COUNCIL

10 December 2007

Present: The Mayor (Councillor John Rawson) The Deputy Mayor (Councillor David Prince) Councillors Peter Allen, Garth Barnes, Lydia Bishop, Nigel Britter, Ken Buckland, Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Jacky Fletcher, Wendy Flynn, Tina Franklin, Les Freeman, Gerry Gearing, Les Godwin, Diana Hale, David Hall, Penelope Hall, Colin Hay, Diane Hibbert, Sandra Holliday, Stuart Hutton, Steve Jordan, Robin MacDonald, Paul Massey, Andrew McKinlay, Paul McLain, John Morris, Alan Nicholson, Anne Regan, Christine Ryder, Diggory Seacome, Duncan Smith, Malcolm Stennett, Lloyd Surgenor, Pat Thornton, Andrew Wall, and John Webster

Apologies Councillors Rob Garnham and Simon Wheeler

(2.30pm – 6.00pm)

59 Prayers

The Mayor's Chaplain Reverend Tamsin Merchant opened the meeting with prayer.

60 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made at this time.

61 Public Questions

A question to Leader of the Council had been submitted by a Alexa Collicott, 7 Millway House, Yeand Close, Cheltenham GL51 9QW.

Can the Leader of the Council confirm that the Cheltenham North West Distributor Road, referred to on page 23 of the growth point expressions of interest document is the same road which was scrapped in 2002 due to massive local opposition?

Reply,

Wording in the Growth Point Expression of Interest document reflects the key infrastructure requirements considered by the Cheltenham and Gloucester joint study area during 2004/05 to inform the preparation of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy.

The Council representatives on this body were Councillor David Fidgeon and Councillor John Morris. The joint study area put forward options for managing the increases in traffic movements that would arise from the increase in traffic movements flowing from the sub Regional Strategy for Gloucester and Cheltenham. This included the need for a relief road to the north west of Cheltenham.

Councillor Morris on a point of personal explanation made reference to the response in which his name had been mentioned but this was out of context. Whilst he had accepted that he had been a member of the joint study area which had given consideration to potential traffic movement in the area including expansion to junction 10 and other major options no decisions regarding a North West Distributor Road were made at any meeting of a JSA. The Mayor on behalf of Council noted the explanation.

62 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2007 were approved and signed as a correct record. Councillor Allen sought and received confirmation that the Notice of Motion regarding illegal parking (minute 54) had been amended to include the whole the Borough of Cheltenham

63 Communications by the Mayor

Remembrance Sunday – 11 November 2007

The Mayor thanked all those who had joined him for the Remembrance Day Service on Sunday 11 November. The support by members of Council and of the public was commendable. In his view this reflected not only the desire to honour those who had died for their country at war but also a wish to show support for the armed forces currently serving in dangerous situations around the world. He had been made aware of some concern expressed at noise from some businesses in the Promenade during the service. It was hoped it would be possible for the Council and Royal British Legion to work with the business community to ensure a reasonable degree of quiet was achieved at next year's service.

Christmas Lights Switch On

The Mayor placed on record his congratulations to Council officers and anyone who had helped to organise the switch on of the Christmas Lights on 24 November 2007. He also thanked the business community for its generous sponsorship of this event. It was an excellent family occasion attracting an estimated 8-10 thousand people who seemed to have thoroughly enjoyed themselves.

Civic Service - Sunday 6 January 2008

The Mayor informed the Council that he would be holding a Civic service at Christchurch on Sunday 6 January 2008 and invited members to join him for this occasion. He had mentioned at Mayor Making that he had altered the Civic calendar for 2007/08 discontinuing the service which was normally held in April or May and replacing by this New Year's service. He would be writing to all Councillors about this service in due course and also the Holocaust Memorial day event which is to be held on Sunday 27 January 2008 at the Cheltenham Synagogue.

The Mayor invited all members and officers to join him for a glass of wine in the parlour at the conclusion of the Council meeting.

64 Communications by Leader of the Council

1. Tewkesbury Borough Council had passed a resolution asking the government to establish a single agency to overview flooding and drainage issues nationally. The Leader had written in support of this resolution and would report on any developments in due course.

2. Council was informed of a black tie new year's event to be held at the Pump Room on New Year's Eve. This would be an elegant evening of dining and dancing. This event however was in addition to the usual New Year's Eve function at the Town Hall.

