

## **Council – 29 July 2014**

---

Minutes of the meeting of **Council** held on **29 July 2014** when there were present:-

Chairman: Cllr Mrs J R Lumley  
Vice-Chairman: Cllr Mrs H L A Glynn

Cllr C I Black	Cllr M Maddocks
Cllr J C Burton	Cllr Mrs C M Mason
Cllr Mrs L A Butcher	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 J A Mockford
Cllr K J Gordon	Cllr T E Mountain
Cllr J D Griffin	Cllr R A Oatham
Cllr J Hayter	Cllr Mrs C E Roe
Cllr B T Hazlewood	Cllr C G Seagers
Cllr N J Hookway	Cllr Mrs M H Spencer
Cllr Mrs D Hoy	Cllr M J Steptoe
Cllr M Hoy	Cllr I H Ward
Cllr J L Lawmon	Cllr Mrs B J Wilkins
Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill	

### **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs P A Capon, Mrs T J Capon, M R Carter, Mrs A V Hale, K H Hudson, S P Smith, D J Sperring and Mrs C A Weston.

### **OFFICERS PRESENT**

A Dave	–	Chief Executive
A Bugeja	–	Head of Legal, Estates and Member Services
Y Woodward	–	Head of Finance
R Evans	–	Head of Environmental Services
S Scrutton	–	Head of Planning and Transportation
L Bliss	–	Senior Corporate Communications Officer
J Bostock	–	Member Services Manager

It was noted that the report of the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise on the Council Depot, Rochford, (Agenda Item 9(2)) had been withdrawn.

### **160 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Annual Meeting held on 3 June 2014 and the Extraordinary Meeting held on 1 July 2014 were approved as correct records and signed by the Chairman, subject to noting that the recorded vote commencing on page 5 of the Minutes of 1 July related to Resolution 2(2) of Minute 138 and that Cllr M R Carter had submitted his apologies to the 1 July meeting.

**161 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND LEADER**

The Chairman had been honoured to have attended a great many events on behalf of the Council both within and outside the District. In addition to Council events, such as the Wild Woods Day, there had been visits to a number of voluntary and other organisations. A service at St Paul's Cathedral had seen the ordination of the Bishop of Barking and Bishop of Colchester.

The Leader announced that he was commencing a diet to raise monies for the Chairman's Charity.

**162 PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Pursuant to Council procedure rule 12.1, questions had been received from the public as follows:-

**(a) From Mr J E Cripps of 5 Durham Way, Rayleigh, of the Deputy Leader of the Council:-**

"On the 21st September 2013 Cllr Hudson issued an open letter making various personal pledges in respect of the Local Development Framework- Rayleigh & Rawreth. My question relates to the following "quoted" statement:-

"To facilitate this it will be necessary to relocate the Rayleigh Sports and Social Club (a valued facility for our residents), they will receive new and enhanced facilities in recognition of their contribution to Rayleigh life at no cost to themselves - this is my pledge."

Recently the Leader of the Council (Cllr Cutmore) has announced, via the letters page of the Evening Echo, that there will not be any new and enhanced facilities for RTSSC.

My question is, therefore, at what Council meeting was this discussed/agreed and recorded."

The Leader of the Council, Cllr T G Cutmore, responded on behalf of the Deputy Leader as follows:-

"The provision of new and enhanced facilities for the Rayleigh Sports and Social Club was predicated on the possibility of the Council's land currently occupied by the Social Club being required for future housing development. It has now been concluded that there is no requirement for the Council's land to be used to facilitate the building of housing. That being the case Rayleigh Sports and Social Club, a private members only club, can remain precisely where it is for the foreseeable future. Without the need for the land to be used for housing it will be down to the Club, as a private business, to determine its requirements for enhanced facilities in the future."

By way of supplementary question Mr Cripps referred again to the pledge made by the Deputy Leader in recognition of the Sports and Social Club's contribution to Rayleigh Life and why this no longer stood.

The Leader re-affirmed that the pledge had been predicated on the possibility of the Council's land currently occupied by the Social Club being required for future housing development, which was no longer the case.

