ben am 09:33.

The public part of the meeting ended at 09:33.