

Minutes of the Extra Ordinary meeting of the Council held  
at Knowle, Sidmouth on 25 March 2015

**Attendance list at end of document**

The meeting started at 6.30pm and ended at 9.12pm.

**\*57 Public Speaking**

The Chairman welcomed members of the public to the meeting and invited all those who had indicated their wish to speak to address the Council on matters relating to office relocation.

Jeff Turner said that the proposed relocation project was full of risk and contradiction. He referred to the statement of the Council's achievements sent out with the Council Tax bills and questioned that, if the Council was providing such good services and value for money, why was it planning to change. The Council had been at the Knowle site for 40 years; why was there such a hurry to push the relocation through before the election? He said that the Council was incurring unnecessary risk, that staff should be consulted and greater consideration given to the affect on service delivery. He said that the models used could give a distorted argument and questioned the rationale behind splitting the operation onto two sites. The Council was planning to refurbish Exmouth Town Hall but said that the Knowle was not fit for purpose. He asked Members to reconsider the decision over a longer timeframe.

Dr Gardner said that the risks identified in the document were grossly inaccurate. She said that more detail was needed to assess the risks properly. Only a small number of Councillors had been privy to the decision making process. The original Office Working Party set up to consider the matter had not met for a long time, instead a much smaller group had progressed the project. She said that the Council debt in respect of Council House self-funding was not comparable with that which would be incurred by relocation. She asked how Councillors could assure residents on the risk of financial loss.

Peter Whitfield referred to the application to develop the Knowle site, which had been refused by the Development Management Committee and the reasons for that refusal. He said that the defined development boundary was in defiance of the Local Plan and that the upper terrace area, currently included within the development site, should be excluded; this had not been fully debated. Although the proportion of parkland included within the development site was not great in terms of acreage, the quality of the land should be taken into account. The vistas from the terraces were of the sea and parkland. He referred to the Open Spaces study, which gave a minimum requirement as guidance; that did not mean that open space above that minimum should be described as excessive. Data used for comparison and usage was out of date. He asked that the development site boundary be re-drawn to exclude the terrace area.

John Hollick, Chairman of Sidmouth Town Council, spoke on behalf of his Council. He said that Sidmouth Town Council had consistently opposed the relocation project due to the impact of the move on the town's economy and its businesses and due to the loss of open space and parkland. Loss of business to the town would be to Sidmouth's detriment. Developing part of the site would damage the parkland, would put the

character of the town at risk and deter visitors. He said that the business case for the move was full of contradictions. The development of the Knowle site should only be on the current built footprint. The Knowle land had been handed to the district by Sidmouth Urban Council and disposing of the site was asset stripping Sidmouth and, although may be legally allowed, was not morally right. He did not accept the proposals as they stood.

Paul Arnott asked that when the district council was abolished, what will happen to the new building in Honiton? In response, the Chairman advised that there was no sign of such change but that if the move was shelved for this reason and there was a reorganisation of local government, any successor authority would be likely to sell the whole of the Knowle site without the safeguards that EDDC had currently put in place.

Keith Northover, Chairman of the Knowle Residents Association said that the proposals ignored key issues and failed to meet Council priorities. He asked if Councillors were happy that all options had been considered. He suggested the option of refurbishing the newer part of the Knowle Offices and the Exmouth Town Hall. He said that the value of the Council's assets would be significantly reduced by the proposed move – this was throwing money away as from an investment point of view there would be an immediate £3.5m deficit. There was therefore no compelling investment argument. He said that taking out a loan when the future was so unsure was unwise and that the Council should think ahead about what was best for its customers. He anticipated that the costs would over-run and referred to decisions being made with indecent haste at the end of a period of administration. He asked the Council to reject the relocation plans.

Jeremy Woodward referred to the Council's involvement in a costly case with the Information Tribunal – the Council had appealed the decision. The Information Tribunal was to give its final decision on Friday this week in respect of information on the relocation project currently unavailable to the public. He said that this information would throw a clearer light on the project but that the Council had belittled the information, saying that it was not worthy of current consideration. If that was the case, he questioned why it had been kept from public consideration and deduced that it was to quash public debate and consultation. He asked the Council to wait until the reports were publically available to avoid bringing itself into disrepute.

Michael Temple spoke for the Knowle Residents' Association advising that an application to register Knowle Parkland as an asset of community value had been delivered. The Association had been in discussion with Save Britain's Heritage, which aims to list assets that would otherwise be lost or damaged. The priority was to protect valued amenity from the ravages of development. The application was to secure the whole parkland site for the local community. If the application failed, the Association would go to appeal. He asked the Council to make note of this intention.