**(b) From Mr R Lambourne of 7 Whitehouse Court, 158 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh, of the Leader of the Council:-**

"I note from the latest edition of Rochford District Matters that the Council has employed a barrister to defend an action by a local resident concerning the Core Strategy and Allocation Plan.

Can you confirm who authorised the defence of this action and in particular the considerable extra expense that is presumably budgeted for and will be paid for out of the council tax and why that authorisation hasn't been sanctioned by the Full Council?"

The Leader of the Council, Cllr T G Cutmore, responded as follows:-

"The defence of the legal challenge brought against the Council's Adopted Allocation Plan was undertaken by the Head of Legal, Estates and Member Services in accordance with the authorisation conferred by Article 13 of the Council's Constitution."

By way of supplementary question Mr Lambourne asked if, when considering possibilities, account had been taken of the costs of not defending the action and the making of adjustments to the Strategy.

The Leader indicated that every contingency would have been considered and that the Council had the right to defend its own policies.

**163 MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Council received the Minutes of Executive and Committee meetings held between the period 4 June to 18 July 2014.

**164 REFERRAL OF DECISIONS TO COUNCIL**

**(a) Collections Support Officer**

Pursuant to Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(b), a requisition had been received in the names of Cllrs J Hayter, J C Burton and N J Hookway requiring that the Portfolio Holder decision on the post of Collections Support Officer be referred to Full Council.

Observations made against the decision included that the work envisaged could probably be carried out reasonably by the existing workforce; that it was not clear that the salary identified in the report included all on costs; that, if a 1% increase in income is not achieved, the post salary would still have to be paid; that monies saved from not appointing could be made available to support the Council's frontline services and that, at the point the decision was made, the Council had been achieving targets associated with business rates collection.

Observations made in favour of the decision included that it would bring in additional income; that funding for the post would primarily come from the major preceptors and would be ring fenced; that the business case for securing funding holds the Council to account to achieve a minimum rate of collections and would be withdrawn if the Council failed to deliver; that the referral meant additional recruitment expenses and that the revenues and benefits service often dealt with vulnerable residents facing a variety of issues and any resource diminution could impact on this work.

A motion that there be no appointment, either permanent or temporary, and that the additional collection target be assimilated into the existing staff resource, moved by Cllr J C Burton and seconded by Cllr J Hayter, was lost on a show of hands. On a motion, moved by Cllr T G Cutmore and seconded by Cllr K J Gordon, it was:-

### **Resolved**

That the original decision on this item be upheld. (HFS)

### **(b) Essex County Council Call for Waste Sites Submission**

Pursuant to Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(b), a requisition had been received in the names of Cllrs J Hayter, J C Burton and N J Hookway requiring that the Portfolio Holder decision on a Waste Sites Submission be referred to Full Council.

It was observed that, whilst the Executive had now agreed to a pilot amenity scheme for Great Wakering thereby recognising that there are issues for residents in the East of the District, the pilot scheme should perhaps run its course before a Submission is made.

Observations made in favour of the decision included that waste collection sites remained the responsibility of the County Council, that Rochford District Council had been lobbying for two sites over a number of years and that any concerns on this matter could have been raised with the Portfolio Holder at an early stage to enable the situation to be fully understood.

It was noted that the County Council as the Authority responsible for preparing a Waste Plan was required to consult the District Council on any sites it would wish to promote. The District Council was not in the

position to be able to allocate sites and the Michelins Farm site was currently within the Council's Allocations Document. Additional sites could be suggested to inform the Essex County Council Draft Waste Plan, which would then be the subject of consultation.

A motion that the decision on this item be held in abeyance pending consideration of the three options set out under the referral, moved by Cllr M J Hookway and seconded by Cllr J C Burton, was lost on a show of hands. On a motion, moved by Cllr K J Gordon and seconded by Cllr T G Cutmore, it was:-

### **Resolved**

That the original decision on this item be upheld. (HPT)

### **(c) Development Management Plan Examination – Proposed Schedule of Modifications to Development Management Submission Document**

Pursuant to Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(b) a requisition had been received in the names of Cllrs C I Black, T E Mountain and R A Oatham requiring that the Portfolio Holder decision on approval of the Proposed Schedule of Modifications to the Development Management Submission document (April 2013) be referred to Full Council.

