

# **MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**



**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA NO. 1  
MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – Agenda Item 4**

**Thursday, 15th May, 2014**

**7.00 pm**

**Council Chamber  
Thanet District Council  
Margate**

**[www.thanet.gov.uk](http://www.thanet.gov.uk)  
01843 577000**

**Please note that under the Council's procedure rules, no audio or visual recordings shall be made at any Council meeting except for official recordings by the clerk or recordings agreed by the Chairman to be made by accredited media organisations**

**We may be able to provide this document in a different format such as Braille, audio or large print, or in another language. Please call 01843 577165 for details.**

Date: 12 May 2014  
Ask For: Anona Somasundaram  
Direct Dial: (01843) 577046  
Email: anona.somasundaram@thanet.gov.uk



You are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of the Thanet District Council to be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent on Thursday, 15 May 2014 at 7.00 pm for the purpose of transacting the business mentioned below.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G Bach".

Democratic Services & Scrutiny Manager

To: The Members of Thanet District Council

**FIRE ALARM PROCEDURES:** If the fire alarm is activated, please vacate the offices via the stairs either through the security door to the left of the Chairman or opposite the lifts in the foyer. Please do not use the lifts. Please assemble in Hawley Square on the green. Officers will assist you and advise when it is deemed safe to return to the Chamber.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

Item  
No

Subject

4. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** (Pages 1 - 10)

To approve the Minutes of the meeting of Council held on 24 April 2014 (to follow)

## COUNCIL

### Minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2014 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Council Offices, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

**Present:** Councillor Mrs Kay A Dark (Chairman); Councillors H Scobie, Alexandrou, Aldred, Bayford, Bruce, Campbell, Clark, Cohen, Coleman-Cooke, Day, Driver, Duncan, Dwyer, Edwards, Everitt, Fenner, Gideon, D Green, E Green, I Gregory, K Gregory, Grove, Harrison, C Hart, S Hart, Hayton, Hornus, Huxley, Johnston, King, Kirby, Lodge-Pritchard, Marson, Matterface, Moore, Moores, Nicholson, Poole, D Saunders, M Saunders, Savage, Scobie, W Scobie, Sullivan, M Tomlinson, S Tomlinson, Watkins, Wells, Wiltshire, Wise, Worrow and Wright

#### **104. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence have been received from Councillors Binks, Gibson & Roberts.

#### **105. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

On the proposal of the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 27 February 2014 were approved by Council and signed by the Chairman.

#### **106. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman announced that Kath Coe, former Labour Councillor for Cliftonville East from 1995 to 1999, had recently passed away. Tribute was paid to her accomplishments on behalf of residents and all present stood for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

#### **107. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interests.

#### **108. PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

##### **(a) Petition No. 1 - Margate Port**

Mr Andrew Murray presented a petition with 207 signatories, as follows:

"It is about our Margate Cinque Port Harbour that has for many years been allowed to build up with rotting, decaying mud rubbish, sediments and seaweed. This is creating a methane sewage emitting smell, that smells similar to urine and the stench is airborne because of the build-up of sediments over on-going years. It is putting people off from coming to our Heritage Cinque Port Harbour. The Council are advertising Our Town as a unique port and that Cinque Ports are to look after sailors when coming into Margate.

"As the Council are in charge of maintaining our beaches which is included in people's rates, the smell that the harbour emits is putting people off coming to our town. The main problem seems to have started when the sluice arched part got bricked up on the outer side of the harbour wall which allowed water to pass through and clear the inner harbour of unwanted sediments, mud and seaweed. This would take it out to the sea. We the petitioners are disgusted that this has been allowed to happen over many years which would not bring prosperity to our town. The problems are easy to resolve, i.e re-open the sluice with a big gated gate to allow water pass through clearing the harbour of decaying debris. There was once a time when the harbour was full of vessels of all types, including yachts and cargo boats. Now only smaller crafts can enter

our harbour as its been allowed to clog up with debris of all kinds. This is putting off our holiday makers and people who visit our Turner Centre and some wouldn't want to come again. We the petitioners feel that businesses are suffering in the area. It is a disgrace for our Heritage Town. The Council have recently spent millions of pounds on steps and an Art Gallery. It is a small amount of money to re-open the sluice gate and would solve the problems for good. Under Maritime Law and Cinque Port Laws which the Council advertise this build up should never of happened as sailors cannot get boats in any more, as the sand has built up over the years. How is this neglect helping sailors and our ports? That is why Cinque Ports were made, many years ago to look after sailors mainly.

