

Council – 20 October 2015

Minutes of the meeting of **Council** held on **20 October 2015** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn
Vice-Chairman: Cllr J L Lawmon

Cllr J C Burton	Cllr Mrs C M Mason
Cllr M R Carter	Cllr J R F Mason
Cllr T G Cutmore	Cllr Mrs J E McPherson
Cllr R R Dray	Cllr D Merrick
Cllr J H Gibson	Cllr Mrs C A Pavelin
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr Mrs C E Roe
Cllr J D Griffin	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr J Hayter	Cllr S P Smith
Cllr B T Hazlewood	Cllr Mrs M H Spencer
Cllr N J Hookway	Cllr D J Sperring
Cllr Mrs D Hoy	Cllr M J Steptoe
Cllr M Hoy	Cllr I H Ward
Cllr K H Hudson	Cllr M J Webb
Cllr G J Ioannou	Cllr Mrs C A Weston
Cllr M Maddocks	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs C I Black, Mrs L A Butcher, Mrs A V Hale, Mrs J R Lumley, Mrs J A Mockford and R A Oatham.

OFFICERS PRESENT

A Dave	- Chief Executive
N Khan	- Director
S Scrutton	- Director
J Bostock	- Assistant Director, Democratic Services
M Harwood-White	- Assistant Director, Commercial Services
M Hotten	- Assistant Director, Environmental Services
A Mowbray	- Assistant Director, Transformational Services
D Murray	- Section 151 Officer
L Spicer	- Senior Communications Officer
S Worthington	- Committee Administrator

Prior to commencement of the meeting Members of the Council stood in silent tribute to the memory of former Councillor Mrs G A Lucas-Gill, Portfolio Holder for People and Technology, who had recently passed away. Tributes were paid, emphasising her unique qualities and contribution to the Council, which would be missed by her fellow Councillors.

202 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2015 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Outstanding questions from the meeting held on 28 July would be raised under item 6 of the Agenda (Minute 206 refers).

203 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs J C Burton, R R Day, J L Lawmon, Mrs C A Pavelin, Mrs C E Roe, Mrs M H Spencer, D J Sperring and I H Ward each declared a non pecuniary interest in item 15 of the Agenda relating to the Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan by virtue of membership of Rayleigh Town Council.

204 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman reported on the civic events she had attended since the last meeting. She thanked Members for the privilege of representing the Council as Chairman, which had enabled her to attend many events, including the opening of the site of the RSPB Wallasea Island Wild Coast Project and the River Crouch celebrations, which saw schools joining together in friendship. She had attended many civic functions, large and small, which enabled her to see first hand the pride residents felt at living within the District, from Foulness to Rawreth.

205 MEMBER QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Pursuant to Council procedure rule 12.2, the following questions had been received from Members:-

(1) From Cllr K J Gordon of the Portfolio Holder for Planning

“Two Berkshire Councils have won a landmark High Court challenge over Government policy brought in last November, which set a threshold on the size of developments beneath which planning authorities should not seek affordable housing contributions through section 106 agreements. That has now been quashed. As a result of last week’s ruling by Mr Justice Holgate some 12 paragraphs have been removed from the National Planning Policy Guidance.

Last November Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis, announced the new policy on affordable housing provision in a ministerial statement, which set a threshold of developments of 10 homes or fewer. In designated rural areas the threshold was set at five homes or fewer. West Berkshire Council and Reading Borough Council successfully joined forces to challenge the proposal. The judge agreed with the Councils that the consultation process over the policy had been unfair and unlawful. He argued that there was a failure to take into account ‘obviously material’ considerations when promulgating the policy, including the full implications for the supply of affordable housing land.

Following the judgment the Government has announced that the relevant paragraphs of the NPPG will be removed and this is now reflected on the NPPG website. Accordingly, with immediate effect, developers will be unable to rely on those paragraphs in negotiations as to affordable housing and tariff style infrastructure contributions. The vacant building credit will also no longer be applicable.

Therefore, Chairman, I would like the Portfolio Holder for Planning to inform this Authority when the necessary documents in our Planning Portfolio will be altered and brought up to date to incorporate this. Or are we going to lose out on this like other items that his department has been too busy to take into consideration?”