3. The Leader of the Council reminded Councillors of the programme of seminars that had been arranged throughout the first part of 2008 regarding developing the core structure of the local development framework. These seminars were important in informing members prior to

eventual decisions being taken. The Council was also informed that the inspector's report expected in December was now likely to be published in January 2008.

65 Questions from Councillors

1. Question from Councillor Webster to the Leader of the Council.

In reporting to E&BI on 5th Nov. you said that you had not taken the SSCT bid to Cabinet but had consulted various colleagues before you had agreed the bid. Who were those colleagues and did they see the bid?

Reply

I am not aware of a SSCT bid. Perhaps Councillor Webster is referring to the Growth Point expression of interest document?

In which case the colleagues referred to were members of the cabinet.

I can confirm that all members of council have seen the EOI

Councillor Webster asked the following supplementary question

The bid had been signed on 31 October 2007. Why was Cabinet not briefed on 30 October so that all members present could have been briefed?

The Leader of the Council indicated that in accordance with the agrred approach there was a moratorium not to publish the expression of interest. However this was not observed by one of the other Local Authorities. As a consequence the Leader had attended the meeting of the Economic and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee and informed it of the expression of interest.

2. Question from Councillor Webster to the Leader of the Council

Are you aware of the Grundon Hazardous Waste plant at Uckington?

Reply

I am not aware of such a plant at Uckington

Councillor Webster asked the following supplementary question

Could the Leader of the Council make aware information regarding waste facilities resulting from the growth bid?

The Leader of the Council indicated that the waste facility was located at Bishop Cleeve and known as Wingmore Farm he assumed that this was the facility to which Councillor Webster was referring.

3. Question from Councillor Webster to the Leader of the Council

Do you support the NW ring road linking the new accelerated Growth point to the A435?

Reply

I am not able to give a considered opinion on the merits of this scheme.

I have not seen the evidence that Councillor Morris and others on the JSA considered when putting forward this option.

What is clear is that an urban extension of the size that may be imposed by the final RSS will need significant investment in the transport infrastructure.

This investment will be needed to service the new community and also to protect the existing community.

I hope that this will mean a significant improvement in the public transport network and cycling opportunities across the town in order to minimise the environmental impact of the development.

If Cheltenham and Tewkesbury are required to build an urban extension, it will be important to ensure that the councils have sufficient capacity to ensure that such a development is properly planned and incorporates the highest environmental and sustainability standards.

It is against these high standards that I would expect all proposals for new roads to be judged.

Councillor Webster asked the following supplementary question
Councillor Webster sought clarification with regard to reference in the expression of interest document regarding the North West relief road.

It was confirmed that the road had been considered by the Cheltenham and Gloucester Joint Study area and was included in the expression of interest document.

4. Question from Councillor Webster to the Leader of the Council
What is the identity of the developer consortium 'now in place' mentioned in para 3.21 in the Growth Points Bid?

Reply
Para 3.21 does not mention a developer consortium.

Councillor Webster asked the following supplementary question
Councillor Webster asked if the Leader of the Council had met with the developer consortium as referred to in paragraph 5.21 of the expression of information document.

The Leader of the Council indicated that he had not met with the consortium.

5. Question from Councillor Wall to the Chair of Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee
In light of the recent turmoil in the Social & Community O&S does Cllr Webster regret accepting the nomination as chairman of this committee when no cross-party working is now possible and does he agree that the style he has exhibited as Chairman is the same for which he criticised the previous chairman - that of representing his own views and agenda rather than representing those of the Committee.

Reply
No. The previous Chair failed to support the position of O&S to the Cabinet. In the reports I have presented to Cabinet I have represented the position of O&S.

Councillor Wall asked the following supplementary question
Was the Chairman of Social and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee prepared to resign in order that the Committee could be properly representative.

Councillor Webster indicated that he would not resign but would work with People Against Bureaucracy Group to maintain an effective Overview and Scrutiny process.

66 Council Tax Base 2008-2009

The Assistant Director Front Line Services informed Council that it was legally required to determine its Council Tax Base for the forthcoming financial year and to notify precepting authorities between 1 December 2007 and 31 January 2008. The Council's Tax Base calculation had taken account of the policy regarding discount levels in respect of second homes and long term empty properties.

Resolved

1) That the Council's Tax Base as shown in Appendix A be used in calculating the Council's tax for 2008-2009.

2) That the Tax Base in respect of each parish in the Borough of Cheltenham shown in Appendix B be used in calculating the parishes Council Tax charges for 2008-2009.

