

HOUSE OF LORDS

Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee

12th Report of Session 2016–17

Draft Coasting Schools (England) Regulations 2016

**Correspondence:
M62 Motorway (Junctions 9 to 11)
(Eastbound) and the M6 Motorway
(Junction 21A) (Variable Speed Limits)
Regulations 2016**

Includes 4 Information Paragraphs on 4 Instruments

Ordered to be printed 1 November 2016 and published 3 November 2016

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee

The Committee was established on 17 December 2003 as the Merits of Statutory Instruments Committee. It was renamed in 2012 to reflect the widening of its responsibilities to include the scrutiny of Orders laid under the Public Bodies Act 2011.

The Committee's terms of reference are set out in full on the website but are, broadly, to scrutinise —

(a) every instrument (whether or not a statutory instrument), or draft of an instrument, which is laid before each House of Parliament and upon which proceedings may be, or might have been, taken in either House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament;

(b) every proposal which is in the form of a draft of such an instrument and is laid before each House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament,

with a view to determining whether or not the special attention of the House should be drawn to it on any of these specified grounds:

(a) that it is politically or legally important or gives rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House;

(b) that it may be inappropriate in view of changed circumstances since the enactment of the parent Act;

(c) that it may inappropriately implement European Union legislation;

(d) that it may imperfectly achieve its policy objectives;

(e) that the explanatory material laid in support provides insufficient information to gain a clear understanding about the instrument's policy objective and intended implementation;

(f) that there appear to be inadequacies in the consultation process which relates to the instrument.

The Committee may also consider such other general matters relating to the effective scrutiny of secondary legislation as the Committee considers appropriate, except matters within the orders of reference of the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Members

Baroness Andrews	Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots	Lord Rowlands
Lord Bowness	Baroness Humphreys	Baroness Stern
Lord Goddard of Stockport	Rt Hon. Lord Janvrin	Rt Hon. Lord Trefgarne (<i>Chairman</i>)
Lord Haskel	Baroness O'Loan	

Registered interests

Information about interests of Committee Members can be found in the last Appendix to this report.

Publications

The Committee's Reports are published on the internet at www.parliament.uk/seclegpublications

The National Archives publish statutory instruments with a plain English explanatory memorandum on the internet at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi>

Information and Contacts

Any query about the Committee or its work, or opinions on any new item of secondary legislation, should be directed to the Clerk to the Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee, Legislation Office, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW. The telephone number is 020 7219 8821 and the email address is hseclegscrutiny@parliament.uk.

Twelfth Report

INSTRUMENT DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

Draft Coasting Schools (England) Regulations 2016

Date laid: 20 October 2016

Parliamentary procedure: affirmative

The Education and Adoption Act 2016 allows the Secretary of State to identify coasting schools, where, over time, pupils are not fulfilling their potential. These Regulations define what “coasting” means. Under the 2016 Act, the Secretary of State has the power to “challenge, support and take action” in any school identified as coasting. Consultation on the Regulations demonstrated only limited support for the approach being proposed.

We are disappointed that the Explanatory Memorandum gives only a partial account of the consultation responses received, and that it describes as “minimal” the impact of the Regulations on the public sector, even though the results may be far-reaching for many schools. We expect explanatory material laid in support of secondary legislation to provide a fuller picture of the impact of, and reaction to, a statutory instrument.

We draw these Regulations to the special attention of the House on the ground that they give rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House and that the explanatory material laid in support provides insufficient information to gain a clear understanding about the instrument’s policy objective and intended implementation.

1. The Department for Education (DfE) has laid these Regulations with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM). In the EM, DfE explains that the Education and Adoption Act 2016 (“the 2016 Act”) allows the Secretary of State to identify coasting schools, that is, schools where, over time, pupils are not fulfilling their potential. These Regulations define what “coasting” means in relation to the performance of schools,¹ as the Secretary of State is required to do under the 2016 Act. DfE says that, as regards any school identified as coasting, the Secretary of State has the power under the 2016 Act to “challenge, support and take action” in that school.

