

## Council

**Monday, 31st March, 2014**  
**2.30 - 4.50 pm**

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Councillors:</b>	Wendy Flynn (Chair), Simon Wheeler (Vice-Chair), Andrew Chard, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Chris Coleman, Barbara Driver, Jacky Fletcher, Rob Garnham, Les Godwin, Colin Hay, Penny Hall, Tim Harman, Rowena Hay, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Paul Massey, Andrew McKinlay, David Prince, John Rawson, Anne Regan, Rob Reid, Chris Ryder, Diggory Seacome, Duncan Smith, Charles Stewart, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Andrew Wall and Roger Whyborn

## Minutes

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Fisher, Holliday, Lansley, McLain, McCloskey, Stennett, Sudbury and Williams.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors C Hay and Smith declared an interest in Agenda Item 11 as Trustees of the Leisure and Culture Trust and Board Members of Cheltenham Borough Homes.

Councillor Driver declared an interest in Agenda Item 11 as Board Member of Cheltenham Borough Homes.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the last meeting were approved and signed as a correct record.

### 4. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor informed Members of the sad loss of Councillor Holliday's father and expressed her condolences. She then informed Members that she had attended the launch of the Race for Life and had launched the school art exhibition at the Wilson. Finally she made reference to the fact that the Mayor of Annecy had been re-elected in the recent municipal elections.

### 5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council referred to the recent retirement of the Executive Director, Grahame Lewis. He paid tribute to his work for Cheltenham and said that he would be missed.

The Leader reminded members that the Late Night Levy would come in to force on 1 April 2014. In terms of member involvement in the Late Night Levy Advisory Group, the proposal was to have proportionate representation and members would be appointed to the body after the elections in the normal way.

6. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Mary Nelson to the Leader</b>
	<p>At the 16<sup>th</sup> December Full Council Meeting Cllr. Smith questioned the Leader regarding the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan and was informed that the Final SEP was not due to be completed until 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, but would no doubt be subject to widespread discussion by then.</p> <p>A draft version of the SEP was submitted to central government in December 2013, but not subject to consideration by elected members. A revised draft version of the SEP was due to be published by the 16<sup>th</sup> March, just two days before the 18<sup>th</sup> March Cabinet meeting, and the Final SEP has to be submitted to the Government by the 31<sup>st</sup> March. At the 18<sup>th</sup> March Cabinet meeting Cllr. Jordan stated that due to the short time-scale now involved it was necessary for the Leader to sign off the final version of the SEP in consultation with appropriate Cabinet members and Group Leaders.</p> <p>Question</p> <p><b>Given CBC's stated requirement for the SEP to be in harmony with the JCS, thereby making the SEP an important "Evidence Base" JCS document, does Cllr. Jordan consider that the final SEP, only just published and now to be hurriedly signed off, by only Cabinet and leaders, has had the stated "widespread discussion" he said it would have, and does he not think that this will raise suspicions by the public and by some elected members?</b></p>
	<b>Response from the Leader</b>
	<p>To avoid any confusion, drawing up and submitting the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) is the responsibility of the Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Hence while Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC) would wish harmony between the SEP and JCS it could not be a 'stated requirement'. While the LEP has been working to a very tight timetable set by Government they have consulted widely and CBC has already given feedback on the draft SEP.</p> <p>The CBC 'sign-off' process referred to is now underway. So far there has been a presentation to council members and the SEP has now been circulated so that members can give their feedback. While I would anticipate that the council will give general support for the proposals, there will no doubt be some areas of concern that we wish to raise.</p> <p>In addition, the council will today be debating the proposal to set up the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee (GEGJC) where all the local authorities in Gloucestershire will be represented and which will coordinate their future input to the SEP. There are also proposals for a scrutiny process to cover both the LEP and GEGJC.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Question from Mary Nelson to the Leader</b>
	<p>The mid March draft SEP on the LEP website stated that the LEP were exploring the contribution that could be made from "<i>the New Home Bonus generated from the new large developments including the possibility of</i></p>