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Cllr I H Ward, responded as follows:-

“The Ministerial announcement made amendments to the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), but made no changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The key proposed change was to exempt developments of fewer than 10 dwellings from affordable housing and tariff style contributions. The reality is that the planning policy situation remains as it was prior to 28 November 2014 when the Written Ministerial Statement was issued. Paragraph 50 of the NPPF states:-

...To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should:-

- plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);
- identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and
- where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example, to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.

The Council’s adopted development plan (Core Strategy, Allocations Plan and Development Management Plan) meets the requirements set out in the NPPF. For the avoidance of doubt, Policy H4 of the Core Strategy says that at least 35% of dwellings on all developments of 15 or more units, or on sites greater than 0.5 hectares, shall be affordable.

Since, at present the 10 unit threshold does not apply, there is no impact on the current situation in Rochford. A decision about the application of the CIL will be made in due course, but as things currently stand, the CIL can be applied to sites of fewer than 10 dwellings.”

(2) From Cllr K J Gordon of the Portfolio Holder for Planning

“Cllr Ward, as you refused to answer the question at our last Council, maybe you can confirm the following?

The costs to Countryside properties for the appeal on the refusal of London Road will be between £250,000 and £500,000. The loss of schools contributions will be £5,100,000.00. The loss of contributions for flood alleviation works will be £200,000.00. The loss of contributions to highways works to the junction with Hambro Hill will be £250,000.00. The loss of the NHS contribution will be £164,581.82. Altogether the total could be in the region of £5,964,581.82 to £6,214,581.82. Is that correct, Cllr Ward?”

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Cllr I H Ward, responded as follows:-

“The full details of the financial contributions sought from the developer (planning application reference 15/00362/OUT) are set out in the report to the Development Committee on 30 September 2015.

The likely costs of an appeal can only be estimated, of course, but there is little doubt that for large development schemes, the costs can be substantial, hence the reason for the decision taken by Council on 23 July not to offer evidence to the appeal planned for 5 January 2016. In this instance the good news is that following the decision to grant planning consent for the Countryside scheme in Rayleigh, the pending appeal will be withdrawn, and it is understood Countryside will not be seeking a costs award against the Council.”

(3) From Cllr K J Gordon of the Portfolio Holders for Environment and Planning

“As we have now had 2 incidents at Michelin Farm regarding tyres being set on fire, could the two Portfolio Holders please answer the following questions:-

- (1) When will enforcement action be completed to clear the area?
- (2) What plans are in hand to deal with the environmental impact of this site?
- (3) How are they individually or collectively going to safeguard the local residents, as this burning seems to now be a regular occurrence?

(4) What will be the costs of the enforcement action?

(5) What will be the costs of the clean up of the site?"

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Cllr I H Ward, responded as follows:-

"The Council last visited the site in August to walk around and to assess the progress of clearance works. At that time the owners had made considerable progress, though there was still a lot of waste material to be removed. Nevertheless, the quantity of waste has reduced significantly from what was present before the fire.

The EA advises they are still chasing the current owners, Michelins Properties, for a schedule for the clearance of the remaining tyres from the site, both burnt remains and unburnt bundles. The site of the most recent fire was evident; it appeared to be rubber underlay from AstroTurf that had ignited, though the fire was small scale compared to the tyre fire.

It was also noted at the time of the visit that a geotechnical survey was being carried out on behalf of a potential purchaser of the site.

It is not possible to provide a precise figure for the cost of the enforcement action to date, which has spread over several years, or the cost of the site clearance. The latter is anticipated to be a substantial cost. In any event, in anticipation of the site being sold, the current owners are progressing site clearance. A further inspection will be organised in November to check on progress."

Cllr K J Gordon asked the following supplementary question:-

"I have had enough of this tyre burning now and so too has everyone I have spoken to. Black plumes of smoke cover the skyline, stop the trains running, and cause problems with our overhead power supplies. But it's not the fires that scare me more than the after effects of all the toxic fumes that we are all inhaling, from this unauthorised burning. Also the environmental impact of the materials in this smoke falling to earth on our farm land.

