

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 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, Binks, Bruce, Campbell, Cohen, Coleman-Cooke, Day, Duncan, Dwyer, Edwards, Everitt, Fenner, Gideon, D Green, I 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, J Scobie, W Scobie, Sullivan, M Tomlinson, S Tomlinson, Wells, Wiltshire, Wise and Worrow

178. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Clark, Gibson, L Green, K Gregory, Roberts, Watkins, and Wright.

179. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

(a) Minutes of ordinary meeting of Council held on 2 October 2014

An amendment was noted as follows:

In paragraph nine of Minute No. 166, the word 'red' should be removed.

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and agreed that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 2 October 2014 were, subject to that amendment, approved by Council and signed by the Chairman.

(b) Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 18 November 2014

An amendment was noted as follows:

The reference to the recommendation as set out in Minute No. 177 should read paragraph '11.1', relating to the Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places 2014.

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and agreed that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Council held on 18 November 2014 were, subject to that amendment, approved by Council and signed by the Chairman.

180. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that Dennis Hart, former Labour Councillor for St Lawrence Ward and Nethercourt Ward had recently passed away. Tributes were paid to his character and accomplishments, and all present stood for a minute silence as a mark of respect.

181. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

182. PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

It was NOTED that no petitions had been received from the public in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme.

183. QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

(a) **Question No. 1 From a Member of the Public - Dickens House Museum**

Mr Kirkpatrick asked Councillor Johnston the following question:

"Despite repeated discussions, and further assurances prior to the previous full Council meeting, no action has been taken to use the £50,000 bequest for improving the Dickens House tourism product. The initial offer was reaffirmed over two years ago.

Does the Council intend to ever take advantage of this money?"

Councillor Johnston replied:

"Mr Kirkpatrick contacted me earlier this year, because he had been in contact with officers regarding the £50,000 legacy from Joyce Smith, somebody much loved by all of us, who was a curator at the museum. When we met my immediate feeling was that I had never seen the Will, nor had our officers seen the terms of the Will. There was also an issue about the actual ownership of the Dickens House Museum.

I'm sorry that this has taken a long time, but I've asked the officers for a timeline, because I came into this story probably about March time. An Economic Development Officer spoke to you on the 1st October and noted that the £50,000 was for the Dickens House Museum, and could not cover anything that the Council should already be paying for. Then we asked to see the Will around the 20th October, I had asked for it before but it needed to be formally done. So we requested to see the Will to understand what implications the £50,000 funding had for the Council from a legal perspective.

We were advised that once we had the relevant legal advice we could arrange a meeting to discuss what the options might be. We were then advised that we could not discuss options until we understood fully any legal implications in relation to the Council's ownership of the Museum. In all the years I have been here, I thought the Council fully owned it.

Officers continued to get on with this, and on the 23rd October, Mr Kirkpatrick, you sent an extract of Joyce's Will to us which is what we really needed. It said that the sum of £50,000 was to go to the Dickens House Museum Broadstairs, on condition that it was set aside in a separate endowment fund to be administered jointly by the museum and the Dickens Fellowship, Broadstairs.

Officers took legal advice on two issues:

Firstly, what the options were for the future ownership, management and operation of the Dickens House Museum based on Miss D.L.Tattam's Will and subsequent assent. This included the view that the Museum could be put into an external trust and be run separately. For this, officers from the legal team sought external counsel who had more experience in the area, obviously we would have to pay for this.

Secondly, what the legal implications are in relation to the monies from Mrs Smiths Will?

On the 21st November we received complex advice from Legal Counsel in relation to the Council's ownership of the museum.

On the 27th November we received advice from the internal Legal department in relation to the Legal Counsel's advice due to its complexity.

On the 1st December, and remember that I have been asking for all this, we received advice from the internal Legal department in relation to the query about the spending of the £50,000 from Mrs Smith's Will.

The summary of the advice, and I'm sure it was much longer, is:

Mrs Tattam's Will - the Dickens House Museum is held by the Council as a charitable trustee, with the implication that the Council's freedom to deal with it is thereby strictly limited. The Council will need to make contact with the Charity Commission to discuss any potential options, so that the Council is not in breach of this legal trust arrangement. Any action the Council takes moving forward will require formal consent from the Charity Commission.