Coasting definition

2. DfE says that its coasting definition is based on published performance data. It reflects accountability measures that schools already know; is based on the progress that pupils make in a school; and considers a school’s performance over three years.
3. In 2016, a primary school will be coasting if, in 2014 and 2015, fewer than 85% of pupils achieved level 4 in reading, writing and mathematics and less than the national median achieved expected progress in reading, writing and mathematics; and in 2016, fewer than 85% of pupils meet the new

1 DfE provides a link to the Government website for the comparison of school and college performance: <https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/download-data>

expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics; and the school's progress scores are below -2.5 in reading, below -3.5 in writing or below -2.5 in mathematics.

4. In 2016, a secondary school will be coasting if, in 2014 and 2015, fewer than 60% of pupils achieved 5 A*–C at GCSE (including English and mathematics) and less than the national median achieved expected progress in English and mathematics; and in 2016, the school's Progress 8 score² is below -0.25.
5. We obtained further information from DfE about the number of schools likely to be identified as coasting, and about the robustness of the data to be used for the identification; we are publishing that information as Appendix 1. The Department has told us that it expects that there will be “hundreds rather than thousands of coasting schools”; and that the coasting definition is based on performance measures that underpin the wider school accountability system, which are known and understood by the sector.

Delegated powers in the 2016 Act

6. When the Education and Adoption Bill was presented to the House, it provided for the definition of “coasting” to be contained in regulations subject to the negative procedure. In reporting on the Bill,³ the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee (DPRRC) said that it found the Department's explanation for putting the definition of “coasting” in regulations to be unconvincing; that leaving “coasting” wholly to be defined in regulations was an inappropriate delegation of powers; and that, even if more detail were placed on the face of the Bill, it took the view that the regulations should be subject to the affirmative procedure.
7. In a letter of 23 November 2015, Lord Nash, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, DfE, set out the Government response to the DPRRC's report. He said that he had decided to amend the Bill to subject the coasting regulations to the affirmative procedure when they were first laid. Lord Nash also set out his view, however, “that, after this point, to require there to be a debate every time the regulations are amended—even when we have been clear that we anticipate minor and technical amendments will be needed at least twice a year—would appear an unnecessary demand of Parliamentary time.” For this reason, the Government considered that subsequent regulations should be subject to the negative procedure.⁴

Powers of intervention

8. In the EM to the draft Regulations, DfE says that, once a school has fallen within the coasting definition, Regional Schools Commissioners (RSCs)⁵ will decide whether additional support is needed; in discussion with the school and with the advice of their Headteacher Boards, they will have discretion to

2 A DfE publication states that: “Progress 8 aims to capture the progress a pupil makes from the end of primary school to the end of secondary school. It is a type of value added measure, which means that pupils' results are compared to the actual achievements of other pupils with the same prior attainment.” See: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/561003/Progress-8-school-performance-measure-18-Oct.pdf.pdf

3 [10th Report](#), Session 2015–16 (HL Paper 45).

4 The letter of 23 November 2015 from Lord Nash was published as Appendix 1 to the DPRRC's [17th Report](#), Session 2015–16 (HL Paper 73).

5 RSCs act on behalf of the Secretary of State.

decide on the specific course of action that will be taken. Intervention will not be automatic. DfE says that an RSC may decide that:

- a school is supporting pupils well, or has a sufficient plan and the capacity to improve, and therefore no further support is required; or
 - that additional support is needed, for example from a National Leader of Education or a high performing local school. The RSC will work with the school to arrange this; or
 - that a more formal approach is required. For maintained schools, they may use the Secretary of State’s power to require the school to accept additional support or to change the membership of its governing body. For academies, they may issue the academy trust with a warning notice setting out the improvement action required.
9. DfE says that it expects that only in a small minority of cases will RSCs use the Secretary of State’s powers to direct a coasting maintained school to become an academy or to move a coasting academy to a new trust.
10. We asked DfE how it would ensure consistency of action by the RSCs, given the discretion that will be given to them. The Department has told us that the Department will centrally moderate a selection of cases from each RSC region, reviewing the evidence considered and the decision that has been reached in each case; and that, as with any other work RSCs undertake, “the action they take in a coasting school will, where appropriate, be discussed collectively and individually with the National Schools Commissioner, to ensure a consistent approach.”