	<p><i>using it as an income stream to repay the cost of borrowing to fund upfront capital investments”.</i></p> <p>However the government's own website states very clearly that:</p> <p><i><u>"Local Councils can decide how to spend the New Homes Bonus. However, we expect local councils to consult communities about how they will spend the money, especially communities where housing stock has increased."</u></i></p> <p>Question</p> <p><b>Will the Leader guarantee that all New Homes Bonus money received from development of JCS Strategic housing sites, is first consulted upon with the local communities affected by new development, especially as concern over inadequate infrastructure has been mentioned in so many JCS Public Consultation Responses, and that the LEP will not be given any priority allocation of this money?</b></p>
	<p><b>Response from the Leader</b></p>
	<p>Cheltenham Borough Council has only committed spending of New Homes Bonus money based on houses already built. This has been agreed via the Council's budget setting process which is already subject to public consultation.</p> <p>Most new homes proposed in the JCS are not in the Cheltenham Borough area so I can not give any guarantees as to how other councils spend their New Homes Bonus.</p> <p>Future New Homes Bonus could be one source of funding to help meet infrastructure needs identified in the JCS. However, no mechanism to achieve this has been agreed yet and the issue will be subject of further discussion. In any case, I would expect that any proposals will undergo public consultation before New Homes Bonus money is spent.</p>
3.	<p><b>Question from Ken Pollock to the Leader</b></p>
	<p>Does the Leader agree that it is not acceptable for the SEP, appearing now at the last minute of the drafting of the JCS Pre-Submission plan, to seek to grab <u>very much more</u> of the land available at Cheltenham's North West (extending inward from M5 Junction10) to be a major 'Employment Growth Zone', thereby displacing planned <u>housing</u>, considering that this is the direction allocated for the principal Urban Extension to this town, which is overall so very constrained by hills and by coalescence-preventing GreenBelt ?</p>
	<p><b>Response from the Leader</b></p>
	<p>The timetable for the SEP is set by Government so is something we have to work with. It is important that both the SEP and JCS continue to progress.</p> <p>The JCS is a statutory process which will determine where development is permitted and where it is not. The JCS has a close inter-relationship with the emerging Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) for Gloucestershire</p>

	<p>being prepared by Gloucestershire Local Enterprise Partnership. The SEP is an aspirational plan for economic growth and one which promotes the JCS area as the key driver for delivering new jobs and increased Gross Value Added (GVA). It will trigger discussion with government over future funding to enable economic growth in Gloucestershire which will form part of a potential Growth Deal.</p> <p>However, in supporting the SEP the JCS needs to plan for the population that will support economic growth. The JCS Pre Submission has sought to plan taking account of the evidence provided by consultants Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners. The SEP embodies the view that the economy will recover much more rapidly; the top end of the Objectively Assessed Need reflects a situation of full economic recovery. The economic projections now supporting the JCS Pre Submission are indicating that the economy is improving at a faster rate than previously projected, but this does not lead to the conclusion that a full economic recovery will be achieved within the plan period. The SEP will not be able to 'grab' sites not agreed via the JCS.</p> <p>The particular issue at M5 Junction 10 is that while there is strong local support to make this junction 4 way, it is unlikely that there will be funding to enable this unless it can be demonstrated that it supports future economic growth. While this could involve some employment land near J10, the further work undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners is not showing current evidence that the 150 Ha at J10 suggested in the SEP is needed in the JCS plan period.</p>
4.	<p><b>Question from Ken Pollock to the Leader</b></p>
	<p>Does the Leader agree that as the SEP and all its cited but unpublished "Appendices" have not been shown to any councillors for information/approval, then the accompanying JCS Pre-Submission Draft cannot reasonably be cemented in place by Full Council on quite so hasty a timetable as next week, (especially when the crucial JCS <u>traffic assessments</u> are also still delayed and unpublished) ?</p>
	<p><b>Response from the Leader</b></p>
	<p>As mentioned in my answer to question 1, the full SEP has been circulated to all members as part of the 'sign-off' process.</p> <p>Agreeing the JCS is a statutory process which will determine the core strategy for our area. While the council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April is an important part of that process it does not mean anything is 'cemented in place'. There will be further public consultation on the soundness of the JCS Pre Submission before the 3 councils consider submitting a final version to the Secretary of State. There will then be a public inspection leading to potential adoption of the JCS in mid 2015.</p> <p>Delay to the JCS increases the risk of speculative planning applications being received and possibly being approved on appeal before a plan is in place. Hence my view is that it is sensible for this Council to proceed to debate the JCS on 9<sup>th</sup> April.</p>