Joyce's Will – internal guidance, not specialist advice, is that the £50,000 should be in an endowment fund, and that the income from this should be used for the purposes for which the fund has been established, the museum. Spending of the money is presumably determined by the Trustees. It is understood that the Trustees are the Council, who it now says 'owns' the museum, and the Broadstairs Fellowship.

Next steps, and this is the important bit which we will forward to you in writing, officers will now send an update paper to Corporate Management Team to identify the required resources to take forward a review of the legal advice in relation to making contact with the Charity Commission, to help identify what options are available to the Council to ensure the sustainability of the museum.

This will then inform how the funds from Joyce Smith's Will can be spent.

I'm really sorry that this has taken so long, I came to hear about it earlier in the year from you, the Will is the first thing we should have seen, the ownership of the building was the second thing we should have been sure about, and whether the Council had any right to be in any way involved. But I think the moral for all of you who do so much work over there is to work with us, and once we have all the advice we can move on. I'm sorry you had to wait so long."

184. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(a) Question No. 1 - Migration in Thanet

Councillor Moores put the following question to Councillor Johnston:

"Given the growing media interest in Thanet's immigration figures. Is the Leader able to provide a figure which reveals the true picture of migration in Thanet and in particular figures for Margate Central, Cliftonville West and Ramsgate?"

Councillor Johnston responded to Councillor Moores' question as follows:

"I contacted officers who have provided both of us with so much material that it took some time to unravel. It looked at the 2011 census down to where we are now. This included breakdowns of nationality in quite some detail. It is important to note that migration figures are generated from two sets of data, immigration – people coming in, and emigration – people leaving the area. The Council has access to district level data from 2003 to 2013 showing the patterns of movement in and out of the area, in terms of national and international movements. It should be noted that the data is not definitive as it is based on surveys of international entrants that do not necessary give their final

destination. However the quality of the data is improved by linking with national insurance number statistics.

Over the last decade international immigration is exceeding international emigration. More people are coming into the area than are leaving. Although more people have moved into the area than have moved out the difference between the two has decreased to 0.22% of population in 2012/13, from 0.39% of population in 2003/4. Internal migration from within the country has remained considerably higher than international movement for the last decade. However the 2011 census shows that 97% of Thanet's population has lived here for more than five years. The 2011 census also provides additional information at ward level. It shows that 93.3% of Margate South's population have lived here for more than five years, but 86.1% of Cliftonville West residents have lived here for five years. It also shows that the proportion of the population that have lived in for Thanet for less than two years was 1.2% of the population, that figure is 3.25% for Margate Central and 6.3% for Cliftonville West. The picture that emerges is that there is a small area that is considerably more diverse than the rest of Thanet. There is the 2011 census data for the parish of Ramsgate which was the final part of your question. That data showed that 92.1% of Ramsgate residents were born in the UK, 94.8% of residents have lived here for more than five years, and 92.3% have lived here for more than ten years. This suggests that Ramsgate has a lower migrant population than is average for Thanet, and the region is typical of the rest of the county.

I have a lot of information that we can share on a breakdown by nationality."

Supplementary Question

Councillor Moores then asked Councillor Johnston a supplementary question:

"In the last couple of weeks we have heard that the 2011 census figures are unreliable, in fact the Office of National Statistics have said that rather more people have come in here, and I think the figure for the South East was something in the region of 127,000 people according to the ONS.

If the census figures are inaccurate then what are we going to do to get a feel for the true figures?"

Councillor Johnston's response was as follows:

"I absolutely agree with you, in 1983/4 I wanted to look at the census to see how many babies were born because I was campaigning for nursery provision, and there was no way they had got the figures right. Schools were being built on the basis of the census figures, and we found when we built at the Holy Trinity School (at which I was a governor for 18 years) it was said we had a needless classroom. Then suddenly when the children became four or five we needed the classroom. I've always had an issue with the census figures. But there are statistics, there is the data, there is all the information. I think it is a snap shot in time, but I think from the point of view of planning for schools and nurseries, and everything else, we need to get these things right. I get your point exactly. I think that using the figures for political purposes coming up to an election is a bit silly, I stood with the midwives on the picket line the other day and I have to say that there was every nationality you could think of. Where would we be without those women all over the world delivering our babies?"