Richard Thurlow said that Save Our Sidmouth had written to the Council to advise that the procedure being adopted for appropriation of open space was inaccurate and suggested that the Cabinet should meet again to follow the correct procedure. If this suggestion was rejected, the matter would be taken further. The public should be able to challenge and should have been properly consulted. He urged the Council to reject the proposals but if to be agreed, to exclude the precious area of the terraces from the development site.

Richard Eley said that the problem was the cost analysis. Knowle would be worth more over time as land prices were rising and it was a valuable asset. The relocation model assumed that the prices would remain static. The report also assumed that reorganisation of local government was unlikely and he questioned this. He said that the decision to relocate would make the future of the Council more uncertain. He asked the Council to use common sense. He referred to Cornwall Council, which was devolving decision making to local communities; by ignoring the wishes of Sidmouth, the Council was hastening the unitary option.

Jacqueline Green referred to the importance of achieving best value. She said that EDDC's negotiating position had been compromised as the Heads of Terms had yet to be agreed with the developer but the Council had accepted the sale price. Other factors such as overage (sums to be paid by the developer in the event that the site was sold on for a profit; this was linked to the sale price) had yet to be agreed. She said that by agreeing the sale price without negotiation in respect of overage first, the Council would not achieve best value.

\*58 Declarations

Cllr Trevor Cope – Min no. 59

Personal interest

Reason: Citizen's Advice Bureau Trustee

\*59 Office relocation

The proposals for relocation of its offices from Knowle, Sidmouth had been considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 11 March 2015 and by the combined meeting of the Audit & Governance and Overview & Scrutiny Committees on 12 March 2015. The recommendations from Cabinet had been supported at the combined meeting, the only amendment (from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee) being an additional recommendation in respect of the proposed land transfer of the Knowle parkland to Sidmouth Town Council. The recommendations from both of these meetings were set out in full on the agenda.

Although present, the Leader was unwell and therefore the Deputy Leader presented this item on his behalf.

In presenting this item, Councillor Andrew Moulding, Strategic Development and Partnerships Portfolio Holder and Deputy Leader said that East Devon had been considering the office relocation carefully and in detail through a variety of options for several years. Throughout that time, the consistent finding has been that the Knowle was not the location for a cost effective or operationally successful local government function and the Council needed to look to the future to provide and deliver the best possible services to all of the people of East Devon. He referred to a site visit to the purpose built offices of West Dorset. These gave an excellent example of effective modern ways of working.

He reminded Councillors that at the Council meeting in December 2014 two things had been made clear and accepted, namely to continue to make progress and engage independent testing of the process, the financial modelling and the assumptions in the project. The numbers had been subject to detailed modelling developed with Grant Thornton, the Council's external auditors. In addition, SWAP, the Council's internal auditors had assessed the project's processes and governance in place. The

independently tested modelling had given a comparison between the dual-site option and remaining at Knowle.

Councillor Moulding said that the findings had been supported by Cabinet and the combined meeting of Audit and Governance and Overview and Scrutiny committees; at both meetings, the internal and external auditors had been present to be questioned on their work. A workshop had subsequently been held for Councillors to further consider the financial modelling, raise any concerns and ask questions of the Strategic Lead - Finance and the Relocation Project Manager.

Councillor Moulding emphasised the cost savings that would be achieved and highlighted key figures:

- The Knowle Site offer price agreed is £7-8m
- Exmouth Town Hall modernisation will cost in the region of £1m
- New Offices at Honiton will cost in the region of £7m
- The Council will secure relocation in total for under £10m

Independently verified modelling of whole life costs showed the following:

- Comparing operational expenditure over 20 years between Knowle and the twin site solution of Honiton and Exmouth, the twin sites will save the Council £6m.
- From day 1 of the move and thereafter in the new and modernised offices the Council will be saving on operational expenditure including repayment of borrowing; after 20 years the Council would have cleared the debt.
- To make the move to modern offices £2.1m of long-term borrowing was needed - to stay at the Knowle and do minimum repairs, £2.6m would need to be spent.

What that meant for the future was:

- A Council that can deliver continued quality of service, manage its operational costs and make best use of its assets.
- New and modernised offices based in the heart of the district and in the district's most populace town with a guarantee of availability of services in other towns as people need them.
- A split site operation on land already owned by the Council and sufficiently flexible for what the future might hold.
- A new level of financial certainty for a Council that is in control of its assets not in fear of unpredictable repair or running costs.
- A new asset for Sidmouth both in terms of 3.5 ha of parkland for the Town Council to own as well as a high quality retirement and independent living facility for a town that has a retired population nearly three times the national average.