Observations made against the decision included that recognition should be given to concern raised by the Inspector on how the Council engaged and consulted residents; that such documents should be considered in a public forum; that, given that housing numbers had been identified and agreed as part of the Allocations Plan, why would a modification to include an additional statement of minimum dwellings per hectare be necessary for inclusion in the Development Management Plan; that the criteria associated with terms such as 'unviable' and 'undeliverable' needed to be fully understood and, given that Members spent significant periods of time at Development Committee meetings considering individual applications, it would be appropriate to give detailed consideration to the implications of this decision, possibly through the auspices of the Local Development Framework Sub-Committee.

A motion that the words 'unless it can be clearly demonstrated to be unviable or undeliverable' be removed from the first sentence of Policy DM4, reference MM9, was moved by Cllr C I Black and seconded by Cllr R A Oatham.

Against the motion reference was made to the fact that the Policy would not apply to pre-allocated sites, that the Inspector had expressed concern on Policy DM4 being too rigid and that the original wording meant that the appropriateness of any move away from existing floor space standards would have to be clearly demonstrated.

In favour of the motion reference was made to the practice at Development Committee meetings when consideration is given to, say, garden standards, whereby an application involving a number of buildings that are below standard is refused. Proposals that are close to meeting a standard are not necessarily thrown out.

The motion was lost on a show of hands and it was:-

### **Resolved**

That the original decision on this item be upheld. (HPT)

Note: Cllrs C I Black, Mrs D Hoy and R A Oatham wished it to be recorded that they had voted against the above decision.

## **165 REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEES TO COUNCIL**

### **(a) Draft Corporate Plan 2014-2017**

Council considered the report of the Executive containing a recommendation on the revised draft Corporate Plan.

The Leader of the Council, Cllr T G Cutmore, observed that the Plan reflected the Council's aspirations moving forward.

Responding to questions, the Leader advised that:-

- Whilst not appropriate for the overriding Corporate Plan, supporting documentation could pick up on the precise nature of County Highway involvement with development plans, such as when and which sites they visit.
- The public would be able to attend meetings of the Flood Forum, which would be looking to those with responsibility for addressing flooding issues to take appropriate action. Any urgent flood related problems should be raised with Essex County Council as one of the responsible Authorities.

The Portfolio Holder for Community, Cllr Mrs J E McPherson, confirmed that she would be happy to liaise with Members on the work of other forums within the Community remit such as the Youth Strategy Group.

### **Resolved**

That the revised draft Corporate Plan 2014-2017 be approved. (CE)

### **(b) Use of iPads for Council business**

Council considered the report of the Executive containing recommendations on the use of iPads for Council business.

During discussion it recognised that a move from hard copy paperwork to utilising iPads could be seen as significant. It was also recognised that during the trial there had been situations when, for technical reasons, it had not been possible to download to an iPad at a meeting. It would be important for Members to get as much support as possible.

Responding to questions, the Portfolio Holder for People and Technology, Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill, advised that the iPads had been trialled with half a dozen Members at a time. Trial users had been contacted on a regular basis and had been able to feed back any problems. Members involved with the trial felt happy with the concept of moving to the use of iPads as outlined in the report. It could be appreciated that the project was challenging and that there can always be room for improvement in matters of technology. Whilst other authorities utilised a number of electronic devices, the majority had iPads.

It was noted that display screen assessments undertaken by officers may relate to fixed equipment. In any event, the objective was to ensure that individual Members were not disadvantaged. Officers were currently reviewing a system of file sharing available through the Essex On-Line Partnership that could be of particular use for larger files.

It was observed that greater use of technology was recognised by many authorities as the way forward and that there would invariably be teething issues that would need managing through.

Officers would continue to have some hard copy documents available at meetings. Should Chairmen have a particular need for hard copy documentation by virtue of their roles this could be accommodated.