**7. MEMBER QUESTIONS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Harman to the Leader</b>
	Surprisingly the Member of Parliament for Cheltenham is out of step with other political leaders and MPs in his opposition to the proposal for the completion of the A417 (Missing Link). Can the Leader of the Council confirm whether the majority Liberal Democrat Group is supporting or opposing this vital project or whether there is also a link missing between his group and the MP of our Town?
	<b>Response from the Leader</b>
	I am surprised and disappointed that Cllr Harman is attempting to cause division for political advantage at a time when we are seeking unity for the benefit of Gloucestershire. While Martin Horwood has always had concerns about the environmental impact of the current proposals he is not actively opposing the completion of the A417 (Missing Link). As Cllr Harman well knows my motion supporting the scheme had unanimous support at the last meeting of this Council.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Chard to Cabinet Member Housing and Safety</b>
	In view of the large number of licensed premises which have varied their licenses so as to avoid the Late Night Levy could the Cabinet Member for Housing and Safety tell the Council what he now anticipates the Levy will raise on an annual basis?
	<b>Response from the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety</b>
	<p>As the closing date for free variations is today 31<sup>st</sup> March I am unable to produce definitive figures, but the number of licensed premises which have taken up the offer of a free variation is broadly in line with the original estimates, some 52 out of the 218 premises eligible.</p> <p>The anticipated level of levy revenue which will be collected at £96,000 is broadly in line with estimates although this figure will still be subject to change up or down as new licences are issued, existing licences are surrendered and licence variations' take place throughout the year.</p> <p>The levy payments will be collected over a 12 month period starting on the 1<sup>st</sup> April. Currently, all licensed premises pay an annual fee due on the anniversary of the issue of the license. The levy will be due at the same time as the annual fee. It will not be possible to give a more accurate estimation until nearer the end of the financial year (14/15).</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Chard referred to the increasing list of establishments who wished to shorten their licensing hours to avoid the Late Night Levy which included Up Hatherley social club. He asked why such venues had not been excluded from the tax.</p> <p>In response the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety reminded the Member that the Late Night Levy had been a Council decision. He added that only 25 % of premises had applied for a free variation to their licence.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Question from Councillor Hall to Cabinet Member Sustainability</b>
	As of yesterday and again today 24th March 2014 at 1030 the only reference that I can find on the CBC website despite repeated searches for Street Cleaning and litter is the following;

	<p>"Contact: Cleansing Email: cleansing @cheltenham.gov.uk Tel 01242 262626 Municipal Offices"</p> <p>Does the removal of all the previous information on Street cleaning and litter policies and processes mean that the policy for street cleansing and litter has changed ?</p>
	<p><b>Response from the Cabinet Member Sustainability</b></p>
	<p>I wish to reassure members that the information is on the website. I am unsure where Councillor Hall was looking but if you use the website's search facility and type in street cleaning it brings up a range of options which includes the page setting out the council's policy.</p> <p>"Cheltenham town centre is litter picked, mechanically swept and spot power washed every morning on a daily basis including weekends. Litter picking carries on throughout the day until 5pm.</p> <p>Major routes into the town are swept on a weekly basis or more often if necessary.</p> <p>All areas outside the town centre are scheduled to be litter picked according to their needs and this can vary from a twice weekly litter pick to a monthly litter pick depending on footfall and the amount of litter that occurs.</p> <p>Fly tipping is picked up on the day of the litter pick, or if it is reported to Cheltenham Borough Council a ticket will be raised to remove it as soon as practical.</p> <p>The schedules will be altered during the autumn months as more emphasis will be placed on leaf clearance in the areas most affected until leaf fall is complete.</p> <p>Inspections are carried out on a daily basis by the street cleansing supervisor who documents 40 random checks each month. Standards are also recorded with 300 NI 195 inspections which are carried out over each four month cycle, these figures are recorded and compared to previous results."</p> <p>In a supplementary question Councillor Hall pointed out that on the council's website there was an alphabetical list of council services and one of her colleagues had also searched under "S" and street cleaning was 23<sup>rd</sup> down the list. She asked why such an important service to residents was so reflected on the website. In response the Cabinet Member Sustainability offered to put in a similar search on the website but believed that there were two different methods to obtain the information. He would raise the issue and report back.</p>

**8. PROCESS FOR APPROVAL OF THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN**

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and explained that the Council, together with all the other local authorities in Gloucestershire, was a key partner in the development of the Gloucestershire Strategic Economic Plan which would support a bid for Growth Plan funding to the Government in March 2014. He added that whilst Cabinet held the formal decision making powers to authorise the process it was felt that Council should have an opportunity to comment on it. He emphasised that there was a very tight schedule for approving the process.