"We hope that our petition will sort this problem out for Margate. We hope our Port will be a better attraction for all in the future once this sluice gate is re-opened."

In presenting the petition, Mr Martin also suggested: that the rotting seaweed trapped in a confined area produced methane gas, which could pose respirational health risks; that the seaweed could be recycled by means of an anaerobic digester or burned without harmful emissions to produce electricity, thereby saving the Council money in terms of landfilling costs; that seaweed was a danger when wet but an excellent bio feedstock why dry; and that the slipway for launching craft was covered with rubbish.

It was NOTED that, in accordance with the Council's petitions scheme, the petition would be referred to Cabinet without debate for report to Council within three ordinary meetings.

## **109. QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

### **(a) Question No. 1 - Ramsgate Main Sands**

Mr Barry James asked Councillor Poole the following question:

"It is now the beginning of the 2014 Season, can you tell us what measures the Council is taking to make sure Ramsgate Main Sands will be awarded a Blue Flag, originally lost at the beginning of the 2013 season?"

Councillor Poole responded as follows:

"In 2013 there was a change to Blue Flag Criteria that required beaches to achieve the 'excellent' water quality standard as set out in the revised bathing water directive. This new standard is based on the previous four years' bathing water quality results, and is now twice as stringent as the previous directive.

"Ramsgate achieved the 'guideline' standard in 2013 but under the new bathing water directive based on the 2009-2012 results the beach only achieved the 'good' standard and therefore Ramsgate Sands was not eligible for a Blue Flag Award. Unfortunately, this is also the case for 2014 which is based on 2010 - 2013 results.

"Ramsgate beach is likely to receive a seaside award from Keep Britain Tidy that reflects all other aspects of the beach.

"There are many things on and adjacent to the beach that can affect the water quality. They are: pumping station failures; long sea harmful discharges; surface water drainage; highway gully pots; seagull droppings; dog faeces; cigarette butts; seaweed; ship discharges; dumped rubbish; and food waste.

"Unfortunately, it is very rare for the Environment Agency to have direct evidence as to what causes a drop in water quality. During heavy rainfall, Southern Water has granted approval to allow discharges from storm drains. These discharges carry stream varieties such as dog fouling and litter, cigarette butts, etc that could easily have been culturing bacteria in road gulleys, and this can get washed onto our beaches. Most of these problems are beyond the control of the Council and need a cohesive working relationship with Southern Water, the Environment Agency and Kent County Council."

**(b) Question No. 2 - Pleasurama Site, Ramsgate**

Ms Kandice Jones asked Councillor Everitt the following question:

“As the construction engineer for the Pleasurama site has just been employed, can you tell me if this person has been given all the knowledge of works done, with the details of the environmental agency’s recommendation for the flood risk and sea defences to be re-assessed?”

Councillor Everitt’s response was as follows:

“The firm employed to assist the council have been given an initial task as agreed by Cabinet to advise on a programme of works to deal with the breach of the development agreement. This involves an assessment of works undertaken so far, together with use of the construction drawings and works programmes submitted to the council, and using industry knowledge of material delivery and set up periods. The work has to be done carefully to ensure that the proposed programme is reasonable and would be assessed as such by a court.

“Flood risk assessments and the need for sea defences do not form part of the planning approval enacted on the site, nor the development agreement with the council, and do not form part of the work being undertaken by the external expert employed by the council.”

**(c) Question No. 3 - The Little Oasis Skate Park**

As the questioner, Mr Duncan Smithson, was not present at the meeting, it was noted that his question would, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.7, be answered in writing.

**110. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL****(a) Question No. 1 - Local Lettings Plan in Minster**

Councillor Grove put the following question to Councillor D Green:

“In Minster a Local Lettings Plan is in place in accordance with the section 106 agreement attached to the Heronsbrook Development. Please provide clarification as to the role Minster Parish Council has in having an input into the allocation of the re-letting of these properties at this site in perpetuity.”