On a motion, moved by Cllr Mrs J R Lumley and seconded by Cllr T G Cutmore it was:-

### **Resolved**

(1) That, apart from the issuing of hard copy summons and the making of separate arrangements where necessary to accord with equalities/disability discrimination legislation, all Members of the Council receive business documentation via email links. Specifically that:-

- Agenda pages only (not associated reports) be posted out first class via the Royal Mail or made available at the Council offices to appointees only in accordance with legislative requirement. Separately, all Members (including appointees) to receive an email link to all agendas and reports as they are published.
- Email links to the various business documents identified in paragraph 3.6 of the officer report be issued to all Members of the Council.

- Any ad hoc Member correspondence received at the Council offices be posted out first class via Royal Mail as appropriate.
- (2) That it be noted that a Government Order providing that, where a Member consents, a summons can be sent to an electronic address in electronic form, is imminent.
- (3) That the Portfolio Holder for People and Technology, in consultation with officers, monitor the new arrangements and address any issues that arise. (HLEMS)

### **166 REPORT ON URGENT DECISIONS**

Pursuant to Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(f), Council received a report on decisions that had been taken as a matter of urgency and not subject a call-in/referral. It was noted that the introduction of locking and unlocking at various premises had been urgent due to recent crime and disorder incidents.

### **167 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 second Council meeting for the 2014/15 Municipal Year and I would like to welcome all Members.

Since the last meeting I am delighted to announce that:-

- Another successful Wild Woods Day was held in Hockley Woods on 7 June.
- On Saturday 19 July 2014 our Chairman hosted a wonderful Reception in the Old House gardens in Rochford.
- Rayleigh Windmill won a Museums and Heritage award for Customer Services in recognition of the volunteers who go the extra mile in providing a knowledgeable and friendly service to visitors. It will also soon be hosting its 200<sup>th</sup> wedding.
- Our staff are benefiting from funding of just over £82,000 from Sport England’s Community Sport Activation Fund, in partnership with Castle Point Borough Council. Over the coming year, staff will be able to take part in various sporting activities during lunchtimes and after work.

The Executive has met on two occasions, when we considered matters such as:-

- The open spaces refurbishment programme for 2014/15
- The Ageing Population Strategy and Action Plan for 2014-17



- Funding for support in redesigning the Organisation

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

- The Thames Gateway South Essex Partnership, which I am pleased to report has secured additional funding.
- Surface Water Flooding – a Forum has been set up and will meet in August, when the Environment Agency will be represented.

Following a very successful Business Summit on 23 April, we have arranged our first Parish Summit, which is to be held this Thursday (31 July) at Saxon Hall, off Aviation Way. We have listened to our business community and are working on developing and building partnership working. The new format was universally welcomed at a Business Breakfast on 3 July.

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.”

### **168 MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

#### **(a) Rochford Off Street Parking Order**

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 16.1, the following motion had been received from Cllrs T E Mountain, J R F Mason, M Hoy, Mrs C M Mason, Mrs D Hoy, J Hayter, J C Burton, N J Hookway and C I Black:-

‘That the following resolution made under Minute 138 (Rochford Off Street Parking Order) of the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 1 July 2014 be rescinded:-

- (2) That the remaining proposed changes to the Parking Order set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report, including the tariff revisions and adjustments to the charging period in Old Ship Lane, Rochford, be agreed.’

The motion was moved by Cllr T E Mountain and seconded by Cllr J R F Mason.

Observations made in favour of the motion included that:-

- It was about transparency. Initially, the Review Committee had recommended that there should be no increase in parking charges to the Executive which the Executive had accepted. There had then been an unexpected change of approach involving an increase to charges, followed by a further change to remove Saturday afternoon charges on the basis of the receipt of a windfall. In addition the County Council continued to be pressed on the freeing up of separate monies associated with verge cutting. It was difficult to ascertain the

sense of the budget gap in question and whether there remained a real need to increase the tariff.

