

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2013 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Cecil Street, Margate, Kent.

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

In Attendance: Mr Robin Hills, Independent Member and Chairman of the Standards Committee

40. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Coleman-Cooke, Gibson, Grove, Hayton, Roberts and Sullivan and an apology for lateness was received from Councillor Wells.

41. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor K Gregory declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Agenda Item No. 8a [Minute No. 47a below refers].

42. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

(a) Minutes of the ordinary meeting of council held on 11 July 2013

The following amendments were NOTED:

1. The first sentence at minute no. 25 (f) [page 4 of the minutes] should read, "Ms Rebecca Sewell asked the Leader ...";
2. The first sentence of the second paragraph under the heading, "Supplementary Question" at minute no. 26(b) [page 7 of the minutes] should read, "Councillor Bruce asked Councillor Poole ...".

On the proposal of the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 11 July 2013 were, subject to those amendments, approved by Council and signed by the Chairman.

(b) Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 6 August 2013

On the proposal of the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 6 August 2013 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

43. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements under Council Procedure Rule 2.1 (iv).

44. PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no petitions received from the public in accordance with the Council's petitions scheme.

45. QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

(a) **No. 1 - Visibility of junction of Tenderden Way and Millmead Road, Margate**

Mr Matthew Brown put the following question to Councillor Johnston:

"Given the number of near deaths and other bad traffic accidents due to poor visibility at the right hand turn on the corner of Tenderden Way and Millmead Road what will you be doing to support the addition of a traffic mirror to save lives?"

Councillor Johnston, who referred to emails already sent by her to Mr Brown, replied:

"This issue came up a number of years ago and the three Ward Councillors – Councillor Sandra Hart, Councillor Will Scobie and Councillor Edwards – have taken this up.

"It has been under discussion for some time and, I know, within this Council we have actually, as part of a consultation, included this junction in a large parking order (because, obviously, it is parking of cars that is a problem there) and that is due to be published for consultation next week. So that is a move forward from this Council's point of view.

"The proposals, at the moment, are for double yellow lines (I don't know if you feel this would help, but we should talk about that) to prohibit the parking.

"I agree with you about mirrors, but it doesn't seem to be something that Kent County Council are happy about; they think of reflection and blinding people. As of this evening, I've had an email to say that they didn't think that this would work – they don't think that there have been enough deaths, probably, up there to justify putting a mirror.

"I am not happy with that. It will, hopefully, go to the Joint Transportation Board. That's what I would like us to do. Perhaps, talking to the Chairman, Councillor Clark here, we can pursue it through there.

"In the meantime, we will allow our own officers to pursue the yellow lines, but I certainly support you in this. We have lots of families coming through there with children on their way to school, lots of elderly in Riverside Close, and I know we have the support of the District Councillors and certainly County Councillor Will Scobie. I am happy to support you and I will keep you informed as I have already. Thank you."

(b) **No. 2 - Royal Harbour, Ramsgate**

Ms Kandice Jones asked Councillor Poole the following question:

"How are you going to tackle issues at our Royal Harbour, which is falling into disrepair including: the East Wall crumbling, the sandbanks stopping boats over 40ft entering/exiting, the working dredger having been sold and the hired dredger doing a bad job, and price hikes for mooring deterring boats?"

Councillor Poole replied:

"The East Pier at Ramsgate is a Grade 2 listed stone structure which is maintained in accordance with good engineering practice, the Council's health and safety obligations and the structure's listed status. Maintenance is undertaken on a programmed and

sometimes reactive basis but we are not aware of any evidence to suggest that it is in a poor state of repair.

“The Council actively monitors sediment levels via hydrographic surveys throughout the Port and Royal Harbour and carries out programmed dredging work accordingly. The survey results are published on the Port of Ramsgate website.

“It is not the case that vessels over 40 feet cannot enter the Royal Harbour - all of the wind farm support vessels are in excess of 40 feet and both enter and exit the Royal Harbour many times on a daily basis. Last week saw a tall ship in the Royal Harbour at a length of 181 feet and the Race of the Classics is expected on 10 October with 25 such vessels. A variety of dredging methods are required to facilitate the cost effective management of sediment levels at Ramsgate. This approach requires capabilities beyond those of a single vessel such as 'MV Ramsgate', the former harbour grab dredger. Recent dredging operations have been undertaken by several companies using various dredging methods to best suit the areas of the Port and Harbour concerned, these works have been completed to a fully acceptable standard in accordance with a contract specification.