Do you know that there are over 2 gallons (7 litres) of petroleum and oil in one tyre alone, numerous chemicals including chlorine, styrene, butadiene and more than 20 different heavy metals. I was stunned to learn this. Styrene and butadiene are both suspected of causing cancer, the extender oils contain carcinogenic benzene derivatives and the metals like lead, chromium, cadmium and mercury don't even burn away, they just get released into the atmosphere as fragment ash. Tyre smoke contains higher levels of toxic heavy metals, 407% more chromium, 392% more lead and 1448% more arsenic than coal, and the carbon black is a fine particulate matter produced by incomplete combustion of fossil fuels - now that's scary.

So having learnt that much I then continued with my research and found that Dioxin which is a byproduct of chlorine once released into the air can travel long distances before settling onto the soil, water, plants and animals, miles away from the fires source some times, where it remains and becomes absorbed. Dioxin does not break down it just accumulates in the fatty tissues of animals (and humans) that consume the contaminated vegetation, meats, chickens and dairy products. In humans these Dioxins can lead to reproductive impairments, development injuries and an increase in the risk of diabetes. The Canadian Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE) did a survey in 1991, on a tyre fire site and noted that contamination was seen in vegetables growing 100 -200 meters away from the sight and furthermore it remained in the soil 200 days after the fire.

Now the heavy metals that I spoke about earlier, around 20 different ones, do not break down either and so they too build up into an alarming concentration level within the soils. They reduce crop yields and eventually destroy plots of agricultural land. The side effects to human exposure to these toxins in our food chain can lead to serious health conditions. Lead poisoning destroys human nervous systems, can cause retardation, learning difficulties, bone marrow deficiencies and stunted growth in children. Zinc can cause birth defects, chromium and arsenic causes cancer.

When the fire is burning we expect the smoke plume to contain hazardous substances but did you know that even when the fire is cooling down it still releases other poisons and the Benzene produced in this process once inhaled, ingested or touched will lead to symptoms such as dizziness, euphoria, giddiness, headache, nausea, weakness, drowsiness, respiratory irritation, pulmonary edema, pneumonia and skin, eyes and mucous membrane irritation.

Smells like sulphur occur when tyres are being burnt but it's the odorless gas called carbon monoxide that worries me the most. When this is unknowingly inhaled it then interferes with the transfer of oxygen in human tissues and leads to CO poisoning. This can be extremely dangerous and sufferers experience nausea and dizziness but if not realized quickly enough people collapse, lapse into comas and then die.

Now if 1 burnt tire contains 7 liters of petroleum and untold amounts of toxins, how much is released into our atmosphere every time someone sets fire to the tyres stored at the Farm I guess the people who are burning these tyres on a regular basis are ignorant to the fact that they are potentially crippling the next generation of children or that they themselves could die an early death from lung cancer, leukemia or lead poisoning. The future looks grim, doesn't it.

That black smoke is not funny, it will kill anyone who dares to get in its way, maybe not today or tomorrow but in years to come you could be gasping for breath from diseased lungs. You will wish that you had listened to the people

who said it wasn't wise. To keep these tyres there without doing something to stop people setting fire to them.

This tyre burning is extremely hazardous, the chemicals released are life threatening and it leaves behind permanent toxic remnants in the air and in the soil. So my question to the portfolio holders is, why are you not coming down hard on these tyre burners in the same way that you do with poor old dog walkers or litter droppers, if we can fine people for littering, surely it is not beyond our comprehension to do something about the storage of tyres that seem to catch fire with some regularity."

The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Cllr Mrs J E McPherson advised that a written response would be provided in due course.

(4) From Cllr K J Gordon of the Portfolio Holder for Environment

- (1) "Can you please inform the Council what steps you have taken to secure the shortfall from Essex County Council for the verge cutting?"
- (2) Can you please inform the Council how much this is now costing RDC and what return we are getting from ECC?
- (3) Can you also inform the Council how many cuts you will be completing this year?"

The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Cllr Mrs J E McPherson, responded as follows:-

- (1) "The funding provided by Essex County Council has not changed; it is provided to undertake 1 cut per year, and further cuts of junction site lines when necessary. The cost to undertake 1 cut of all the verges each year, and further cuts of site lines, is not easily separated from the overall cost of cutting all urban verges up to 12 times a year. These additional grass cuts of the urban verges, is a choice and a cost that is the responsibility of Rochford District Council.