Councillor Moulding ended the presentation of the proposals by advising that the recommendations for debate addressed a number of actions toward relocation including:

- The reassurance that auditors have given the Council regarding the process, governance and modelling of this project.
- The legal decision to appropriate and dispose of the Knowle site for housing use.

- The various actions and funding agreement that will enable the move to happen including contract for sale of the Knowle and agreeing the project budget for design and contracting of Honiton and Exmouth offices.
- In addition, Council would be tasking officers with investigating whether Exmouth Town Hall modernisation could be brought forward and negotiating the transfer of the extensive remaining Knowle Park to Sidmouth Town Council.

The Chairman invited Councillor Ken Potter, Chairman of Audit and Governance Committee to address the Council. Councillor Potter advised that his Committee had been very much involved in the relocation project over a long period of time. Meetings with auditors as part of the process had been reassuring and as a result, the Audit and Governance Committee had unanimously supported Cabinet's recommendations.

The Chairman invited Councillor Tim Wood, Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee to address the Council. Councillor Wood said that his Committee had scrutinised the figures and asked questions of the auditors and relevant officers present to ensure that an in-depth analysis was properly carried out into the proposals. All relevant information had been made available for the Committee to make a decision on Cabinet's recommendations. An additional recommendation had been put forward by the Committee – that as part of the negotiations with Sidmouth Town Council on land transfer, a covenant is proposed to ensure that the land is not built on and remains as public open space. He added that although the terrace area of the parkland was included within the development site, there was every expectation that the developer would incorporate this area within the design for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents of the new development.

The Chairman invited Councillors to debate on the recommendations set out in the agenda papers. Points raised included:

- The driver for the move was not just that the Knowle offices were old and deteriorating but that they were no longer suitable for the Council operation.
- Honiton was the geographical centre of the district and Exmouth was the largest town – there were therefore logical reasons for the twin-site approach.
- The loss of jobs would have an adverse impact on Sidmouth.

Councillor Graham Troman proposed that the newer part of the Knowle building plus the Civic Suite (Chamber and Members' Area) be retained with the remainder of the old part of Knowle demolished. He said that this, in addition to the refurbished Exmouth Town Hall, would be sufficient for the Council's needs. He asked for the suggestion to be costed.

The proposal was:

'That any decision on the move be deferred to await a full and detailed report on an alternative Knowle model, with this being prepared and reported in the first cycle of meetings of the new Council.'

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Stuart Hughes who questioned why the proposal had not been costed as requested. The proposal would safeguard the jobs in

Sidmouth. He referred to the motion which he had proposed in December 2012 which had yet to be debated – ‘In the light of the recommendation to abolish District Authorities in the Michael Heseltine report ‘No Stone Unturned’, this Council puts on hold its Honiton relocation plans until Government has ruled on the recommendations.’

Councillor Hughes said that he believed that whichever Government was in power, that unitary government was likely within 7-8 years. If Devon County Council became a unitary authority, power would be devolved to Sidmouth and a scaled down Knowle office building would probably fit the bill. He said that the grass terraces in front of the current Knowle offices were one of the finest features.

In response to the amendment, the following points were made:

- The proposal would be costly and would not generate the essential capital receipt on which to base borrowing for the necessary refurbishment.
- Sidmouth Ward Councillors were accused of using delaying tactics.
- Knowle was too costly to maintain.
- Unitary authorities were not the solution but if such a reorganisation was to be carried out, the new authority would not be as sympathetic and accommodating to the wishes of Sidmouth.
- The amendment was not a practical solution.
- The ‘newer’ part of the building was still out of date and not suitable for modern working.
- Staff would suffer in the chaos of the refurbishment that would be required.

It was proposed and supported that a recorded vote be taken on the amendment.