- Neither relevant background financial information or a Finance Officer had been available at the last Council meeting when the tariff had been considered. Appropriate advice would be of value given indications that reserves would build up to £2.5M over the next five years. It could be argued that, if you build up a reserve, it is bound to be taken in some way by the Government in any event.
- The United Kingdom was coming out of recession and an increase in charges would not assist the economy, particularly businesses. Savings recommendations likely to emanate from both the Chief Executive and the Review Committee would be the appropriate way to address shortfalls. Increasing income through car parking charges could be viewed as a form of tax increase by stealth.
- Priority should be given to the maintenance of frontline services. Costs associated with subjects such as the introduction of a new Portfolio, the Civic Dinner over a five year period and earlier increases in Councillor Allowances were of particular concern if there is a need to increase car parking charges.

Responding to questions the Head of Finance advised that County Council Tax Support Scheme monies were not a windfall but part of a contingency budget that could be reduced. The budget gap for the current financial year had increased to £140,000 because of the delay in introducing the tariff, and it was too early in the year to know what the outturn would be. General Fund contingency monies were to cover unexpected disasters or the drying up of income streams. The advice of the Head of Finance as the Section 151 Officer was that there should be a target of £1.8M by 2016-17. Monies associated with the New Homes Bonus were currently directed to frontline services but there was a risk that the Government would review and withdraw the Bonus scheme, which was forecast to generate around £1m per annum from 2016/17 onwards. The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy allowed Members to consider the long term impacts of financial decisions.

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

For (11): Cllrs C I Black; J C Burton; J H Gibson; J Hayter, N J Hookway; Mrs D Hoy; M Hoy; Mrs C M Mason, J R F Mason; T E Mountain and R A Oatham.

Against (19): Cllrs Mrs L A Butcher; T G Cutmore; R R Dray, Mrs H L A Glynn; K J Gordon; J D Griffin; B T Hazlewood; J L Lawmon; Mrs G A Lucas-Gill; M Maddocks; Mrs J E McPherson; D Merrick; Mrs J A Mockford; Mrs C E Roe; C G Seagers; Mrs M H Spencer; M J Steptoe; I H Ward and Mrs B J Wilkins.

Abstentions (1) Cllr Mrs J R Lumley

The motion was declared lost.

### **(b) Referral Up Facility**

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 13.1, the following motion had been received from Cllrs T G Cutmore; Mrs C E Roe; K H Hudson; D Merrick; I H Ward; M R Carter; M J Steptoe; Mrs L A Butcher; Mrs M H Spencer; Mrs G A Lucas-Gill; Mrs J E McPherson; M Maddocks; C G Seagers; K J Gordon; S P Smith; Mrs A V Hale; Mrs C A Weston; R R Dray; Mrs J A Mockford and B T Hazlewood:-

‘That the referral up facility within the Constitution be removed (paragraph 15 commencing on page 4.43 refers).’

The motion was moved by Cllr T G Cutmore and seconded by Cllr Mrs G A Lucas-Gill.

Observations made against the motion included that:-

- Removal of the facility was against the spirit of democracy and accountability, including Article 1 of the Council’s Constitution in relation to the creation of a powerful and effective means of holding decision makers to public account. The Annual Report made reference to the Council being open, accountable, and listening.
- Utilisation of the facility had been relatively rare, it last having been used in October 2012.
- From the perspective of the public it was right that the Executive could be seen as accountable in a public forum. A recent national press article had highlighted how democracy can be the loser with a cabinet system.
- Call-in arrangements available to the Review Committee could be influenced by the majority party. Separately there are concerns as to whether the Key Decisions Document was comprehensive.
- Other authorities provided additional avenues for non majority party Members, such as a facility for questions and answers at Executive meetings and the appointment of Executive Members without Portfolio. Whilst Rochford District Council had been seen as a place of goodwill compared to other Councils, removal of this facility would be a negative step.

Observations made in favour of the motion included that it would remove lengthy delays in the decision making process; reduce the waste of taxpayers money and take away a possibility of delays in Council services provided to vulnerable people. It was difficult to operate an efficient and

caring Council and deliver frontline services when significant delays can be automatically introduced.

It was noted that, if the motion was passed, the call-in arrangements associated with the work of the Review Committee would remain.