Councillor D Green replied to Councillor Grove’s question as follows:

“The Section 106 agreement states under paragraph 1.23:

*“‘Qualifying Resident’ shall mean a person who is on the Thanet District Council Housing Register administered by the Council or the transfer register held by a relevant Registered Social Landlord and who is approached in writing by the Council as being in need of Affordable Housing’*

“There is no mention of Minster Parish Council being involved with allocations of the units or re-lets. However, at the time of the initial allocation Housing thought it was good practice to involve them in the lettings panels due to the emphasis of local connection to Minster. This enabled a joined up approach and consideration of their input before the Council and Southern Housing made the final decision on allocation.

“All re-lets will go through the Council’s Choice Based Lettings and upon shortlisting & verification the Local Lettings Plan will be adhered to by the Allocations Officer.”

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Grove then asked Councillor D Green a supplementary question:

“Would Cabinet consider an amendment to the Local Lettings Plan at Heronsbrook to consult Minster Parish Council on the shortlist and allocation for all future lettings in view of our being consulted on further development in the Local Plan?”

Councillor D Green’s response was as follows:

“I want to give the Councillor my opinion on the Local Letting Plans. I think we need to be really careful about the number of Local Letting Plans that we support in the district, for each one we support compromises the pool of housing that is available to everyone who is on our housing register. So I have asked officers to review the number and scope of local lettings plans that we, in fact, run.

“But, as a compromise, Thanet District Council are willing to involve the Parish Council when a household has been identified via the shortlist for the Heronsbrook site by emailing the nominated name of the household to the Parish Council so that we can obtain further information regarding residency qualifications with regard to the parish. Please note this will only be for sites with Local Lettings Plans and we will also need a quick response from the Parish so that we can pass the information onto Southern Housing to avoid avoidable costs.”

(b) **Question No. 2 - Manston Airport**

Councillor King asked the Leader of Council, Councillor C Hart the following question:

“Would Councillor Hart tell Council precisely what action he has taken as Leader of the Council to address the proposed closure of Manston Airport?”

Councillor C Hart responded:

“The Leader put a motion to the Kent Leaders and to the Thanet Regeneration Board to propose that the Enterprise Zone be extended from Discovery Park to cover Manston Airport and Business Park, including the Richborough Corridor. This was carried forward as an 'ask' to Government in the South East Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan which went to Government at the end of March for negotiation.

“Senior officers and I are meeting and working with the MP’s, Kent County Council and other relevant departments as part of the Task Force to support the retention of the airport and should that not be possible to mitigate the impact of any possible closure. We have a meeting in London on Monday.

“The Council is holding regular meetings with the representatives of the airport to try and identify timescales and things that the Council could do to support.

“Through engagement with the Thanet Regeneration Board we understand that Jobcentre Plus are available and ready to support anyone who is put at risk of being redundant and will need to find a job, they have proved to be an invaluable support service in other cases, for example when Pfizer sold the majority of their interest in Sandwich.

“We have sent out a press release and contacted the business network to help identify businesses that would be impacted by the potential closure of the airport either due to their location on airport land or if they formed part of the supply chain. So far we have had five businesses contact us, it is still early days and some businesses will be waiting to find out what is going to happen. We have also worked with the airport to find out who their local suppliers are to contact them directly.

“We are monitoring the situation closely to ensure that we have the relevant information and evidence for the local plan.

“In short, we are working with Kent County Council, local MPs and the Task Force to do everything we can.”

Councillor King then asked a supplementary question:

“Should any rescue plan for the survival of Manson airport be dependent on the agreement of night flights, would Councillor Hart then support night flights for the greater good of the regeneration of Thanet and the success of Manston airport?”

Councillor C Hart’s reply to that supplementary question was:

“I am very clear on this one. I stood on a manifesto pledge to support the Airport in any way I could but not at any environmental cost, and I stand by that pledge. What I have been told is that at the public meeting that Roger Gale MP called in Acol last week, he was asked the same question and he apparently told the public that this was not an issue; not a reason for the closure of the airport; and had no impact on the decision.”

(c) **Question No. 3 - Peer Review Report**

Councillor Driver put the following question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor C Hart:

“I understand that the Council has been in possession of the draft Peer Review report for almost 3 weeks. Could you tell me when this report will be made available to all Councillors?”