185. QUESTION NO. 2 - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION, WIMPEY ESTATE, ST PETER'S

Councillor Matterface asked Councillor Nicholson the following question:

“Have investigations been concluded into the number of HMOs (houses of multiple occupation) on the Wimpey estate in St Peter’s ward”

Councillor Nicholson responded:

“Housing Regeneration and Enforcement were tasked to investigate allegations of HMO’s containing student occupants in the premises on the Wimpy estate. The information that was received via Councillor Wiltshire initially referred to 35 premises to investigate. Of those 35 premises, 19 were found to be lawful HMO’s, and the remaining premises were found to be family homes. Of the 19 lawful HMO’s, three were found not to be on the Wimpy estate and five were on the periphery. This information was investigated by sources including council tax records, the M3 protection database and door to door calling. Following further communication with Councillor Wiltshire we received another list alleging another 76 student HMO’s, this was checked against the existing list of 35 and it was found that some of the addresses had been duplicated. The total premises remaining was 69. Of these 69 premises on this list, 19 had previously been investigated and were either lawful HMO’s or family homes. There were also two addresses that did not exist. The remaining 50 premises were investigated between the 17 October 2014 and 6 November 2014. None of the addresses supplied were found to be student HMO’s. In this case the evidence was confirmed by council tax records, talking to the named occupants at the address (where no answer was received a letter was left explaining why the Council had called), and by talking to neighbouring premises either side or in the vicinity of the address. The local people on the Wimpy estate were asked if they had experienced any problems with student HMO’s and we received varying responses from ‘no problems at all’, to ‘some problems’ stating anti-social behaviour and noise issues. Overall only a small percentage said they had any problems with student HMO’s. All that were spoken to were advised that they can call Environmental Health in relation to noise problems and Community Safety in relation to anti-social behaviour. Where we left a letter at the premises, people were understanding of why we had called and were happy to confirm the current status of their premises. However a small percentage were upset, and slightly distressed to think that they had been targeted or noted as a HMO. In the course of this investigation it was highlighted that some properties on the Wimpy estate do have, now or in the past, foreign students staying at their homes for a short term. Overall 104 premises have been investigated and after looking through all the information, there are 16 HMO’s that are all lawful.”

Councillor Matterface then asked a supplementary question:

“What controls does the Council have in place to deal with HMOs?”

Councillor Nicholson’s reply to that supplementary question was as follows:

“The council bought in the Article 4 Direction in February 2012, no new HMO that is occupied by three or more people can lawfully come into being without being subject to a change of use application. Small HMO’s of three to six persons in use before this date will have permitted development rights and will therefore be lawful. Had the Council not had the Article 4 Direction in place landlords on the Wimpy estate could have turned their properties into HMO’s without obtaining any formal permission at all. This is because the mandatory HMO licensing scheme does not apply to any property on the Wimpey estate as there are no properties above two stories. However HMO management regulations do apply, and we carefully monitor and deal with any complaints and issues raised by people in relation to HMOs. We cannot bring in any additional HMO licensing at this time as there are several matters laid down in guidelines by the government that would probably make it very difficult to bring anything in. This is because there is no evidence of a problem to the degree required to trigger additional regulation.

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

187. LEADER'S REPORT

The Leader of the Council advised that many of the issues in her report had been covered in Cabinet meetings, Members' briefings, other Council reports and press releases. She expressed her thanks to Individual Cabinet Members and for the cross party support demonstrated through some pretty heavy work schedules. She then highlighted some good news stories such as the receipt of Coastal Community Funding of over £1.8 million for Dreamland, and that eight local businesses obtained Success Support.