“Consultation between the Council and the Harbour Users Group occurs four times per year and the harbour charges have not been a contentious issue at these minuted meetings.

“This year has seen an increasing number of permanent berth holders and a higher than forecast number of visiting vessels. Visitors have been surveyed as to their levels of satisfaction, including the charges levied, and this has demonstrated that the appropriate market charges are made at Ramsgate and that the satisfaction levels are very high.”

(c) **No. 3 - Transeuropa Ferries debt**

Mr Duncan Smithson put the following question to the Leader, Councillor C Hart:

“What advice did the Chief Finance Officer give the incoming administration over securing the outstanding Transeuropa Ferries debt, 2011; who is responsible for not securing the debt when you came to power; and did the administration feel no change was needed to the agreements with Transeuropa?”

The Leader replied:

“When we took control of Thanet District Council, the Chief Finance Officer briefed us about the extent of the Transeuropa debt.

“On the basis of legal advice, it was understood that there was no recourse for Thanet District Council to secure the debt. External independent specialist advice received to date concurs with this advice.

“We are still looking at what options are available to us to recover the debt owed.

“In relation to whether the new administration felt that change was needed; I cannot speak on behalf of the previous Conservative administration, of course, who were in power at the time that the agreement was made, but I can tell you that the position was monitored on an ongoing basis from the time we took power. In fact, we took a slightly harder stance by requiring that they made an agreed minimum payment.

“It was agreed that the position would be revisited at the end of the financial year, but this was unfortunately preceded by the insolvency of the company. What we did was try to work with one of our key customers, to agree measures to minimise the risk of non-

payment. Had we insisted on payment up front, this would almost certainly have caused bankruptcy of the firm, leading to certain financial loss for the Council.

“Let me make it clear: the Council has never, at any point, loaned any money to Transeuropa. What it did do was recognise that the company was struggling in the economic climate and agreed to restructure the payments of its port fees on the understanding that the money would be repaid in full. This was done in the best interests of the local economy, to support one of the district’s key economic assets and to protect the Council’s revenue/income budget.”

(d) **No. 4 - Corporate governance**

Mrs Rebecca Sewell put the following question to the Leader, Councillor C Hart:

“On the basis of advice given to me by the Government and CIPFA, I would ask you if you think a full corporate governance investigation should be undertaken of all TDC councillors and lead officers as relationships are at rock bottom?”

The Leader replied by stating that, in order to answer the question, he would require the information to which Mrs Sewell was referring. He assured people that relationships were not rock bottom and that he had no knowledge of any relationships that were broken down. He invited Mrs Sewell to write to the Chief Executive and S.151 officer about the CIPFA situation, whereupon she would be provided with a written response.

46. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(a) **Live Margate Scheme**

Councillor W Scobie asked Councillor D Green the following question:

“Would the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning Services please inform Council whether there will be further building demolitions as part of the Live Margate scheme? Many local residents are concerned about losing historic buildings, particularly as they are the main feature that is attracting people to invest in the area.”

Councillor D Green responded as follows:

“The Live Margate Scheme is a joint scheme between Thanet District Council and Kent County Council, aimed at improving the living conditions in the Live Margate area, mainly in Cliftonville.

“The aim of the scheme is to improve the structure of many of the buildings, but also to change the tenure conditions to a more balanced state. As far as I know, there are no plans to demolish any buildings that are currently underway. This Council has not demolished any buildings, but I believe there has been one building demolished as a result of Kent County Council’s activities. But, having said that, I cannot promise that there will never be any other building demolitions because in order to carry out the aims of the schemes, it may be that we find buildings that are not economically able to be restored, and then demolition needs to be a consideration.

“I am pleased, however, that there are local residents in the Live Margate area who are concerned about losing historic buildings because conservation of our history is a bit of a passion of mine, so I am pleased that others feel the same.

“I would query, though, the last phrase that they are the main feature that is attracting people to invest in the area because the historic buildings have been there for many years and failed to attract people to restore them over many years; hence the state that some of the buildings find themselves in.