The Leader stated that there was a mechanism for signing off the plan and he was keen to obtain the support of all local councillors. Members were invited to feedback directly to the Leader or via Group Leaders. In terms of governance, a local joint committee, comprising members of the local authorities, would oversee the input to the process. This was business led but local authorities had a role in coordinating funding. The Leader would attend the meetings of the Joint Committee. He explained that the committee had a process of majority voting but if there was an issue specific to a particular district, the countywide approach was that this could not be voted in against the will of the authority in that area. He also added that the committee could not stop the things an authority was already doing in an area, for example Cheltenham already provided a local business advice service.

The Leader also informed that the County intended to establish a scrutiny body, similar to the County Council's Health and Care Overview Scrutiny Committee, comprising 6 members from the County Council and 6 representatives from the district councils. The Leader stated that the person going to the Joint Committee meeting would announce the decision to be taken in advance and this decision could be called in locally.

Members discussed the issue and the following points of clarification were raised :

- The figure of 3200 homes referred to in the document related to the potential development capacity at junction 10. This number had not been incorporated into the JCS
- Barn Farm which ran alongside junction 10 was in the ownership of CBC.
- Resolution 4 referred to authorities not requiring a vote by Council
- Executive functions were delegated to the Leader and he was able to delegate them to Cabinet and anyone else
- A request for a budgetary contribution was expected at some point as a post would be created to coordinate the process but had yet to be allocated. In any case CBC would contribute one-seventh of the cost. Longer term there would be discussions on how to fund the proposed infrastructure whether this be by the use of the New Homes Bonus, pooled business rates or the community infrastructure levy
- In response to a question on timings the Leader commented that they were working to a very tight schedule and Government was "making it up as they went along".
- It was clarified that under paragraph 4.3, 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point the protocol was not to impose any conditions on a particular area that it didn't want, the aim was to work collaboratively

- The Leader undertook to pass on the comment as to whether the proposed county scrutiny committee would have call-in powers on decision making. It was important that the scrutiny process worked properly.
- The Leader pointed out that the SEP was a strategic document and the LEP's business plan should align itself accordingly. The SEP was drawn up based on specific criteria from Government but he acknowledged that it was important to have a balance to ensure industries such as agriculture and tourism were not forgotten.

**RESOLVED (unanimously)**

**To note the proposal to establish the Gloucestershire Economic Growth Joint Committee.**

**9. ACQUISITION OF LAND FORMING THE FORMER SHOPFITTERS SITE AND LAND AT SYNAGOGUE LANE, AND DISPOSAL OF FORMER CAR PARK LAND AT ST JAMES STREET**

The Cabinet Member Finance introduced the report and explained that Cabinet had agreed to acquire the Shopfitters Site at St George's Place along with open land at Synagogue Lane from the County Council. Council was now being requested to authorise the capital investment necessary for the cost of acquisition, planning application, demolition, site remediation and construction of a temporary surface public car park and all ancillary costs.

The Cabinet Member explained that as the transaction had yet to be completed, the detailed figures were commercially sensitive but the broad principles of the transaction were in the public domain.

He explained that the acquisition of the site would realise to the Council a substantial brownfield site suitable for development in the short-term as off street public car parking, and offer wider opportunities thereafter for future development of the site in part or whole. The benefits would be to clear the former Shopfitters site which was currently derelict, provide the opportunity to merge the Chelt Walk and the Synagogue Lane car parks thereby generating additional income, provide an opportunity for regenerating that particular part of the town centre and would allow the Council to assemble a significant town centre site with substantial development potential which may include options to build out new Municipal Offices and other public facilities.

The Cabinet Member Finance said that this was an example of how officers had been thinking creatively and proactively in investigating opportunities for the future of the town centre.