3) That the Section 151 officer be delegated authority to amend 2008-2009 Tax Base if required before notifying precepting authorities.

67 Licensing Act 2003 – Review of Licensing Policy Statement

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee reminded Council that it had adopted the first version of its policy statement under the Licensing Act 2003 on 6 December 2004. The Licensing Act 2003 required a review of policy statements every three years. The Licensing Committee had considered a draft revised policy which had taken account of revised statutory guidance issued at the end of June 2007 and other national research as well as lessons learnt in Cheltenham since the Act came into force at its meeting on 31 August 2007.

The Chairman indicated that there were some concerns that there had been insufficient opportunity for the outcomes from the representation to be considered. It was therefore suggested that Council should approve continuation of the current policy whilst at the same time carrying out a full review of the proposed Licensing Policy Statement for approval at Council on 30 June 2008.

Resolved That Council confirms that the current Licensing Policy Statement remains in force until such time as a complete review of the new draft policy is completed.

68 Council Garden Land – Update Report

Councillor Morris at the commencement of this item expressed his concern that the report before Council was in the name of the Leader of the Council. The report had arisen from an outcome of a motion at the last meeting when group leaders had been asked to set up a working party. A Chair had been elected and the group had met twice. At the second meeting a report in the name of the Leader of the Council was presented to the working group. The usual protocol was for reports of working groups to report to its parent body and for the report to then proceed in the name of that group and not, as in this

instance, the Leader of the Council. Councillor Morris requested a ruling from the Mayor with regard to the legitimacy of this item. The Mayor ruled that it was appropriate for the item to be debated as now presented.

The report now presented set out the work done to date by the member and officer working group set up by the Group Leaders to consider the issue of garden land development. Attached to the report was a draft garden land: advice for planning committee which provided a robust framework for the Committee to consider applications for development in garden land.

Councillor Webster who had been the Chairman of the working group, whilst accepting the approach set out in the report, supported the view that the working party should have been consulted after the report had been written and that he as Chair of the working group had not been consulted.

The view was expressed that whilst welcoming the advice relating to planning applications for development of garden land there were less tangible elements which had to be assessed in the applications such as “character” which was more difficult to determine. The view was also expressed that whilst the report and advice note were sufficiently robust it might be advisable to produce a special planning document as an interim measure prior to the local development framework taking effect.

The Chairman of Planning Committee (Councillor Jacky Fletcher) reminded Council that the original notice of motion had been presented by the Leader of the Council and that as a consequence a report had been delivered that would assist the Planning Committee in determining applications involving garden land. The Leader of the Council in summing up the debate thanked all those who had contributed to the preparation of the report and guidance which gave a clear message that inappropriate development on garden land would not necessarily be permitted and that the Council had merging guidance in place with which to assess planning applications.

Resolved

1) that all planning applications proposing intensified residential use on private garden land be referred to planning committee rather than being determined under the scheme of officer delegation.

2) That Planning Committee be advised to use the prepared guidance note as a reference when considering applications affecting private garden land.

3) That Planning Committee review progress with this issue after 6 months to establish whether the revised approach to garden land applications has addressed the Council’s concerns or whether planning policy changes are deemed necessary.

4) That a framework and related training for both Planning officers and members is being developed by the garden land development working group to ensure a consistent and robust interpretation of existing planning policies in relation to garden land development.

5) That the Planning appeals budget as part of the 2008-09 budget process be reviewed having regard to outturn expenditure in 2007/08 and the balance remaining in the designated reserve.

6) That the strategic land use manager be instructed to consider policy options for consultation within the context of the core strategy of Cheltenham's Local Development Framework having regard to policies implemented elsewhere and other available best practice.

69 Flood Recovery Grant

The Leader of the Council of behalf of the Cabinet Member Environment presented a report that set out decisions taken by Cabinet on 9 October 2007 with regard to expenditure of Flood Recovery Grant totalling £623,550.

As the grant received was outside the agreed budget and policy framework it was necessary for Council to formally agree the expenditure.