The Leader responded:

“Following the on-site Peer Review work and the feedback presentation on 13 March, the Council is now waiting for the Local Government Association (LGA)’s final report. We received a draft report on 3 April and have submitted our feedback to the LGA in response to this. We are now waiting for the final report which is expected to come to the Council in the next week and will be made available to all Members immediately (we intend to do that through the email system). I would like to stress that it is the LGA’s report, based on their assessment of the Council. They meet with 100 staff, Councillors and external partners as part of the onsite work as well as reviewing a number of our key documents beforehand. Their findings will reflect all of these sources of information. Whilst we will have an equal opportunity to comment on the draft versions, this is primarily to ensure that any factual errors are corrected or any misunderstandings clarified. However, in the interests of transparency and openness, we will also be making the draft report available to Scrutiny along with the council’s comments on the draft.”

Councillor Driver then asked the Leader whether in the event of the report being critical of the Cabinet, he would respond to the LGA in the same way as he had responded to the Independent Members of the Standards Committee.

The Leader’s answer to that supplementary question was:

“I have no comment on that.”

(d) **Question No. 4 - Restructure of the Council**

Councillor Wells asked Councillor Fenner, Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate and Regulatory Services, the following question:

“Could the Cabinet Member for Business, Corporate and Regulatory Services please advise why it was deemed appropriate for the Chief Executive not to report their proposals for restructure of this council to the authority as appears to be required by section 4 of The Local Government and Housing Act 1989?”

Councillor Fenner responded:

“For the information of the Members, Section 4 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 states that:

*‘It shall be the duty of the relevant authority’s Head of Paid Service, where s/he considers it appropriate to do so in respect of any proposals of her/him with respect to any of the matters specified ...’*

which, in effect, are matters to do with restructuring ..

*'It shall be the duty of the head of a relevant authority's paid service, as soon as practicable after s/he has prepared a report under this section, to arrange for a copy of it to be sent to each member of the authority'.*

"So, the recent management restructure was considered for some time and formally consulted upon from 24 October 2013. The main changes were to reporting lines and the functional changes within each directorate were reported to council on 27 February 2014. The Chief Executive had to be mindful of the employment laws, which require several phases of staff consultation. The new restructure emerges fully after full consultation has ended. As the changes impacted on two of the statutory posts - the S.151 Officer, which moved to a vacant director post, and the Monitoring Officer - it was necessary to gain specific approval for this. This was the subject of a report considered and approved by council on 27 February, which, as I pointed out earlier, also included a senior officer and service structure chart. The organisation imposed a recruitment freeze in the summer of 2013, resulting in vacancies remaining vacant so as to minimise job losses resulting from the restructure but agency staff were put in place. Some key positions have now been taken up by existing staff. Appointments are in progress to the structure. It is the intention of the Chief Executive to report the final structure and officers in place once the internal recruitment process has been completed and staff are placed and no longer at risk of redundancy."

Councillor Wells then put a supplementary question to Councillor Fenner:

"Perhaps the Cabinet Member could advise us all, following her endorsement of the Chief Executive's approach, why she felt it necessary to consult with Rustom Tarta, an employment lawyer, whose website advises a specialism of reputational management for organisations looking to part company with their chief officers."

Councillor Fenner's response to that supplementary question was as follows:

"I believe it is for this organisation to seek legal advice wherever it feels that is necessary. In the context of this restructure, I would also like to point out that a great deal is being made of the council's constitution."

(e) **Question No. 5 - Parking Permits**

Councillor Duncan asked Councillor Poole, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Operational Services, the following question:

"How many annual subscribers to both the short-term parking permits and the long-term parking permits did not pay to renew them this April?"

Councillor Poole responded:

"A total of 248 permits have been purchased to date for this year and 262 permits were purchased in the same time period for last year that is a reduction of 14 permits purchased on last year. "

Councillor Duncan asked a supplementary question:

"I am aware that some subscribers in Broadstairs in particular, bearing in mind the problems in Albion Street last week, would pay £360 but have declined to renew at the uplifted price of £400 resulting in a loss to the Council. How can an increase of 11.11% be justified with all the current financial restraints to the public purses?"