Consultation

11. In the EM, DfE says that it ran an online public consultation from October to December 2015, which sought views on the proposed definition of coasting and on an illustrative version of this instrument. It received 332 responses. The Department says that a range of views were expressed in the responses, with “wide support for the use of progress measures as the basis of the coasting definition”. It adds that, where respondents were not opposed to the premise of identifying coasting schools, they generally agreed with the principles set out.
12. In March 2016, DfE published a Government response to the consultation.⁶ This gives a fuller picture of the views of consultation respondents than the abbreviated account in the EM. Question 7 in the October 2015 consultation asked: “Do you agree that the three principles underlying our coasting definition are the right ones?” There were 272 responses to this question: 185 (68%) answered “no”; 29 (11%) were not sure; and 58 (21%) answered “yes”.⁷ DfE comments that “while a large proportion of respondents responded ‘no’ to question 7 ... this was often because those respondents were more fundamentally opposed to the premise of identifying coasting schools, rather than because they disagreed with these three principles.”⁸ **We would comment that this seems a rather specious qualification of the opposition expressed; and that, if only one in five respondents**

6 See: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/510644/Intervening-in-failing-underperforming-and-coasting-schools-government-response.pdf

7 *Ibid*, p 25.

8 *Ibid*, p 25.

explicitly endorsed the approach proposed, the claim made in the EM of “wide support” does not accurately represent the views put to the Department.

Impact

13. We asked DfE to clarify the statement in the EM that the Regulations would have “a minimal impact” on the public sector. The Department has told us that identifying coasting schools will ensure that support from system leaders⁹ can be prioritised better to the schools that need it most. It does not therefore consider that being identified as coasting will place an unreasonable burden on schools because of such additional support; although “in some cases, schools may be required to take additional action, but the Department considers this is necessary to ensure pupils are provided with the best possible education.” **DfE expects hundreds of schools to be identified as coasting; in each case a Regional Schools Commissioner will engage with the school to decide on a course of action, which may range from little change to transformation into an academy (if it is a maintained school) or moving to a new trust (if an existing academy). We find it difficult to reconcile this range of possibilities with the claim that there will be minimal impact.**

Conclusion

14. The House took a close interest in the framing of the powers in the Education and Adoption Act 2016 enabling the Secretary of State to identify coasting schools, as a trigger for intervention. The Department for Education has laid the draft Regulations using those powers; it is clear that consultation on the Regulations demonstrated only limited support for the approach being proposed. **We are disappointed that the Explanatory Memorandum gives only a partial account of the consultation responses received, and that it describes as minimal the impact of the Regulations on the public sector, even though the results may be far-reaching for many schools. We expect explanatory material laid in support of secondary legislation to provide a fuller picture of the impact of, and reaction to, a statutory instrument.**

9 Such as National Leaders of Education or National Leaders of Governance.

CORRESPONDENCE

M62 Motorway (Junctions 9 to 11) (Eastbound) and the M6 Motorway (Junction 21a) (Variable Speed Limits) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/988)

15. Although we cleared these Regulations last week, the Chairman wrote, on behalf of the Committee, to the Department for Transport to express concern that the consultation exercise had not involved either the public or any organisation representing the ordinary car driver, such as the AA or the RAC. The Minister of State, the Rt Hon. John Hayes MP, responded stating that although the impact on the ordinary car driver would be very limited in this particular instance it would still be sensible to invite comment from organisations that represent the ordinary car driver and he would ask officials to ensure that this is done routinely in future. The correspondence is published in Appendix 2.

INSTRUMENTS OF INTEREST

Human Tissue Act Codes of Practice 2016

16. The current nine Codes of Practice on the handling of human tissue for various purposes last underwent a major review in 2009. Following extensive consultation online and in workshops with professionals in 2015, the Codes have been revised to provide a clearer flow of information, and to reduce the number of documents to which an establishment must refer. The restructuring means that establishments will need only to follow Code A plus their relevant sector Codes. Code A deals with principles and consent. The other sectoral Codes cover: post mortem, anatomy, public display, research, organ donation and the donation of bone marrow and stem cells.