"I hope and believe that what is attracting people to invest in the area, and they certainly are, is precisely the Live Margate Scheme, backed by Thanet District Council and Kent County Council under both administrations of this Council and it is that, I believe, that is slowly turning round the area.

Supplementary Question

Councillor W Scobie asked Councillor D Green a supplementary question:

"With that in mind, would it be possible, Councillor Green, for you to organise a meeting with the local Ward Councillors and some of the groups involved in Cliftonville in conservation, to talk about some of these issues. I think it would be really good to have a dialogue between the Council and possibly the Chairs and Secretaries of the different conservation groups in Cliftonville to talk about these issues."

Councillor D Green replied to that supplementary question as follows:

"That is something that, of course, I would welcome, and I know the officers involved in running the scheme would welcome also. We are more than happy to set up a meeting to achieve just that, particularly with the Ward Councillors, but also with any groups or individuals that the Council would like to suggest should be included."

47. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

(a) **Downgrading of Crown Post Offices**

Councillor K Gregory, who had declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item [Minute No. 41 above refers], left the Chamber at this stage.

It was proposed by Councillor Johnston and seconded by Councillor W Scobie:

"Thanet District Council supports the Communication Workers Union in their efforts to stop the privatisation and down grading of 70 Crown Post Offices, including our Margate office, and the further closure of 6 offices with a total loss of over 800 jobs.

"We welcome the wide support of many local people who wish to keep the Crown Post Office in its existing historic building in Cecil Square. The nearest will be at Ashford and Faversham should this service be franchised out.

"We request the Leader writes a letter of concern to:

Paula Venells, Post Office Chief Executive, 148 Old Street, London, EC1 9HQ.

"We would further request the Leader to write to the Under Secretary of State with Parliamentary responsibility for Post Offices informing him of the detrimental impact on services to the public in a franchised facility and include the MP for North Thanet Sir Roger Gale in that correspondence."

It was AGREED that the motion be debated.

Councillor King proposed that the wording in the final paragraph of the motion:

"... and include the MP for North Thanet Sir Roger Gale in that correspondence"

be amended to read:

“... and invite the MP for North Thanet Sir Roger Gale to come to a full council meeting of Thanet District Council to respond to the proposals.”

That amendment was not seconded.

The Leader of the Conservative Group stated that it was not possible for his group to support the motion in view of its expressed support for the actions of the Communication Workers Union.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared CARRIED.

(b) **No. 2 - Bedroom Tax**

It was proposed by Councillor Fenner and seconded by Councillor Campbell:

“Thanet District Council commits to protecting tenants from the Bedroom Tax in the following ways:

Proactively engaging with tenants and offering advice and assistance;
Preventing tenants from losing their homes through sensitive debt management and rent arrears procedures;
Identifying the need for and processing Discretionary Housing Payments quickly;
Adjusting allocations and letting policies to assist tenants who wish to downsize.

“Thanet District Council also commits to protesting to Government to repeal the Bedroom Tax by:

Working with tenant organisations who call for the repeal of the Bedroom Tax;
Communicating the hidden costs and impracticalities of the Bedroom Tax;
Demonstrating to Government the unfairness of the Bedroom Tax;
Working with the Government to provide alternative strategies to address housing shortages.”

On the proposal of Councillor Fenner, seconded by Councillor Hart, it was **AGREED** to debate the motion.

Some Members stated that whilst they could support the first part of the motion, they could not support the second. At the conclusion of the debate, Councillor Bayford requested that a vote be taken separately on each part of the motion. Councillor Fenner, as proposer of the motion, expressed her wish to have the motion put to the vote as a single motion.

Upon the motion being put to the vote, it was **RESOLVED**:

“That Council agrees the motion in principle and refers it to Cabinet.”

48. LEADER'S REPORT

In his report, the Leader of the Council referred to:

1. How the Council was working closely with national organisations:

The Leader and Councillors Johnson and Will Scobie had contributed towards the report of the Centre for Social Justice, whose aim was to seek solutions to poverty.

2. How the Council was working closely with other seaside authorities:

The Council was continuing to work with Hastings and Tendring Councils on the “SUCCESS” Programme, the aim of which was to encourage growth in the

creative and cultural industries in the South East coastal area. The core themes shared by the councils were housing, worklessness and offshore renewable energy and, together, the councils were fighting the case for coastal areas through the Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Plan.