With the lower revised cost of the new grounds maintenance contract, and the funding provided by Essex County Council, it is judged that there is no current shortfall in funding. In addition to cost savings made from the new grounds maintenance contract we are still actively working very closely with Essex County Highways to identify areas of joint working that could be undertaken to deliver savings for both parties.

- (2) The current total cost of verge cutting is estimated at £70,000 per year; this covers all frequency options and all manner of verge cutting - the County Council provides £34,000 towards this service. As already explained, the additional grass cuts of the urban verges is a choice and a cost that is the responsibility of Rochford District Council. Essex

County Highways may feel the 1 cut provision is sufficient for our residents; personally I do not. So if we, Rochford District Council, can deliver for our residents where others fail, then we will.

The Council has taken 10 cuts of the urban verges this year, and is presently on its eleventh cut; this is, of course, weather dependent at this time of year. The Council has also undertaken 1 cut of the rural verges, and 4 cuts of the site lines on rural verges.”

(5) From Cllr K J Gordon of the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise

“I have the following question to Cllr Mike Steptoe:-

- (1) Could the Councillor inform me as to the costs already incurred for the depot for the supply of the temporary toilet facilities and the disconnection of the services to the existing demountable building, as well as the asbestos removal and demolition of this unit? Together with any other costs for hire of other units as this has now gone over a year since it was originally discussed. As I seem to remember this being very close to, if not just over, the budget figure of £60,000.00. With the costs for the new portacabin of £207,000 (option 1) agreed on 28/07/2015 I am concerned that the reports are not like for like, as the costs for the storage/shipping containers were not included in option one, but were shown in the other options (strangely enough, in the report of 06/11/2014 option one was £378,026, so this is £171,026 less).

So I am concerned that we have a possible difference of £171,026, which, when added to the £60,000 for the demolition, etc., puts the scheme over budget by £38,026. Hence my question.

- (2) Can the Portfolio Holder confirm that there will be no further costs incurred?”

The Portfolio Holder for Enterprise, Cllr M J Steptoe responded as follows:-

- (1) “The report of 23 July 2015 refers to the original costs in appendix 1. The sunk costs were relevant to all three options, as the site has to be cleared and temporary accommodation provided irrespective of the option; it is predicted that these tasks will be delivered within budget. The current cost is £19,000, with a revised estimated final spend of £128,000, which represents a saving of £8,000 against the original budget.
- (2) Of the £207,000 direct cost associated with the option to proceed with a portacabin at the depot, it is predicted that the building will be delivered within, if not slightly under, budget.

Of the original £400,000 overall budget, it is predicted that the project can now be delivered for approximately £315,000, representing a significant saving. Therefore I can confirm that these works will be completed within the allocated budget.”

206 BUSINESS FROM LAST COUNCIL MEETING

Cllr K J Gordon confirmed that he had received a response to the supplementary question he had raised at the last meeting in respect of the community infrastructure levy.

In response to concern raised by Cllr J R F Mason that responses to questions raised at the last Council in respect of waste disposal vehicles had not yet been received, officers confirmed that outstanding information would be sent to all Members as soon as possible.

207 MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Council received the Minutes of Executive and Committee meetings held between the period 29 July to 9 October 2015.

208 REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE, COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES TO COUNCIL

(1) Report of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee

New Local Plan Evidence Base – Environmental Capacity Study

Council considered the report of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee containing a recommendation in relation to incorporating the finalised Environmental Capacity Study into the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

On a motion, moved by Cllr D J Sperring and seconded by Cllr T G Cutmore, it was:-

Resolved

That the finalised Environmental Capacity Study be accepted as part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan. (Director)

(2) Report of the Review Committee

Regulation of Investigative Powers Act 2000 (RIPA)

Council considered the report of the Review Committee containing a recommendation for Council to approve a revised RIPA policy.

Resolved

That the proposed changes to the Council's 'Covert Surveillance Policy and Procedure Manual' (RIPA policy), be approved. (Director)

209 REPORT OF THE LEADER ON THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE

Council received the following report from the Leader of the Council on the work of the Executive:-

"This is the third ordinary Council meeting for the 2015/16 municipal year and I would like to welcome all Members.