The report set out issues arising including criteria for the award of Council Tax discretionary discount

- Flood resilience grants to property owners
- Resilience and preventative work including protecting Leisure@ and St Paul's areas
- Ongoing maintenance
- Severn Trent Water Flood recovery community support
- Other compensations from Bellwin Scheme; South West Regional Development Agency and South West Tourism

In presenting the report Council's attention was drawn to the provisions of the Severn Trent Water Community support which for Cheltenham amounted to £463,000. The Council would not however have direct access to the money but were encouraged to channel specific projects to Severn Trent Water. It was therefore proposed to nominate a member working group to determine how Severn Trent Water funding could be spent. The working group would then report back through the relevant Cabinet Deputy to Cabinet. Final decisions on funding would be made by Severn Trent Water.

It was noted that the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee had already established a working group to monitor resilience and preventative works and Council was recommended to delegate to this group determination of the full programme of resilience works (including Leisure@) to be undertaken using the final sum available of £586,825.

Reference was made to other areas of compensation that could be forthcoming that might deliver an opportunity to address large scale problems such as Prestbury land drainage scheme.

Council debated the content of the report and stressed the importance of ongoing funding for maintenance. However in doing so the Council should ensure that other agencies with responsibilities for water courses and drainage should also exercise those responsibilities appropriately. The issue of land owner responsibilities regarding water courses was also recognised.

The view was expressed that some flooding had been caused by highway drains not functioning properly. The County Council should be asked to ensure that highway drains were functioning efficiently. It was also suggested that management of drainage systems should be considered when preparing applications for due developments to ensure that the amount of surface water run off caused by a development could be handled by the existing drainage system.

It was suggested that there was no need to establish a second working group to oversee the Severn Trent Water Community Support Scheme as this could be considered by the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Working Group.

Councillor Hibbert emphasised that a major problem was to be the long term problem of cleaning and maintenance which should be given a high priority in future. This should also apply to other agencies particularly the Environment Agency who should take full responsibility for ensuring that the systems in place were adequate and they were maintained in the long term.

The Leader of the Council in summing up felt that it was appropriate for a second working group to be established as the potential work load of each was significant and would therefore be best handled by the two groups. The issue of ongoing maintenance costs was recognised as was the need to ensure that proper responsibility was allocated to the appropriate organisations for ongoing maintenance. The booklet on flooding issued by the County Council gave good advice to householders on their responsibilities with regard to water courses.

Resolved

1) that the principle at the Flood Recovery grant should be used for preventative and resilience measures was endorsed and that the use of the total amount of flood relief grant received (£646,500) be approved.

2) that the terms of reference for the flood recovery grant-monitoring of preventative resilience measures working group be agreed and that the Strategic Director Environment be delegated in consultation with that group to determine the full programme of resilience works (including Leisure@) to be undertaken using the final sum available (£586,825) of the total flood grant received to be reported back to cabinet in due course.

3) That Council nominate a member working group to determine how the Severn Trent Water funding is to be spent and on completion of this task the working group report through the relevant Cabinet member back to Cabinet on its deliberations.

70 Members Scheme Allowances – Recommendations of Independent Review Panel

Council was reminded that its current scheme of member's allowances had been adopted in March 2007. The current scheme also stipulated that the independent review panel should meet annually to review any increases in basic allowances and special responsibility allowances. As a consequence the independent remuneration panel had met in November 2007 to review the current scheme and to make recommendations for 2008/09.

The Council was required to consider the recommendations and if acceptable to resolve to adopt them. If the Council rejected the recommendations then the current scheme would remain in place.

The report and recommendations of the independent remuneration panel on members allowances (November 2007) had been circulated with the agenda and made the following recommendations.

1) That the basic allowances to all Councillors should be increased from £4,806 by an inflationary increase equivalent to the percentage increase in the basic salary used in the calculation (the median gross annual earnings in the south west from 2006 to 2007 equals 2.9%
2) That the special responsibility allowance for the Leader of the Council be increased from £16,403 by an inflationary increase equivalent to the percentage increase in the basic salary for a senior manager in Local Government (2.9%).
3) That the special responsibility allowances should receive an inflationary increase using the formulae and the gross basic allowance
4) That the panel should be reconvened to review the allowances for the Chair of the Standards Committee and the independent members of that Committee once the workload had been established.
5) That no other changes to payments in the scheme be made.
6) That the panel's query concerning pensions is taken up with the Inland Revenue
7) That the Council set up a member working group to consider the issues of development and transparency as set out in the report.

Councillor Mrs Driver placed on record her intention not to take any of the increase to her allowance with effect from 1 April 2008.

A concern was expressed with regard to the recommendation with regard to member development and that this required further detailed consideration.