3. How the Council was working closely with the county authority:

Under the jointly run Live Margate Scheme, an ugly and problematic 20-30 bed house in multiple occupation in Cliftonville had recently been converted into two beautiful 4-bedroom properties. Further funding had been accessed through the Homes and Communities Agency for the creation of 30 homes in Ramsgate and the regeneration of 15 additional properties above local shops.

4. How the Council was working with our neighbouring local authorities, particularly with Dover District Council owing to the two Councils' joint Assisted Area Status and economic and geographic connections. He and the Leader of Dover District Council would continue to work for the benefit of residents and support the Grow for It East Kent campaign.

5. How the Council was working closely with Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group:

The Health and Wellbeing Board meetings had now been established, and a series of joint internal discussion sessions planned. The last full meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board had included a Children's Summit, involving leading local children's agencies.

He supported the campaign to have our local Children's Centres remain open.

6. How the Council was working with local business.

The Chairman of Council was to be congratulated on her focus on our local businesses. He had joined the Chairman on a programme of business visits in Thanet. The visits not only fitted in with the Chairman's civic role, but were also relevant to his Cabinet portfolio.

7. How the Council was working with local community groups and organisations.

Many successful events, staged by local residents, voluntary and community groups, had taken place over the summer period. In particular, Councillors Johnston, Poole and Everitt had worked hard to find funding to support local groups, drive events forward and tidy up the district afterwards.

8. How the Council was working closely with Manston Airport.

The Council continued to support the airport through its environmental services. In the summer, he had attended the arrival of the A380 Airbus. He had recently learned that the MP for South Thanet may have reservations regarding the proposed Parkway Station.

At the conclusion of his report, the Leader made the following announcements:

- a) His intention to set up a Kent International Airport Cabinet Advisory Group for the purposes of:
 - i. considering and assessing the environmental impacts arising from the Kent International Airport in terms of noise, air quality and traffic

management and the impact on protected habitats and how any adverse impacts could be mitigated;

- ii. considering and recommending to Cabinet how the Council should respond to any current or future airport operators' night-time flying proposals;
- iii. keeping under review the Section 106 Agreement regulating Kent International Airport and recommending to Cabinet any amendments to the Agreement considered necessary or desirable as a result of the future development and expansion of the airport.

The Leader thanked Councillor Fenner for her work in relation to this and said that he would shortly be contacting the Leader of the Opposition for nominations.

b) Portfolio changes, as follows:

- i. Enforcement Services, environment and parking would move to the Operational Services portfolio;
- ii. Property Services would move to the Finance portfolio;
- iii. Environmental Health, Licensing and Land Charges would move the Community Services portfolio.

The Leader concluded his report by sending his best wishes to Councillor Gibson who was currently on holiday.

As Leader of the Conservative Group, Councillor Bayford replied: that the housing intervention plan was to be welcomed; that he understood that, although it was proposed to reduce hours of opening, no closures of children's centres were proposed; that all those who had helped with the summer events, particularly volunteers, should be congratulated; that he believed that a parkway station would be beneficial for the area; and that he welcomed the creation of the Airport Cabinet Advisory Group.

Councillor Bayford suggested that the Leader could have made reference to: the introduction of Saudi Airlines Cargo flights to Manston, and the resultant creation of jobs; Turner Contemporary having received its millionth visitor; what had happened to the historic rides in Dreamland; and the new hotel proposed for the Rendezvous site. He asked for clarification on the Portfolio change relating to Property Services.

In response, the Leader of the Council stated that the campaign for children's centres was proving successful and that Property Services included asset management.

The Leader of the Independent Group, Councillor King, stated that it was difficult to respond to the Leader's report as he had not received notification of the topics to be covered until late that evening.

The Leader of the Council apologised for the lateness of the notice.

The Leader of the Thanet Independent Group, Councillor Cohen welcomed the liaison between Thanet and Dover Councils, particularly in relation to the promotion of small businesses; the news that a dedicated Airport Cabinet Advisory Group would be formed; and that so many successful summer events had taken place.

The Leader of the Council thanked Councillor Cohen for his comments.

As Leader of the UKIP Group, Councillor Wiltshire, who welcomed the upturn in Thanet, pointed out that the Government had donated £30m to create businesses in Thanet. She also said that she welcomed the Saudi airline business at Manston.