Secretaries of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, for International Trade and for Exiting the European Union and the Transfer of Functions (Education and Skills) Order 2016 (SI 2016/992)

17. This Order has been laid jointly by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS); the Department for International Trade (DIT); the Department for Exiting the European Union (DExEU); and the Department for Education (DfE), with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM). As stated in the EM, the offices of the relevant Secretaries of State were created on 13 and 14 July 2016, with the creation of BEIS, DIT and DExEU announced by the Prime Minister on those dates. This Order and the EM provide detailed information about the corresponding allocation of, and changes to, policy responsibilities among these Departments.

Transfer of Functions (Elections, Referendums, Third Sector and Information) Order 2016 (SI 2016/997)

18. This Order makes a number of routine machinery of government changes, for example, moving responsibility for charity-related matters to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. It also “transfers certain functions in relation to UK Parliamentary boundaries under the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 so as to be exercisable concurrently by the Secretary of State and the Leader of the House of Commons.” This involves receiving the final reports of the Boundary Commissions, laying them before Parliament and signing the Order that will give effect to the Commissions’ recommendations without change. In additional information, the Cabinet Office informed us that “the approach taken in the Order of transferring existing statutory functions conferred on a minister to the Leader is unusual but it is not without precedent. The Transfer of Functions (European Parliamentary Pay and Pensions) Order 2003 (SI 2003/2922), for example, transferred the functions of the Lord President of the Council under the European Parliament (Pay and Pensions) Act 1979 (and any order made under that Act) to the Leader of the House of Commons.

National Police Records (Recordable Offences) (Amendment) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/1006)

19. These Regulations add the offence of racially or religiously aggravated harassment, alarm or distress to the list of offences for which fingerprints or DNA samples can be taken and retained on conviction (under sections 61, 62 and 63 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984). The Home Office states that it is anomalous that these powers can be applied to the simple offence of harassment but not in relation to the aggravated offence. This situation appears to have resulted from an administrative oversight and is corrected by the instrument.

INSTRUMENTS NOT DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

The Committee has considered the instruments set out below and has determined that the special attention of the House need not be drawn to them.

Draft instruments subject to annulment

Code A: Guiding Principles and the Fundamental Principle of Consent

Code B: Post-mortem examination and Standards

Code C: Anatomical examination and Standards

Code D: Public display and Standards

Code E: Research and Standards

Code F: Donation of solid organs and tissue for transplantation

Code G: Donation of allogeneic bone marrow and peripheral blood stem cells for transplantation

Instruments subject to annulment

Cm 9344	Agreement on the Mutual Recognition of Driving Disqualifications between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Ireland
SI 2016/976	Biofuels and Hydrocarbon Oil Duties (Miscellaneous Amendment) Regulations 2016
SI 2016/982	Child Support (Deduction from Earnings Orders Amendment and Modification and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2016
SI 2016/990	Extradition Act 2003 (Overseas Territories) Order 2016
SI 2016/992	Secretaries of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, for International Trade and for Exiting the European Union and the Transfer of Functions (Education and Skills) Order 2016
SI 2016/997	Transfer of Functions (Elections, Referendums, Third Sector and Information) Order 2016
SI 2016/1000	Electricity (Exemption from the Requirement for a Generation Licence) (Harbunhead) Order 2016
SI 2016/1002	Agricultural Holdings (Units of Production) (England) Order 2016
SI 2016/1006	National Police Records (Recordable Offences) (Amendment) Regulations 2016
SI 2016/1008	General Pharmaceutical Council (Amendment of Miscellaneous Provisions) Rules Order of Council 2016
SI 2016/1013	Family Procedure (Amendment No. 3) Rules 2016
SI 2016/1017	Childcare Payments (Amendment No.2) Regulations 2016

- SI 2016/1021 Childcare Payments (Eligibility) (Amendment No. 2) Regulations 2016
- SR 2016/375 Benefit Cap (Housing Benefit and Universal Credit) (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2016
- SR 2016/376 Social Security (Expenses of Paying Sums in Relation to Vehicle Hire) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2016

APPENDIX 1: DRAFT COASTING SCHOOLS (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2016

Additional information from the Department for Education

Q1: In the Explanatory Memorandum (EM), you say: “The first coasting schools will be identified after the 2016 performance tables have been published in December 2016 (primary) and January 2017 (secondary).” How many schools do you expect to be identified as coasting? Have you carried out a pilot exercise, to test the robustness of the data that will be used to identify coasting schools?