Those in favour – Susie Bond, Roger Boote, Peter Burrows, Bob Buxton, Trevor Cope, Martin Gammell, Roger Giles, Stuart Hughes, Ben Ingham, Sheila Kerridge, Peter Sullivan, Graham Troman, Claire Wright. (13)

Those against – Graham Godbeer, Christine Drew, Paul Diviaini, David Atkins, Ray Bloxham, Peter Bowden, David Chapman, Maddy Chapman, Iain Chubb, David Cox, Deborah Custance Baker, Alan Dent, Vivien Duval-Steer, Jill Elson, Pat Graham, Steve Hall, Peter Halse, Tony Howard, Douglas Hull, John Humphreys, Stephanie Jones, David Key, Andrew Moulding, Frances Newth, John O’Leary, Helen Parr, Geoff Pook, Ken Potter, Pauline Stott, Brenda Taylor, Ian Thomas, Phil Twiss, Chris Wale, Mark Williamson, Tim Wood, Steve Wragg, Tom Wright. (37)

Abstention – Mike Allen (1)

The amendment was lost. Councillors were invited to continue to debate on the recommendations and made the following additional points:

- The Cabinet was a one-party group without opposition.
- The loss of local amenity was fundamental and should not be supported.
- The consultation carried out was not always listened to or was not acted upon. It was not meaningful to carry out consultation after a decision had been made.
- There were mixed opinions in respect of the adequacy of car parking for Exmouth Town Hall.

- There were air quality issues at Honiton.
- Other services used the Town Hall and needed to be accommodated – this included the Citizen’s Advice presence.
- The option to use the Town Hall as a twin site had only arisen due to Devon County Council’s move from that site. The Council had been flexible enough to take advantage of this opportunity.
- Savings and improved mobile working would mean that the Council would have a greater presence across the district.
- The level of debt was a concern. There was a danger that the Council would have to cut its services.
- The contingency had been reduced from 20% to 15% on advice from the auditors. The aim was to pay a lesser debt in a shorter time.
- There was concern over the financial data and measurements being used.
- Overage and Heads of Terms had yet to be agreed. What penalty clauses were in place should the new Council make a different decision or if local government was reorganised?
- The move would have a serious detrimental effect on Sidmouth.
- The economic impact on Sidmouth was overstated – only about 80 EDDC staff lived in Sidmouth and were likely to continue to do so. The new development with 100 residents would bring more revenue to the town.
- The state of the Knowle buildings was questioned – an independent surveyor had not been allowed to undertake a survey.
- The proposed relocation had not been included in the 2011 manifestos and so the public had been denied the opportunity to influence the decision through the ballot box.
- Why had there not been a maintenance programme for Knowle over the last 15 years so that it remained fit for purpose?
- The Knowle site was not achieving its full market value.
- Knowle was not fit for disabled staff or visitors.
- Doing nothing was not an option, the cost of maintaining the Knowle would inevitably rise; cutting running costs would help to protect services delivered to the public. The costs of remaining at Knowle were greater than moving.
- Having a professional and adaptable workplace would mitigate the risk of change.
- The decision was being made in the best interests of all of the residents of East Devon – this was the Council’s duty.
- The transfer of the majority of the parkland to Sidmouth Town Council was a generous offer.
- The Chief Executive had yet to have sight of an application to register the Knowle grounds as an asset of community value.

In summing up Councillor Moulding highlighted the following key points:

- The parkland at Knowle would be retained for public enjoyment.
- The move was for the benefit of the wider district.
- The economic impact was positive – the development would add value to the town.
- If the Knowle building had been maintained in the last 4 years whilst the debate on relocation was on-going, this would have been a waste of taxpayers’ money

- If there was a reorganisation of local government, the whole of the Knowle site would be sold off without the protections currently in place for the benefit of Sidmouth.
- Options had been fully explored but this work had come at an inevitable cost.
- The importance of access for disabled people had been taken into account.
- Parking at Exmouth Town Hall would be for visitors and staff with a disability – other staff would park elsewhere.
- £2.8M would be saved over 20 years compared with £3.8M spend if the Council opted to stay at Knowle. This meant that the Council would be in a position to spend the savings on service provision and delivery.

He asked the Council to be brave and bold and make the right decision that would benefit the town and district as a whole.

It was proposed and supported that a recorded vote be taken on each proposal.