The Leader of the Council suggested that the issue of member development and transparency should be referred to the Staff and Support Services Committee for it to consider and to report back to Council in due course.

Resolved 1) that recommendations of the Independent Review panel as set out above be adopted with effect from 1 April 2008

2) That Council instructs the Monitoring Officer to implement necessary changes to the scheme allowances

Voting	
For	33
Against	1
Abstentions	3

71. Notice of Motion

Councillor Jordan seconded by Councillor Morris proposed the following notice of motion:-

"This council disassociates itself from the "expression of interest letter signed by the Leader of the council which bids for infrastructure funds to develop an accelerated growth point of 4000 units in an urban extension to the NW of Cheltenham and which supports the Governments new target of 2 million homes by 2016. This council demands he withdraws his agreement to this.

This Council believes that making the bid does nothing to reinforce the determination of the Borough to resist the regionally imposed housing quotas; and undermines the previous Council stance on this issue; and will lead to even more housing being allocated to the area under the Regional Spatial Strategy."

In proposing the motion Councillor Jordan outlined his concerns regarding the expression of interest letter signed by the Leader of the Council. The Leader had only advised members of the letter at the Economy and Business Improvement Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 5 November 2007, despite the invitation from government being received on 2 August. He considered it was unacceptable for all members not to be consulted on an issue of such importance. He referred to the government letter of 2 August which seemed to suggest that the funding would only be available to authorities who committed to fulfilling the increased housing targets by 2016. This was bringing forward the potential RSS targets by at least 10 years. He considered that urban extension in the green belt was the last resort and it was high risk to make any commitment to government at this stage.

The Mayor advised Council that they should not decide on the motion without first taking officer advice and he invited the Chief Executive to speak.

The Chief Executive welcomed the opportunity and referred to the written advice he had emailed to all councillors earlier that day in which he had set out his views on this issue. Council had previously expressed their concerns to government regarding the infrastructure that would be needed to support the housing targets. Government was now making a funding mechanism available which would support the council in addressing this critical requirement. It would increase the council's internal capacity and would aid cross boundary work with Tewkesbury. He reminded members that the expression of interest had been submitted jointly with Gloucester County, Gloucester City and Tewkesbury and if Council passed this motion it would have a detrimental affect on our partners. He asked members to think carefully before they made a decision and he advised that a full report to Council in February 2008, setting out all the implications, would be the best way forward.

In speaking against the motion, Councillor Smith referred to a number of factual errors in the motion. The letter to government was not a bid for funds but purely an expression of interest that the council may be interested in bidding in the future. The council had expressed its concerns regarding urban extension in the green belt in its response to the draft RSS. The Gloucestershire councils had only expressed their interest on the basis that these objections would be ignored. However if the government confirmed the housing figures in the final version of the RSS in the spring then the council would be in a position to confirm the bid. Although the council should continue to explore other options they must plan for urban extension in the green belt and the North West development in particular should not be left to the developers. The motion referred to increased housing targets and he confirmed that acquiring growth point status would not cause a single extra house to be built. He warned that to withdraw the expression of interest at this stage could be seriously damaging and would not be good for the people of Cheltenham. He moved to a vote.

The Mayor overruled the move to a vote at this stage as he was aware that a number of members wanted to speak.

Other members spoke in support of the motion. Councillor Webster felt it posed a threat to the green belt and he was sceptical that the leader would have made a bid with the intention of then turning it down if accepted. Councillor Morris was concerned about the target date of 2016 which came with the funding and felt the compressed timescales would not support the planned l development of the infrastructure changes referred to by the Chief Executive. Councillor Allen considered that an expression of interest was effectively a bid for funding and therefore was disappointed at the lack of consultation.

In speaking against the motion, Councillor McLain referred to the expression of interest as a sensible way forward and said it should not be made into a political issue. It was simply a message to the government that if the council was forced to accept the new housing targets, then the council would like to bid for some infrastructure funding.

The Mayor advised that a vote now be taken on the move to a vote.

For 21, Against: 9, Abstain 3
The motion (to move to the vote) was therefore **carried**

In his summing up, Councillor Jordan said that the biggest risk to the council was that in expressing an interest the outcome could be a higher housing allocation to be achieved in less time. He considered this to be a retrograde and naïve step and urged members to support the motion.

In accordance with the constitution a recorded vote was requested.