A1: Ministers were clear during the passage of the Education and Adoption Act 2016 that they expected there to be hundreds rather than thousands of coasting schools. This remains the case.

The coasting definition is based on performance measures that underpin the wider school accountability system, including the floor standard (the minimum expectation of school performance in any one year). These are known and understood by the sector. We consulted on the secondary accountability performance measures in February 2013 and on the primary accountability performance measures in July 2013. This allowed the sector to provide their views on and familiarise themselves with the reforms well ahead of implementation in 2016. The government responses to the consultations were published in October 2013 and March 2014 respectively. We also consulted on the coasting definition in autumn 2015 and published our response in March 2016. Further information on the accountability and coasting consultations can be found on gov.uk.

As with the floor standard, schools that fall within the coasting definition will not automatically be subject to formal action. Rather, Regional Schools Commissioners will carry out conversations with schools that fall within the coasting definition to determine whether any additional support is needed.

Q2: In the EM, you also say:

“Once a school has fallen within the coasting definition, Regional Schools Commissioners (RSCs) acting on behalf of the Secretary of State will engage the school to consider its wider context, and decide whether additional support is needed. RSCs, in discussion with the school and with the support and advice of their Headteacher Boards, will have discretion to decide on the specific course of action that will be taken. Intervention will not be automatic and the focus will be on helping schools to improve in order to drive up standards across the country.”

How will you ensure consistency of action by the RSCs, given the ‘discretion’ that will be given to them? How far is the work of individual RSCs co-ordinated on a national basis?”

A2: The Schools Causing Concern guidance sets out the process and the factors Regional Schools Commissioners may use to determine the course of action for schools falling within the coasting definition. They will have the flexibility to factor in and take account of local intelligence and knowledge that they and their Headteacher Board members bring as part of their decision-making process. To ensure that the decision-making process and types of evidence considered are broadly consistent across each region, the Department will centrally moderate a selection of cases from each RSC region - reviewing the evidence considered and the decision that has been reached in each case.

As with any other work Regional Schools Commissioners undertake, the action they take in a coasting school will, where appropriate, be discussed collectively and individually with the National Schools Commissioner, to ensure a consistent approach.

Q3: In the EM, you also say:

“The instrument has a minimal impact on the public sector. Although the legislation allows local authorities to take action in a coasting school that they maintain, the statutory Schools Causing Concern guidance makes clear that it will be the Regional Schools Commissioners who predominantly take action when maintained schools are regarded as coasting. We do not, therefore, expect the additional power to be burdensome for local authorities. Identifying these schools will allow the resources and support available within the sector and outlined in section 7 to be targeted effectively at those schools that are failing to ensure pupils fulfil their potential.”

Where RSCs intervene, will there not be a significant impact on schools (which are in the public sector)? How will that impact be mitigated by the resources mentioned in the EM?

A3: All schools already seek to provide the best education for their pupils, and to continually improve to enable them to do so. For most schools, school improvement expertise comes from within their own school or from within a partnership of schools to which they belong, such as a multi-academy trust or Teaching School Alliance. Schools are also, however, able to access support from other accredited system leaders, such as National Leaders of Education or National Leaders of Governance. The Department for Education is committed to providing national coverage of accredited system leaders so that all schools can access the support they need. In 2016/17 the Department has provided over £50m to fund these accredited leaders. As of 1 October 2016, there are over 750 teaching schools, over 1,150 National Leaders of Education and 511 National Leaders of Governance.

By identifying coasting schools in this way we can ensure that support from system leaders can be prioritised better to the schools that need it the most. The Department, therefore, does not consider that being identified as coasting will place an unreasonable burden on schools because additional support will be made available to help them improve. In some cases, schools may be required to take additional action but the Department considers this is necessary to ensure pupils are provided with the best possible education.

As set out in the Explanatory Memorandum, the Department expects that only in a small minority of cases will Regional Schools Commissioners use the Secretary of State’s powers to direct a coasting maintained school to become an academy or to move a coasting academy to a new trust.