The Leader advised on progress of a number of items including:

The Local Plan, would go to public consultation from 5 January; **Dreamland**, procurement of an operator was with officers, a full report would follow upon formal conclusion; **Manston Airport**, a report would go to Cabinet on 11 December about the market testing, the Leader was in touch with the new owners and understood that they were working on plans to develop the site, any building plans that were not aviation related would need planning permission. The Leader had asked Sir Roger Gale to reconvene his Taskforce and was awaiting an invitation to the Select Committee; **Pleasurama and Victoria Pavilion Sites**, work was on-going and positive, thanks were expressed to Mrs Crowley and Councillor Everitt for their work; **The Fort Hotel**, officers were working on a scheme for social housing flats; **19 Hawley Square**, work was progressing; **The Theatre Royal**, the future would need to be resolved next year through discussion with Kent County Council and The Arts Council about funding; **A Meeting with Southern Water**, was held at Foreness Point. As a result a stakeholders group had been set up which would meet regularly; **Pierement Hall**, arrangements had been made to move HomeStart and another business into the Kent Innovation Centre, Folk Week and other businesses were helped as much as possible, the boiler and electrical repairs would be costly; **The East Kent Maritime Museum**, an update was planned for the Ramsgate Matters meeting on 12 December; **Heritage Bids** for the Margate Museum, Mayors Parlour, Tudor House - particularly the barn, were underway by officers; **Community Safety Partnership**, the Leader expressed thanks to everyone who attended these meetings, particularly to the Executive Board, Councillor Campbell and his working party, a conference would take place on 10 December; **Neighbourhood Engagement Meetings**, these were well attended, the Leader thanked Councillor Cohen and others who chaired the meetings, she also thanked Councillor Matterface on her street light campaign. The Leader advised that she had visited children's homes to look into rumours that children were being moved into the area from other authorities; **Dispersal Orders**, the last dispersal order under the old system was in Westgate, the Leader expressed thanks to Ward Councillors Scobie, Moores and King for alerting her to issues which were being dealt with; **Anti-social Behaviour Changes**, a briefing session was held for members; **The Margate Task Force**, had continued to deliver positive outcomes, had received national press coverage and is a template for others; **Tourism**, the Destination Management Plan and Beach Management Plan were covered in reports recently, and Wayne Hemmingway launched the excellent toolkit on 25 November. The Leader noted the great affection felt for Harry Lagan, the Chairman of the Destination Management Plan, and expressed sadness at his passing and sympathies to his family for their loss; **Pride in Thanet**, nominations for good service were out now; **Events**, thanks expressed for the Margate Events Group, Ramsgate Events Organisation and Broadstairs Team for their work throughout the year, and suggested that a Thanet Events Group maybe formed; **Sports Awards**, the Leader and Councillor Harry Scobie presented some of the prizes on 21 November which was also attended by triple jumper Michelle Griffiths-Robinson a mentor of local children for the Dame Kelly Holmes trust; **Broadstairs, Margate and Ramsgate Town Teams**, excellent work by all teams which

was very much appreciated. The Leader noted the sad loss of Mrs Brewer who passed away recently; **The Improvement Board**, positive feedback from the peer reviewers, and Members were encourage to attend the equalities training; **Health and Well-being Board**, meetings were held regularly and were still pushing for CCG monies for Sport Preventative Work.

The Leader thanked everyone for their support and efforts noting that it had been an eventful six months.

Councillor Bayford, as Leader of the Conservative Group, acknowledged that probably the biggest issue was in regard to Manston that would go to Cabinet the following week. He explained that the public were looking for answers to questions such as;

- In what way had RiverOak failed TDC's due diligence test?
- Why were RiverOak being asked to provide a 20 year detailed business plan?
- Why did the Leader appear to be following the officers recommendations rather than leading the process?
- Why would only six Councillors make the decision on the CPO when there were 56 Councillors that had a view that they wished to express publically? Previously the Leader had promised to bring the Item to Full Council if it was to approve a CPO, but not if it was to reject a CPO, he said this seemed perverse.
- Had the Leader made up her mind regarding the CPO on 23rd September, when in a Meridian interview she had stated that she would not CPO Manston Airport if the new owners promised 4000 jobs?
- Why had Dover District Council held a Full Council debate on the issue, and yet Thanet would not be doing so? The public noted that Dover Council were unanimous in their support of this Council going through with the CPO.