Councillor Poole responded by stating:

"A review of the parking permit system was carried out during the recent fees and charges of the council budget process and identified the need to bring the cost of parking permits back into line with the daily parking charges. Parking permit charges were last increased in April 2008. Car parking charges were last increased in 2012. In 2011 the incoming labour administration reduced the outgoing conservative administration's' proposed double digit increase to an average increase of 3% the then rate of inflation. Free



Saturday parking was introduced at this time for identified town centre car parks. Following the fees and charges review it was decided to increase the cost of A, B and C permits and withdraw the D permit. There was also the need to reflect the changing patterns of usage in our car parks. These changes were included in the fees and charges report agreed by full Council in December 2013 and reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny in January 2014. There have been a small number of complaints about the increase and the cost of parking permits although the permits are not a like for like replacement. Using Trinity Square car park in Margate as an example, a D permit holder would only pay a small fraction, that is one seventh of the cost of someone buying daily tickets over the year and would also be able to park in another four car parks. This discount was excessive when compared to other areas and also when compared to other types of season tickets and we can compare that with the railways; they always go up. In addition it means that those people who cannot afford a season ticket are subsidising those who can."

#### **111. NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

It was NOTED that no notices of motions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.

#### **112. LEADER'S REPORT**

The Leader of the Council reported on various projects that were planned across the district, including those for: Ramsgate Harbour; East Pier Yard, Ramsgate; Dolphin Lights, Ramsgate; Planting at Royal Parade Alcoves, Ramsgate; Eastern Promenade Gardens, Ramsgate; The Centre Redevelopment, Newington; Empty Properties, Ramsgate; Ramsgate Tunnels; Harbour Projects; "The Green Box"; King Street, Ramsgate; Royal Pavilion, Ramsgate; Dreamland, Margate; Refurbishment of four Play Areas across the district; Skateparks; the Shed Project, Broadstairs; Ellington Park Ramsgate; and the SUCCESS (South-East Urban Coast Creative Enterprise Support Scheme) Programme.

The Leader of the Council also reported that, following the announcement of the closure of Manston Airport, he had proposed an emergency motion to regional meetings to explore extending the Enterprise Zone to cover Manston Business Park and Manston Airport, and that the Government had now been asked to consider such an extension.

Councillor Bayford, as Leader of the Conservative Group, commented that he always had believed that Manston could match the success of Southend, where, as a result of partners pulling together, there was a thriving airport employing 2,500 persons.

He asked why the Leader of the Council had not, from the outset, worked with local skateboarders to resolve the issues identified in the ROSPA report that related to the Little Oasis Skate Park.

He also referred to the judge's ruling in relation to the decision to ban animal exports at Ramsgate Port and noted that an appeal was not being pursued.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating: that he had been proactive regarding Manston Airport; that the decision to ban animal exports had been the right decision from the perspective of protecting staff and animals; and that the negative situation regarding the Little Oasis Skate Park had been turned into a positive, with skateboarders now being fully supported to bring the site up to standard

Councillor King, Leader of the Independent Group, noted that quite a few of the projects mentioned in the Leader of the Council's report related to Ramsgate and enquired what was being done for Westgate particularly in relation to play equipment for Epple Bay. He also suggested that senior officers at Manston Airport felt that the Council's attitude towards the future of the airport was one of negativity.

In response, the Leader of the Council stated that projects covered all parts of the district; that Councillor Johnston was in communication with a party regarding a new pitch and put facility for Westgate; and that he did support the Airport.

Councillor Cohen, as Leader of the Thanet Independent Group, welcomed the projects referred to by the Leader of the Council, particularly those in relation to affordable housing, the Green Box, Ramsgate Tunnels and Dreamland. He also expressed support for Manston Airport, subject to controls being in place to protect the local community, and for the Council's decision to ban animal exports from Ramsgate Port.

Councillor Wiltshire, Leader of the UKIP Group, expressed disappointment that the Little Oasis Skate Park had been demolished and referred to the legal costs likely to be incurred in relation to the ban on animal exports.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that the decision regarding the Skate Park had been regrettable, but inevitable, and that skateboarders were working with the Council to find a positive way forward.

**113. AGREEMENT OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PLAN FOR 2014-2015**

Penny Button, Head of Neighbourhood Services, and Martyn Cassell, Community Safety and Leisure manager, were thanked for their work relation to the draft Plan.