In terms of timescale the Cabinet Member Finance clarified that the County Council were keen to acquire a capital receipt in the current financial year which explained why the transaction had been brought forward and the council intended to ensure that a car park was operational as quickly as possible. The Head of Property and Asset Management was invited to address Council and he clarified that planning permission and the subsequent demolition and construction works would take approximately six months.



When asked whether there had been any changes to the flood risk assessment at the bottom of Cheltenham Walk which had been highlighted when a previous development had been considered, the Head of Property and Asset Management said that initial investigations had confirmed that this site was in the flood zone and should there be a development on site in the future this would be factored into the considerations. Another Member requested that should the site be developed in the future, then the whole area should be considered as part of one big project with parking, in particular residents parking, being a specific concern. In response the Cabinet Member Finance agreed that the future should be considered very carefully. He highlighted that the immediate intention was to create a car park and the longer term discussion for the site would be considered in the coming year. He assured Members that this would not be considered in isolation.

**RESOLVED (unanimously)**

**That the amount of useable capital receipts (outlined in the Exempt Appendix III) be set aside to cover the cost of acquisition, planning application, demolition, site remediation and construction of a temporary surface public car park and all ancillary costs.**

**10. ACCOMMODATION STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member Finance introduced the report and said that as this was a significant issue it was considered that full Council should have an opportunity to discuss it.

He explained that it had become necessary to expand the current remit for alternative accommodation. Staff numbers in 2016/17 were estimated to be 220 as a result of further commissioning and restructuring of services. This meant that less than half of the space in the current Municipal Offices would be required which was wasteful in terms of maintenance and general overheads. In addition the current office space was not suited to modern working methods.

The Cabinet Member Finance explained that officers had been active in looking for alternative accommodation for some time within the existing remit. Expanding the current brief would open up options for officers to consider new purpose built accommodation, the potential of a split site and provide opportunities for the current Municipal Offices. He added that it was the intention to retain the freehold of the Municipal Offices and the frontage of the building should be preserved and protected. He paid tribute to the hard work of officers in seeking the right opportunities at the right price and emphasised that the programme board was committed to finding a solution to enhance the town and best serve the public.

Some Members questioned why Council was being asked for a view when it had no decision to make. In response the Cabinet Member Finance reiterated that its role was to endorse the brief recently updated by Cabinet. When asked whether the Municipal Offices could somehow be divided up to be more fit for purpose for office space, the Cabinet Member Finance explained that this would only be possible at considerable cost and with the move towards more flexible working and hot desking this was not being considered as an option. Assurance was also sought with regard to the future of the current building and the Cabinet

Member Finance explained that the Municipal Offices would not be left vacant for any period of time so there would be some form of synchronisation of the council moving out and new occupiers moving in. In response to a question regarding potential new accommodation at the Royscott building which had underground parking, the Cabinet Member Finance reassured members that every opportunity for alternative accommodation was being taken into account.

Whilst Members recognised the commitment of officers in seeking a solution, some commented on the waste of time and money spent over the last two years on working to the restrictive remit. They welcomed however the plan to seek an independent source of income from the Municipal Offices and thought this should be thoroughly explored. Members had mixed views as to whether a high street presence was still important. Examples were given of reduced footfall where neighbouring authorities had moved out of town but with modern, accessible (particularly for the elderly and the disabled) and online services the need appeared to be less and if the service was available in a ward around the town it would be considered as genuinely local. Reference was made to those neighbouring authorities who had moved out of the town centre where there had been no decrease in customer satisfaction levels and services were being provided in a more cost-effective and accessible way. They also believed it was important to explore options for sharing facilities with other public bodies. In having the whole discussion in the public domain the public should now understand better why the remit was being widened. Members also commented on the current accommodation being a poor vehicle for proper debate and the public gallery was considered to be ill suited for the needs of the public. A member emphasised that Asset Management Working Group had been kept informed of progress with the accommodation strategy and this was a cross party working group.

In summing up the Cabinet Member Finance acknowledged the views which had been expressed but wished to reassure the town that any decisions on future accommodation would be made on sound financial evidence and with a sound respect of historic buildings in the town. There had been a change in attitude from both the public and councillors over the last three years and he hoped that a satisfactory solution would be found soon.