Where this is the case, the Department will provide funding to academy sponsors to take on a maintained school that has been identified as needing a sponsor. There are different rates according to the type of project. Details are set out in guidance on gov.uk. Where an academy needs to be transferred to another trust on the grounds of performance, decisions about whether to provide additional funding are currently taken case-by-case based on the particular circumstances of the academy or trust.

26 October 2016

APPENDIX 2: CORRESPONDENCE: M62 MOTORWAY (JUNCTIONS 9 TO 11) (EASTBOUND) AND THE M6 MOTORWAY (JUNCTION 21A) (VARIABLE SPEED LIMITS) REGULATIONS 2016 (SI 2016/988)

Letter from the Rt Hon. the Lord Trefgarne, Chairman of the Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee, to the Rt Hon. John Hayes MP, Minister of State at the Department for Transport

I am writing as the Chairman of the Secondary Legislation Committee which, at its meeting yesterday, expressed concern about the consultation conducted in relation to the M62 Motorway (Junctions 9 to 11) (Eastbound) and the M6 Motorway (Junction 21A) (Variable Speed Limits) Regulations 2016. (SI 2016/988).

Although the analysis of the consultation outcome presented is exemplary, the Committee was concerned about the limited scope of the exercise. The analysis states that copies were sent to 23 organisations. Whilst we consider those consulted to be entirely appropriate, the Committee queried why neither the AA or RAC, or any other organisation that might represent the ordinary car driver, was involved.

In sum, although it appears that the changes will have a significant impact on the public, particularly the local residents, we were surprised that there was no public element to the consultation. The Committee would welcome your views on this matter and on whether this is something you might introduce for future changes of a similar nature.

26 October 2016

Letter from John Hayes MP to Lord Trefgarne

Thank you for your letter of 26 October raising the concerns of the Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee about the consultation that was carried out in relation to the M62 Motorway (Junctions 9 to 11) (Eastbound) and the M6 Motorway (Junction 21A) (Variable Speed Limits) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/988).

I fully understand and agree with the Committee's concern that there should be a public element to the consultation where the changes will have a significant impact on the public, particularly the local residents.

In the case of this relatively small and targeted project, a single location on the Strategic Road Network which does not involve the removal of any hard shoulder, the decision was taken to tailor the consultation accordingly. This involved reviewing an initial list of Statutory Consultees, based on one used for larger Smart Motorway improvements, which included over 170 individuals and organisations. These organisations are divided into a number of categories, with the AA and the RAC falling into the 'Vehicle Recovery Operators' category. It was considered that there was insufficient impact on Vehicle Recovery Operators to include them in the consultation, whereas the Road Haulage Association, the Freight Transport Association, local MP's and the Emergency Services, amongst others, were included.

Highways England has engaged with the regional representative of Transport Focus to keep them advised of any issues on this scheme or others in the North West. Highways England always intended to undertake a Public Information Exercise (PIE) following investment approval and there will now be engagement with the AA, RAC and the general public as part of this ongoing exercise.

I would also point out that in the case of this particular scheme there are no residential properties in the immediate vicinity of the scheme, and that there is unlikely to be any significant impacts as carriageway capacity will be maintained during the day, with construction of the works undertaken mainly at night.

That said, taking all of this into account, and with the benefit of hindsight, it would still have been sensible to include in the consultation organisations that might represent the ordinary car driver and I will be asking officials and Highways England to ensure that the lessons are learnt from this case and applied to any future consultations.

I thank the Committee for their comments and hope this response goes some way to alleviating their concerns.

31 October 2016

APPENDIX 3: INTERESTS AND ATTENDANCE

Committee Members' registered interests may be examined in the online Register of Lords' Interests at www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld/ldreg.htm. The Register may also be inspected in the Parliamentary Archives.

For the business taken at the meeting on 1 November 2016 Peers declared no interests.

Attendance

The meeting was attended by Lord Bowness, Lord Haskel, Baroness Humphreys, Lord Janvrin, Baroness O'Loan, Lord Rowlands, Baroness Stern and Lord Trefgarne.