It was proposed by Councillor Johnston, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor C Hart, and RESOLVED:

“THAT Council approves the priorities, emerging issues and proposed actions in the Thanet Community Safety Plan 2014/15 as set out in Annex of the officer's report”.

**114. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME 2014/15**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT Council adopts the draft 2014/15 Members' Allowances Scheme as set out at Annex 1 to the report and refers the scheme to the East Kent Joint Independent Remuneration Panel (EKJIRP) for consideration, with any comments from EKJRIP being reported back to Council”.

**115. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**

(a) **Social Media Guidance for Councillors**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 6.1 of the report be adopted, namely:

‘THAT, following the recommendation of Standards Committee, the Social Media Guidance for Councillors, as attached at Annex 1 to the report, be approved and included in Part 5 [Codes and Protocols] of the Council's constitution.’”

(b) **CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendations as set out at paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. THAT the clauses as set out in Annex 1 to the report be approved;
  2. THAT the consequential changes to the responsibilities of the Section 151 Officer in relation to Treasury Management, as set out at Annex 2 to the report, be approved.”
- (c) **Recorded Votes at Budget Meetings of the Council - To amend Council Procedure Rule No. 21**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

1. THAT, following the recommendation of Standards Committee, the following amendments to Council Procedure Rule 21 be approved:-

***New Council Procedure Rule 21.6***

***“21.6 Recorded votes at Council budget decision meetings***

***“A recorded vote will be required at a meeting of the Council on motions, amendments or substantive motions relating to the approval of the budget or setting of council tax, whereby there shall be recorded in the minutes the names of the Members who cast a vote for the motion/ amendment or against the motion/amendment or who abstained from voting. As this is a mandatory standing order under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) Regulations 2001, it cannot be suspended under Council Procedure 29.1.”***

2. ***Amended Council Procedure Rule 21.3***

***“21.3 Show of hands***

***Unless a recorded vote is demanded under Rule 21.4 or required under Rule 21.6, the Chairman will take the vote by show of hands (and a count if requested), or by means of an electronic voting system, or if there is no dissent, by the affirmation of the meeting.”***

- (d) **Business considered at budget-setting meetings - To Review Council Procedure Rule 2.0**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendations as set out at paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. THAT, following the recommendation of Standards Committee, Option 1 be adopted, namely, to exclude from the budget-setting meeting agendas all items that do not relate to the budget, with the exception of the essential items of apologies for absence, minutes of previous meeting and declarations of interests, subject to a qualification as follows:
  - **subject to the Chairman having discretion to accept additional items; but only in exceptional or urgent circumstances**
2. ***THAT the suggested amendment to Council Procedure Rule 2.0 to take account of option 1, as set out at Annex 1, be approved.”***

(e) **To Review Appointment of Substitutes to Attend Meetings**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 5.1 of the report be adopted, namely:

‘That, following the recommendation of Standards Committee, Council Procedure Rule 5 and Clause 9 of the Protocol for the Guidance of Planning Committee Members and Officers be amended, as indicated at Annexes 1 and 2 respectively.’”

(f) **Registers of interests and gifts and hospitality for officers - to amend financial procedure rules to reflect current practice**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 5.1 of the report be adopted, namely

‘That, following the recommendation of Standards Committee, the amendment as shown at Annex 1 to the report be approved by Council.’”

**116. REPORTS BACK TO COUNCIL ON PETITIONS**

(a) **Petition - Pleasurama/Ramsgate Royal Sands Development Agreement**

The report was NOTED.

(b) **Petition - Licensing of Street Traders**

The report was NOTED.

(c) **Petition - Play Area at the Broadstairs Memorial Recreation Ground**

The report was NOTED.

**117. REPORTS BACK TO COUNCIL - NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

(a) **Notice of Motion - Article 4 Direction**

A debate took place, during which Councillor D Green advised that he had instructed officers to write to residents of all houses in the Wimpey Estate, asking them for their views on the situation and to identify any houses that were HMOs (*houses in multiple occupation*).

It was pointed out to Councillor Green that the problem now appeared to be more widespread, whereupon Councillor Green asked Members to let officers know of any other roads affected. He undertook to include those roads and bring back a report on all responses received.

(b) **Notice of Motion No. 3 - Introduction of a local levy**

The report was NOTED.

Meeting concluded : 9.00 pm