**RESOLVED ( with one abstention)**

**That the current situation be noted and the expanded brief set out in the report be endorsed.**

**11. CORPORATE STRATEGY-DRAFT 2014-15 ACTION PLAN**

The Leader introduced the report on the development of the corporate strategy action plan 2014-15 which was circulated to all Members with the agenda. He explained that Council were being asked to approve the action plan which had been produced in parallel with the budget process. There had been consultation with overview and scrutiny and partnerships and the senior leadership team had verified that the plan was achievable within the current level of resources. Overall he felt the action plan represented a positive programme for Cheltenham and urged Members to support the action plan.

Members were invited to ask questions on the detail in the report and the Leader clarified a number of points in the following responses:

- the setting of milestones, baselines and targets was an evolutionary process which had started in 2010 when the five-year strategy was first drawn up. Some measures may need to change due to changes in external factors.
- The action plan distinguished between community targets and targets specific to Cheltenham Borough Council where the council had more control over their achievement.
- COM14 – He considered the management of the 2014 District and European Elections was a significant piece of work and therefore it was appropriate that it was included in the action plan.
- VFM12 - He reminded Members that Council had agreed a major sum in the budget to support the investment in the ICT infrastructure.
- Referring to risk CR33 - if the council does not keep the momentum or the JCS going he acknowledged the point made by a Member that there could be other risks if the council did agree the JCS and these should be considered when reviewing the corporate risk register.
- He noted that Members of O&S were pleased to see that their recommendations on dog fouling and street cleaning had been accommodated in the plan.
- the Cabinet Member Housing and Safety confirmed that the proposed improvement actions relating to people having access to decent and affordable housing would be picked up by the appropriate commissioning review working group.
- The Cabinet Member Leisure and Culture explained that the baseline target for attendances on Sport/Play programmes had remained at 10,000 as that was the maximum capacity that could be accommodated. There also needed to be a balance in setting targets for subsidised activities versus commercial viability..

Members went on to debate the action plan. Some Members felt it was a difficult document for residents to read and understand all the linkages. Other Members questioned some of the terminology used and suggested the document should be written in more plain English, the drafting of the document improved and milestones made more specific.

A Member reminded Council that the document had been to the March meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and challenged why these points had not been made at that stage. He felt that all Members had a duty to engage in the democratic process in bringing this document to Council.

A Member suggested that Council should look at the overall picture and reflect on some of the achievements represented in the strategy such as the development at North Place, the Brewery and Albion Street which had previously been stalling as projects for many years.

A Member congratulated the manager of the Town Hall for their achievements in improving ticket sales. The Museum, Arts and Tourism Manager was also to be congratulated for their achievements regarding footfall at the Wilson.

In responding to the debate the Leader emphasised there was no such thing as a perfect document and rejected some of the criticisms made. In formulating the plan the Cabinet had tried to simplify the amount of information it contained and the measures selected. For next year's plan, he encouraged Members to ask for more detail on any aspect of the plan at any time but ideally before the Council meeting where it was coming for final approval.

Upon a vote it was

**Resolved that the 2014-2015 corporate strategy action plan be approved and used as the basis for monitoring the council's performance over the next 12 months**

Voting: For 23, Against 4 with 1 abstention.

## **12. COUNCIL DIARY 2014-15**

The Cabinet Member Corporate Services introduced the report on the Council Diary September 2014 to August 2015. He proposed two amendments.

- i) that the Council meeting on 6 October 2014 should be moved to 13 October 2014 in order to avoid the party conference dates.
- ii) that the Council Tax Setting meeting planned for Friday 27 February 2015 should start at 6 p.m. rather than 2:30 p.m. to accommodate Members who work.

A Member felt strongly that the start time of the Council meeting had always been a 2.30 start and should remain so. Another Member disagreed and felt that it was important that meeting times were set to encourage more young people to stand for council. A Member suggested that the 6 p.m. start should be reviewed if it turned out there was additional business at the tax setting meeting. This was agreed to be a good way forward.

Upon a vote it was

**Resolved that the draft Council diary of meetings for September 2014 to August 2015 be approved subject to the above amendments.**

Voting: this was agreed with one abstention

## **13. NOTICES OF MOTION**

There were no notices of motion.

## **14. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS**

There were none.

## **15. ANY OTHER ITEM THE MAYOR DETERMINES AS URGENT AND WHICH REQUIRES A DECISION**

None.

Wendy Flynn  
**Chair**