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

For (20): Cllrs Mrs L A Butcher; T G Cutmore; R R Dray; Mrs H L A Glynn; K J Gordon; J D Griffin; B T Hazlewood, J L Lawmon; Mrs G A Lucas-Gill; Mrs J R Lumley; M Maddocks; Mrs J E McPherson; D Merrick; Mrs J A Mockford; Mrs C E Roe; C G Seagers; Mrs M H Spencer; M J Steptoe; I H Ward and Mrs B J Wilkins.

Against (11): Cllrs C I Black; J C Burton; J H Gibson; J Hayter; N J Hookway; Mrs D Hoy; M Hoy; Mrs C M Mason; J R F Mason; T E Mountain and R A Oatham.

The motion was declared carried and it was:-

### **Resolved**

That the Referral Up Facility within the Constitution be removed (Paragraph 15 commencing on Page 4.43 refers). (HLEMS)

## **169 ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14**

Council considered the report of the Head of Finance on the Annual Report 2013-14.

The Head of Finance advised that the second paragraph on page six of the Annual Report would be adjusted to reflect the precise political composition and that there would be one reference to the clearing of chewing gum in the finalised document.

A motion that the words 'of the 345 Rochford District residents who responded' be included after '75.4%' within the bullet point on the Essex Tracker Survey on page 11 of the Annual Report was moved by Cllr T E Mountain and seconded by Cllr C I Black.

In favour of the motion it was observed that such inclusion would reflect the actual statistical position. The percentage figure had been quoted at a previous Council meeting and it would be appropriate to be up front about its nature.

Against the motion it was observed that independent surveys, of which this was one, consistently placed the District at the top of measures in a number of areas.

The motion was lost on a show of hands and it was:-

**Resolved**

- (1) That the Annual Report be agreed for publication.
- (2) That the audited financial statements for 2013-14 be presented to September's Audit Committee meeting for approval with the External Auditors Report. (HF)

**170 CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2014-15**

Council considered the report of the Head of Finance on the Capital Programme for 2014-15.

It was noted that recommendations in relation to the Depot building at Rochford would come to a future meeting.

**Resolved**

That the revised Capital Programme for 2014-15, as set out in the report, be agreed. (HF)

**171 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REVIEW 2013-14**

Council considered the Annual Report of the Head of Finance on Treasury Management activity for the 2013-14 financial year.

It was noted that arrangements were in place to change the Council's Bank over the summer period.

**Resolved**

That the Treasury Management Annual Review Report for 2013-14 be agreed. (HF)

**172 PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT – PROPOSED CHARGES**

Council considered the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation on adopting a policy of charging for Planning Performance Agreements.

It was noted that decisions on subsequent charges would be made by the Head of Planning and Transportation under delegated authority.

**Resolved**

That a policy of charging for Planning Performance Agreements and the associated fee structure, as set out in the report, be adopted. (HPT)

**EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**

**Resolved**

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

**173 REFERRAL OF DECISION ON DRAFT OPEN SPACES STRATEGY**

Pursuant to Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 15(b) a requisition had been received in the names of Cllrs C I Black, M Hoy, J R F Mason and R A Oatham requiring the decision under Minute 74 (Draft Open Spaces Strategy) at the meeting of the Executive held on 2 April 2014 be referred to Full Council.

Observations made against the decision included that information on open spaces previously placed in trust so that they could not be sold should be included in the document; that the Council should be considering options that would demonstrate value for money; that consideration should be given to the potential issues associated with open spaces arising from Core Strategy development going into private management arrangements; that the document should be further developed to include specific sites to minimise public concern and that there should be recognition that there are options other than management companies for land management, such as trusts or Parish Councils.

Observations made in favour of the decision included that it was intended to be published as a draft document on which stakeholders, groups and residents could comment and that its publication had already been significantly delayed given that all Members had had previous opportunity to ask questions of either the Portfolio Holder or officers.

On a show of hands it was:-

**Resolved**

That the original decision on this item be upheld. (HES)

Note: Cllrs M Hoy, J R F Mason and Mrs C M Mason wished it to be recorded that they had voted against the above decision.

The meeting closed at 10.26 pm.

Chairman .....

Date .....

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