Councillor Bayford advised that people had asked for the report to be removed from the Cabinet agenda to allow a further discussion with RiverOak. The public were confused and this was an opportunity to put the record straight.

The Leader responded by saying that she could not reveal confidential information about RiverOak, however the report was in the public domain upon her request, and the executive of the Council had to make a decision based on the results of the soft market testing.

The Leader then described how both she, and Councillor C Hart when he was Leader, had supported the airport through regular meetings ever since it was announced that Mrs Globe would be selling the airport. When a petition was to be bought to the Council on the issue, she arranged for the submission deadline to be extended. The petition was heard on 10 July. At that Full Council meeting, Members supported a resolution that the Leader look into the legal and financial situation, this was done at an Extraordinary Cabinet meeting held on 17 July at which it was decided to conduct market testing.

The Leader advised that the due diligence process was a very strict procedure, upon which officers offer advice. If a back to back investor had been found that would cover all the costs, then the recommendation to Cabinet next week would have been different. We had not yet found a back to back investor that satisfied the soft market testing, therefore there should be no CPO at the present time.

Councillor King, as leader of the Independent Group, drew Members attention to the proposal to allow 1000 additional houses in Westgate as part of the Draft Local Plan. Councillor King felt that the proposed consultation that would start on 5 January and last for six weeks, would not be sufficient to effectively consult on what would be such a significant development. Councillor King suggested that everybody in the affected areas of Westgate and Garlinge should be written to in order to ensure the consultation reached every home.

The Leader agreed that this would have a significant impact on the area; she noted that when the Government dictates the allocation of 12000 homes by 2031, the distribution of those homes could be challenging. The Leader highlighted the important role that Ward Councillors had to play in raising public awareness and offered to ask Councillor Nicholson, the Cabinet Members responsible for housing, if it would be possible to hold a presentation at the next Westgate Resident's Association meeting. She also noted that there was a programme for public meetings which had been recently agreed. The Leader expressed concerns at the cost of writing to all residents, and highlighted that the Draft Local Plan should not come as a surprise as discussions had been taking place for years before it was published.

Councillor Wiltshire, as Leader of the UKIP Group, requested that Councillors were given a copy of the exchange between Councillor Nicholson and the Mayor of London's Office in the light of the number of looked after children being sent from London to live in Thanet.

With regard to Manston Airport, Councillor Wiltshire noted that the Section 151 Officer's recommendation in the report that would go to Cabinet was wrong as it was based on a flawed, rushed report produced by Falcon. She felt that RiverOak gave Thanet the chance for economic development and jobs in the aviation industry. RiverOak should be allowed to put their case to a Full Council meeting to allow all 56 Councillors to hear what they had to say. She requested that Thanet Council publish its legal advice and the rationale behind the recommendation, in order to allow people to understand the officer and Cabinet case for refusal to have RiverOak as an indemnity partner. Councillor Wiltshire advised that overwhelming numbers of people were awaiting TDC's decision, and they had been disappointed. She suggested that if the Leader lacked the courage to make the decision, other Members of the Council should be allowed to come together and decide.

The Leader responded by thanking Councillor Wiltshire for her participation at all meetings they had attended on this issue. She highlighted that the deadlines given to RiverOak had been extended a number of times; this demonstrated the extent to which she cared about the airport. However the Council had a due diligence protocol by which officers made recommendations, and she had a duty to consider their advice. She noted that she was passionate about Manston, but was also passionate about every child that lived in poverty. These were the kind of consideration she had to make before committing Council money and officers time, on a project upon which due diligence had been carried out.

Councillor Cohen, as Leader of the Thanet Independent Group, noted that the document in front of Members was quite clear, RiverOak had failed the test, and it would be foolhardy to go further with this particular group. Councillor Cohen added that he believed some politicians were using the CPO issue for electioneering purposes. He advised that the Council had spent considerable amounts on legal costs, and hours of experienced officer time in order to establish the true position.