The Leader of the Council responded by stating that he acknowledged Government funding and that whilst he did not oppose Manston Airport, he did not support it at any environmental cost.

49. ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REVIEW 2012-2013

It was proposed by Councillor Everitt, seconded by the Leader and RESOLVED:

“THAT Council approves:

1. the actual 2012/13 prudential and treasury indicators in the officer’s report;
2. the annual treasury management report for 2012/13.”

50. THE SCRAP METAL DEALERS ACT 2013 AND DELEGATIONS

It was proposed by Councillor Fenner, who clarified that the legislation had already been implemented, seconded by Councillor Nicholson and RESOLVED:

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

‘Council delegates to the Licensing Board the power to grant, refuse, revoke or vary applications under the 2013 Scrap Metal Dealers Act where representations are to be made. Non-contentious applications without representations may be granted by the Regulatory Services Manager under delegated powers. Fees to be set by the Regulatory Services Manager in consultation with the relevant Cabinet portfolio, then agreed annually by Council.’ ”

51. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, PANELS AND BOARDS

The report, which referred to the replacement of Councillor Dwyer with Councillor Lodge-Pritchard as a Planning Committee substitute, was NOTED.

If was further NOTED from Councillor Bayford that he had nominated Councillors Bruce and M Tomlinson as Planning Committee substitutes.

52. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

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

“THAT Your Leisure Thanet Sub-Group be added to the list of Executive Outside Bodies.”

It was NOTED from the Leader that he would nominate Councillors Johnston and Poole as representatives on Your Leisure Thanet Sub-Group.

53. REPORT BACK TO COUNCIL - PETITION RELATING TO PLEASURAMA SITE, RAMSGATE

The report was NOTED.

54. REPORT BACK TO COUNCIL - NOTICE OF MOTION ON STREET LIGHTING

The report was NOTED.

55. REPORT ON URGENT DECISIONS NOT SUBJECT TO CALL-IN

The report was NOTED.

56. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION

At this point of the meeting, the Chairman announced that she was withdrawing the following agenda items for further consideration:

1. Agenda item 17f – “To review Council Procedure Rule 3.1 – Calling Extraordinary Meetings” [Minute No. 56f refers];
2. Agenda item 17g – “To review Constitutional Procedure Rule relating to ‘Putting the motion to the meeting’ [Minute No. 56g refers].

(a) Filming of Council meetings

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

“THAT the recommendations as set out at Paragraph 8.1 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. That the Protocol for the Filming of Council meetings at Annex 2 of the report be approved;
2. That the Protocol be included at Part 5 of the Council’s constitution;
3. That Council Procedure Rule 34.2:

‘No audio or visual recordings shall be made at meetings except for official recordings by the clerk or recordings agreed by the Chairman to be made by accredited media organisations’

be removed from the Council’s constitution and replaced by a new Council Procedure Rule 35.0, as follows:

‘35.0 Audio and Visual recordings of Council Meetings

35.1 No audio or visual recordings shall be made at meetings except for official recordings by the clerk or recordings agreed by the Chairman in advance in accordance with the ‘Protocol for Filming of Council Committee meetings’ which is included at Part 5 of this constitution’ “.

The motion, upon being put to the meeting, was declared CARRIED.

(b) Revision to Financial Procedure Rules re reporting of balance sheet debt

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

“THAT the recommendations as set out at paragraph 6.0 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. That Council approves the amendment to the Financial Procedure Rules to require the reporting of all aged debt over £150,000 to the next available ordinary council meeting;
2. That Council agrees that the timeline for reporting debts shall be 60 days for those debts with standard payment terms of 0 or 30 days and 90 days for those

debts with payment terms of 60 days, regardless of whether or not the debt has been paid in full or in part between the expiry of the 60 or 90 day period (whatever the case may be) and the date of the next available ordinary council meeting;

3. That Council approves the amendments to Financial Procedure Rules (Regulation D: Systems and Procedures), as set out at Annex 1.”

(c) **Review of Protocol for the Guidance of Planning Committee Members and Officers**

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

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

‘That Council approves the revised Planning Protocol at Annex 1’.”

The motion was, upon being put to the meeting, declared CARRIED.