Since the meeting on 28 July the Executive has met once during which:-

- Consideration was given to a report for allocating the voluntary sector grants fund for the financial year 2016/17.
- Approval was given for the public consultation document 'Consultation on Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2016/17'.

Other matters that my colleagues and I on the Executive have been dealing with include:-

- Agreeing a formal response to be submitted to Essex County Council's Waste Local Plan: Revised Preferred Approach consultation.
- Approving the expenditure of £25,000 on various improvements to open spaces.
- Approving capital expenditure of £25,000 on installation of surfacing and play equipment at Rochford Recreation Ground and surfacing at Playstalls, Little Wakering.
- Approving phase I of the biodiversity offsetting scheme.

As always, I will be happy to take any questions from Members in respect of the work of the Executive and I am sure my Executive colleagues will be happy to contribute where appropriate."

210 MOTION ON NOTICE

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 13.1, a motion had been received from Cllrs T G Cutmore and K H Hudson in relation to changing the size of the Development Committee from 39 to 13 Members with effect from the meeting scheduled for 19 November 2015.

The motion was moved by Cllr T G Cutmore and seconded by Cllr K H Hudson.

Cllr T G Cutmore emphasised that the proposal sought to bring Rochford District Council in line with all other Councils in the country; Rochford District Council was the only Planning Authority to have an all Member planning committee. The Development Committee, as was the case with the Council's other regulatory and probity committees, should be smaller and reflect the political composition of the Council according to pro rata rules.

In response to a Member claim that the motion was invalid as it rescinded an earlier decision made on 19 May 2015 and as such required to be signed by eight Members of the Council, officers confirmed that Annual Council was the forum at which the administrative framework of the Council was established; the motion did not rescind the previous decision, but rather amended it. The motion did not call for the Development Committee to be abolished, but rather re-formatted. As such the motion was valid.

Observations made supporting the motion included that:-

- No other Council has the same archaic system of an all Member Development Committee.
- Decisions made at the Development Committee should not be taken politically, but rather in accordance with national planning policy.
- Non Committee Members will be able to represent their residents without being bound by regulations around pre-determination/impartiality.
- In the past Members have refused planning applications for reasons not related to planning policy; a smaller committee will enable Members to develop expertise and make focused, planning decisions.

Observations made opposing the motion included that:-

- Reducing the size of the Committee would result in a dilution of democracy as it would be prone to political control and non Group Members would be excluded.
- The District was part urban, part rural and it would be preferable to have all Ward Members contributing to the decision-making to ensure a better geographical representation.
- It was premature to introduce any change in the size of the Committee; this would be more timely after all out elections in May 2016, which would also allow time to consult with Parishes/residents.

It was further emphasised, that if the Committee was to be decreased in size by one third, all Members should still be entitled to attend in line with provision for visiting Members.

In response to Member questions, the following points were noted:-

- The Committee would continue to hold evening meetings.
- There would be no change in the arrangements for planning site visits.
- All Members would continue to be able to refer items from the Weekly List.

On a requisition pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 17.4 a recorded vote was taken, as follows:-

For (23) Cllrs M R Carter; T G Cutmore; R R Dray; Mrs H L A Glynn; J D Griffin; B T Hazlewood; K H Hudson; G J Ioannou; J L Lawmon; M Maddocks; Mrs J E McPherson; D Merrick; Mrs C A Pavelin; Mrs C E Roe; C G Seagers; S P Smith; Mrs M H Spencer; D J Sperring; M J Steptoe; I H Ward; M J Webb; Mrs C A Weston; Mrs B J Wilkins

Against (9) Cllrs J C Burton; JH Gibson; K J Gordon; J Hayter; N J Hookway; Mrs D Hoy; M Hoy; Mrs C M Mason; J R F Mason

Abstain (0)

The motion was declared carried and it was:-

Resolved

That the size of the Development Committee be changed from 39 to 13 Members with effect from the meeting scheduled for 19 November 2015 to better align with the sizes of the Council's other probity and regulatory Committees, facilitate non Committee Members to be able to champion the views of their residents on planning applications, minimise potential for political influence and recognise the introduction of thirteen three Member Wards with effect from the next Municipal Year. The Committee to be appointed to on a political pro rata basis (9 Conservative, 2 Green and Rochford District Residents, 1 UKIP and 1 Liberal Democrat) and to retain existing terms of reference. The following administrative arrangements to apply:-