Councillor Cohen, thanked the Leader for the manner in which she had conducted the matter, particularly with regard to the way she had kept the group leaders up to date with developments. He added that he knew the Leader was disappointed that RiverOak could not prove themselves to be a suitable partner.

The Leader responded to say that many people including herself were disappointed that a partner had not yet been found that could satisfy the required due diligence tests. In addition the Leader noted surprise at comments made by Nigel Farage MEP because he had not attended any of the meetings, and she acknowledged the support from Sir Roger Gale MP who she had met with regularly. However she noted that she would have felt more supported if the task group he had initially set up had stayed in existence.

188. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Councillor Gideon, as Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny, introduced her report, offering thanks to the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its sub groups for their hard work and commitment. She outlined a number of issues which had been reviewed, and explained the importance of the committee in scrutinising the work of the Council.

After receiving comments from Members, the report was NOTED.

189. FEES AND CHARGES 2015/16

Councillor Everitt pointed out that a correction was required to Annex 1, page 33 of the agenda, the charge for 2015/16 for exclusive right of burial should read £1,100.00, this was an increase of 2.8% on the previous year.

Subject to the correction, it was proposed by Councillor Everitt, seconded by Councillor Nicholson and RESOLVED:

“THAT Members approve the Fees and Charges for 2015-16 as set out in Annex 1.”

190. COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME

It was proposed by Councillor Everitt, seconded by Councillor Nicholson and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 4.1 be adopted, namely:

‘That Council approves the 2015/16 Council Tax Reduction Scheme. The detailed regulations will then be published by 31 January 2015.’”

191. CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEES, POLITICAL BALANCE, APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, PANELS AND BOARDS

Councillor Johnston pointed out that a correction was required to the report on page 53, paragraph 4.5.1 of the agenda, which should refer to the Governance and Audit Committee.

It was proposed by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Nicholson and RESOLVED:

“THAT option 1 of the recommendations as set out at paragraph 7.1 be adopted, namely:

‘That one seat is removed from the Conservative group on the Planning Committee and that seat is allocated to the UKIP group.’

Councillor Bayford advised that Councillor S. Tomlinson would be replaced on the Planning Committee by Councillor K. Gregory and that Councillor K. Gregory would be replaced on the list of Planning Committee reserves by Councillor S. Tomlinson. Councillor Binks would also be removed from Planning Committee to the list of Planning Committee reserves.

192. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME 2014/15

It was proposed by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Bayford and RESOLVED:

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 5.2 be adopted, namely:

‘To remove paragraph 1.43 of the Members Allowances:

1.43 It is hereby provided, the Independent Remuneration Panel having recommended that all Members of the Council should be eligible for pensions, that:-

a) As from 1st May 2003, all Members of the Council are to be entitled to pensions in accordance with a scheme made under Section 7 of the Superannuation Act 1972; and

b) Both Basic Allowance and Special Responsibility Allowance shall be treated as amounts in respect of which such pensions are payable in accordance with a scheme made under Section 7 of the said Act of 1972.

And to replace it with the following:

1.43 Any Member of Council that joined the Local Government Pension Scheme prior to 1 April 2014 may remain a member of the Scheme until such time as they cease being a Member of Thanet District Council. No Member of that Thanet District Council is entitled to join the Local Government Pension Scheme after 1 April 2014 in accordance with the Local Government Pension Scheme (Transitional Provisions, Savings and Amendment) Regulations 2014.”

193. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

“THAT the recommendation as set out at paragraph 7.1 of the report be adopted, namely:

‘That the public and press be excluded from the meeting for agenda item 16 as it contains exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned for five minutes to allow the press and public to leave the meeting.

194. REPORT REGARDING CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Members expressed their support for the Chief Executive and highlighted a desire to see her back at work once fully recovered.

It was proposed by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Duncan and was unanimously AGREED:

“THAT the Council invite Dr McGonigal to return to work as soon as she is signed off medically fit, and that TDC ensures that she is fully supported on her return.”

Meeting concluded : 9.10 pm