Voting

For Councillor Allen, Barnes, Bishop, Britter, Coleman, Flynn, Franklin, Hay, Holliday, Jordan, Massey, McKinlay, Morris, Rawson, Surgenor, Thornton and Webster. (17)

Against Councillors Buckland, Driver, Fletcher, Freeman, Gearing, Godwin, D. Hall, P. Hall, Hale, Hibbert, Hutton, McLain, Nicholson, Regan, Ryder, Seacome, Smith, Stennett and Wall.
(19)

Abstained Councillor MacDonald.
(1)

For 17, Against 19, Abstain 1

The substantive motion was therefore **LOST**

72 Notice of Motion - Elimination of Excess Packaging

Councillor Anne Regan proposed the following Notice of Motion

"This Council seeks to support and encourage retailers and businesses of this town to eliminate excessive packaging and in particular the widespread use of plastic bags, and will use its influence with the business community to achieve this objective. The Council also requests the Government to commission a report on the options of eliminating plastic bag use"

The Notice of Motion was seconded by Councillor Jacky Fletcher.
In speaking to the Motion Councillor Regan indicated that 80 villages, towns and cities have encouraged local retailers to reduce the use of plastic bags for packaging purposes. The 33 Council's within the London group had also recently resolved to impose restrictions on the use of plastic for bags and packages. It had been estimated that 17 billion bags had been handed out and that if these were put into land fill it would take between 400 and 1,000 years for the plastic bags to break down. A reduction in the use of plastic bags would enable authorities to meet their waste targets.

Council generally supported the aim of the Notice of Motion although the view was expressed that as one Local Authority it was difficult to understand how it could influence major businesses. The view was also expressed that the Council should review its own use of plastic bags in areas such as Tourist Information and other sales outlets.

It was suggested that a report should be prepared to be considered by Cabinet on ways in which the aims of the Notice of Motion could be achieved. In the meantime Local Business Partnerships and the Cheltenham Business Partnership should be made aware of the Council's views.

Councillor Hibbert supported the concept and indicated that the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee already had a waste working group and that this could be an issue for discussion. It should be possible to learn from areas who are in the process of or who have introduced packaging reduction measures.

Councillor Jacky Fletcher in seconding the Motion suggested that a letter should be sent to local supermarkets regarding the Motion also with recent flood events in mind it should be remembered that plastic bags were often a cause of blocked drains. Whatever the Council could achieve in reducing use of plastic packaging would be a small step.

Councillor Jordan seconded by Councillor Britter proposed an amendment to the Notice of Motion as follows:

"A report be brought to Council on how Cheltenham Borough Council can remove plastic bag use in its own operation and within Cheltenham generally".

On a vote being taken the amendment was CARRIED.

Resolved that the substantive Notice of Motion as amended be approved.

73 Notice of Motion – Promotion of Local Sustainability

Councillor Andrew Wall seconded by Councillor Paul McLain proposed the following Notice of Motion.

This Council welcomes the introduction into Law of the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 and its emphasis to promote local sustainability. Together with the Council's new Sustainable Community Strategy the principles of sustainable living will become entrenched in the Council's decision making. This Council notes the decline in some local services in parts of Cheltenham and the impact of these on residents and in the local economy and applauds the campaigns to retain Cheltenham's Post Offices and to encourage people to support local businesses and services. The Council therefore resolves to support local businesses and services and will always consider sourcing products and services from within Cheltenham and the surrounding communities whenever possible within context of seeking best value for these products and services.

The Council supported the aims of the Motion and that the principles of sustainability should be integrated into all policies.

The Leader of the Council suggested that a definition of local would be within a 30 mile radius. The point was also made that approval of the Notice of Motion would not bind the Council to source services locally if it was not appropriate to do.

Resolved unanimously that the Notice of Motion as set out be approved.

74 Petition

No petitions had been received.

75 Any other business the Mayor determines is urgent and requires a decision

There was no such business.

76 Local Government Act 1972 - Exempt Business

Resolved that in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining item of business as it is likely that, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, if members of the public were present there would be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 5, Part 1, Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Local Government Act 1972, namely:-

Paragraph 1, information relation to any individual
Paragraph 5, information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

77 Exempt Minutes

Resolved that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2007 be approved and signed as a correct record.

78 2008-2009 Budget – Human Resources Implication

The Chief executive informed Council of proposal to restructure the Senior Management Team.

Resolved that proposal as put forward by the Chief Executive be approved.

Councillor John Rawson
Mayor