- (1) District Councillors within a Ward to which a planning application relates to be afforded opportunity to speak at a Committee meeting for five minutes should they so wish, in line with current arrangements for applicants, objectors and Parish/Town Council representatives.
- (2) The retention of compulsory training and recognition that potential substitute Members would have to have undertaken such training. Having a substitute arrangement in place would mean that, should all Members from a particular Ward conclude that they would wish to be able to champion the views of their residents but one of those Members is an appointee to the Development Committee, that Member could be freed up to do so. (ADDS)

211 DEVOLUTION

Council considered the report of the Chief Executive setting out the background to the current position on devolution.

The Leader of the Council emphasised the importance of the fifteen local Councils of Essex, although diverse, working closely together in order to achieve a growing economy in Essex. He stressed that this should be a standing agenda item for all upcoming Council meetings.

During debate, the following Member observations were made:-

- The need for additional housing was a key driver for devolution and there was the possibility that devolution could result in the Government imposing further new housing targets.
- Highway infrastructure improvements within the district should be included in any future devolution discussions.
- There should not be a Mayor of Greater Essex as this would put too much power into the hands of one individual.
- A matter of concern was how far devolution would extend to Parish Councils.
- Combined Authorities were not another layer of government, but rather a mechanism for communication between local authorities.
- New planning developments would need to be built in order to release funding for any desired infrastructure.
- Devolution would facilitate freedom from Government to act, rather than funds being retained by central Government.

Resolved

That the current position be noted and that a meeting of Full Council be convened to consider signing-off any initial submission to the Government. (CE)

212 BUSINESS PLAN 2016-2020

Council considered the report of the Director providing details of the new high level business plan to guide the strategic direction of the Council for the period 2016 – 2020.

Members commended the plan, which constituted an innovative blue print for how the Council should develop in the future. It was noted that Members and officers had identical ambitions for the Council's future. It was further emphasised that this had involved cross party working and was closely aligned with the Council's medium term financial strategy; it was a live document that would continue to evolve.

Resolved

That the high level business plan 2016 – 2020 be approved. (Director)

213 INVESTMENT BOARD

Council considered the report of the Assistant Director, Democratic Services inviting Members to constitute and appoint to an Investment Board.

It was recognised that an Investment Board had an important role in terms of the realisation of the Council's business plan.

Cllr N J Hookway moved a motion, seconded by Cllr C G Seagers, that the Board should be comprised of 13 Members. This was agreed on a show of hands.

In response to a Member question it was confirmed that the pro rata composition would be 9 Conservative, 2 Green and Rochford District Residents, 1 UKIP and 1 Liberal Democrat.

Resolved

That an Investment Board be constituted and appointed to, comprising 13 Members (9 Conservative, 2 Green and Rochford District Residents, 1 UKIP and 1 Liberal Democrat) with the terms of reference as set out under paragraph 2.2 of the officer's report. (ADDS)

214 ADOPTION OF THE RAYLEIGH CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN

Council considered the report of the Director seeking Council's approval to adopt the Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan.

On a motion, moved by Cllr I H Ward and seconded by Cllr M J Steptoe, it was:-

Resolved

That the Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan be adopted. (Director)

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining business on the grounds that exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 would be disclosed.

215 REPORT OF THE CHIEF OFFICER APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

Council considered the exempt report of the Chief Officer Appointments Committee on appointment to the role of Section 151 Officer.

In response to a Member question it was confirmed that the proposed arrangement did not carry any salary on costs.

Resolved

That Denise Murray be the District Council's appointed Section 151 Officer for a three year period on the basis of an agreement under Section 113 of the Local Government Act 1972. The agreement to include a three month termination clause and provide for the appointee to nominate a deputy and undertake related management activity. This to be on the proviso that the vacant post of Assistant Director, Resource Services be retained. (CE)

The meeting closed at 9.55 pm.

Chairman

Date

If you would like these minutes in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.