(d) **Contract Standing Orders and Purchasing Guide**

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

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

‘That Full Council receive and approve adoption of the revised Contract Standing Orders and Purchasing Guide as shown at Annexes 1 and 2 to the report, to include such amendments relating to the following areas:

- a) Reinforcement of conflict of interest and confidentiality undertaking protocols, including addition of ‘Conflict of Interest’ contract clause as standard for contracts valued £10K and over;
- b) Inclusion of obligations and requirements of the Council in respect of Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012;
- c) Realignment of headings of Standard Contract Clauses to the Council’s General Conditions of Contract;
- d) Non-material amendments to Job Titles and Section headings to align with the current Council structure/establishment;
- e) Authorisation to the Strategic Procurement Manager to undertake such non-material amendments as a result of restructures, as required from time to time, without the requirement to revert to the Constitutional Review Working Party, provided that a report on amendments is brought to the next available meeting of the Constitutional Review Working Party.’ ”

(e) **Review of decisions made in private session**

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

“THAT the recommendations as set out at paragraph 6.0 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. That a confidential /exempt report is reviewed a year after the ultimate decision taking body has considered it;

2. That the reviews of the status of exempt information relate to all decisions other than those taken by the Standards Committee or its sub-committees;
3. That only exempt decisions taken after the constitution has been updated are affected by this process – in other words, it is not retrospective;
4. That the list of officer delegations in the constitution be amended to include a delegation to the Corporate & Regulatory Services Manager to conduct reviews of exempt information and determine whether it should be published;
5. That the Corporate & Regulatory Services Manager publishes his decision on each review giving reasons for such decision;
6. That Democratic Services uses the modern.gov system to publish reports that are no longer deemed to be exempt;
7. That, if after the first year review a report is still treated as exempt, that report should then be the subject of a further similar review on the third anniversary of the decision having been first reviewed;
8. That full Council receives a report on the decisions reviewed by the Corporate and Regulatory Services Manager on an annual basis; such a report to include the reasons wherever it is considered not possible to release the report/information to the public;
9. That the additional paragraphs, as shown in Annex 1 to the report, to the Council's Access to Information Rules be approved."

(f) **To Review Council Procedure Rule 3.1 - Calling Extraordinary Meetings**

It was NOTED that this item had been withdrawn [Minute no. 56 above refers] by the Chairman for further consideration.

(g) **To review Constitutional Procedure Rule relating to "Putting the Motion to the Meeting"**

It was NOTED that this item had been withdrawn [Minute no. 56 above refers] by the Chairman for further consideration.

(h) **Substitute Members of the Governance & Audit Committee**

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

"THAT the recommendations as set out at paragraph 8.0 of the report be adopted, namely:

1. That there be named substitutes for the Governance and Audit Committee;
2. That the substitutes be appointed in accordance with the principles of political proportionality; and
3. That the following table be included within the terms of reference for Governance and Audit Committee within the Council's Constitution."

Number of Members	Nine Members
Substitute Members permitted	Yes – only from the list approved by Council, which matches the proportionality of the Committee itself
Political Balance Rules Apply	Yes
Appointments / removal from Office	By resolution of Full Council
Restriction on membership	None – Membership decided upon by Full Council
Restrictions on Chairmanship/Vice-Chairmanship	None – Membership decided upon by Full Council
Number of ordinary meetings per year	4

(i) **Changing the Petitions Scheme to a Protocol**

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 paragraphs 12.0 to 12.9 of the Council Procedure Rules be moved to Part 5 of the Council’s constitution and the following new paragraph 12.0 be added:

12.0 Petitions from the Public

The Council will receive, accept and deal with petitions from members of the public in accordance with the requirements of any Petitions Scheme from time to time adopted by the Council. The Council’s current Petitions Scheme is included in Part 5 of the Council’s constitution.”

(j) **To update the Constitution with a view to removing references to the Standards Board for England**

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

“THAT the recommendation at paragraph 4.1 of the report be adopted, namely:

‘Council approves the changes to the constitution as set out at Annex 1.’ ”

(k) **Leader’s Report - Review of Council Procedure Rule 2.2**

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

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

That Council agrees that the following wording be removed from Council Procedure Rule 2.2:

‘The total time (including time slots as mentioned above) will be limited to 31 minutes.’ ”

The motion was, upon being put to the meeting, declared CARRIED.

Meeting concluded : 9.35 pm