### **Proposal A – 1-3**

Those in favour – Graham Godbeer, Christine Drew, Paul Diviani, Mike Allen, David Atkins, Ray Bloxham, Peter Bowden, David Chapman, Maddy Chapman, Iain Chubb, David Cox, Deborah Custance Baker, Alan Dent, Vivien Duval-Steer, Jill Elson, Pat Graham, Steve Hall, Peter Halse, Tony Howard, Douglas Hull, John Humphreys, Stephanie Jones, David Key, Andrew Moulding, John O'Leary, Helen Parr, Geoff Pook, Ken Potter, Pauline Stott, Brenda Taylor, Ian Thomas, Phil Twiss, Chris Wale, Mark Williamson, Tim Wood, Steve Wragg, Tom Wright. (37)

Those against – Susie Bond, Peter Burrows, Trevor Cope, Martin Gammell, Roger Giles, Stuart Hughes, Ben Ingham, Sheila Kerridge, Frances Newth, Peter Sullivan, Graham Troman, Claire Wright. (12)

Abstention – Bob Buxton (1)

**Proposal B – 4-5** (subject to clarification that the Knowle site referred to at B4 is that which is defined in the reports submitted to Cabinet – namely the site included within the red line and separate from the ground identified at C13)

Those in favour – Graham Godbeer, Christine Drew, Paul Diviani, Mike Allen, David Atkins, Ray Bloxham, Peter Bowden, David Chapman, Maddy Chapman, Iain Chubb, David Cox, Deborah Custance Baker, Alan Dent, Vivien Duval-Steer, Jill Elson, Pat Graham, Steve Hall, Peter Halse, Tony Howard, Douglas Hull, John Humphreys, Stephanie Jones, David Key, Andrew Moulding, John O'Leary, Helen Parr, Geoff Pook, Ken Potter, Pauline Stott, Brenda Taylor, Ian Thomas, Phil Twiss, Chris Wale, Mark Williamson, Tim Wood, Steve Wragg, Tom Wright. (37)

Those against – Susie Bond, Peter Burrows, Bob Buxton, Trevor Cope, Martin Gammell, Roger Giles, Stuart Hughes, Ben Ingham, Sheila Kerridge, Frances Newth, Peter Sullivan, Graham Troman, Claire Wright. (13)

**Proposal C 6-14** (subject to an amendment proposed by Councillor Geoff Pook and seconded by Councillor Phil Twiss that C11 be amended to indicate the target of achieving a break-even position)

The Chief Executive gave assurance that delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive to agree Heads of Terms and authority to enter into contract for the sale of Knowle with conditions was based on the price given in confidence to all Councillors. If there was any change to this price, the Deputy Chief Executive would not have delegated authority and the matter would have to be referred back to Cabinet – the Deputy Chief Executive could not act outside his delegation.

Those in favour – Graham Godbeer, Christine Drew, Paul Diviani, Mike Allen, David Atkins, Ray Bloxham, Peter Bowden, David Chapman, Maddy Chapman, Iain Chubb, David Cox, Deborah Custance Baker, Alan Dent, Vivien Duval-Steer, Jill Elson, Pat Graham, Steve Hall, Peter Halse, Tony Howard, Douglas Hull, John Humphreys, Stephanie Jones, David Key, Andrew Moulding, John O’Leary, Helen Parr, Geoff Pook, Ken Potter, Pauline Stott, Brenda Taylor, Ian Thomas, Phil Twiss, Chris Wale, Mark Williamson, Tim Wood, Steve Wragg, Tom Wright. (37)

Those against – Susie Bond, Peter Burrows, Bob Buxton, Trevor Cope, Martin Gammell, Roger Giles, Stuart Hughes, Ben Ingham, Sheila Kerridge, Frances Newth, Peter Sullivan, Graham Troman, Claire Wright. (13)

**RESOLVED:**

**A) that the following be agreed:**

1. the findings of the audit exercises conducted by South West Audit Partnership and Grant Thornton in response to issues raised by December 2014 Full Council and the conclusions set out therein be accepted.
2. the analysis and conclusions on the financial basis for relocating contained within the report be accepted
3. On the basis of the valuation advice and price offered, the Knowle site be disposed of as this would represent ‘best value’ in accordance with the requirements of Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972.

**B) that the following be approved:**

4. the Knowle site (as defined in reports submitted to Cabinet within the red line and excluding land identified at C13 below) is no longer required for the purpose of public walks or as a pleasure ground under the Public Health Act 1875.
5. On the basis that the land is no longer required for those purposes to appropriate the Knowle site to housing purposes pursuant to the powers contained in Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972.

**C) that the following be approved:**

6. To dispose of the Knowle site for housing / extra care assisted living pursuant to Section 32 of the Housing Act 1985.

7. The Deputy Chief Executive – Development, Regeneration and Partnership in consultation with the Office Accommodation Executive Group be authorised to agree on behalf of EDDC appropriate Heads of Terms with Pegasus Life Ltd.
8. Subject to agreeing the Heads of Terms the Deputy Chief Executive – Development, Regeneration and Partnership be given delegated authority to enter into contract for sale of the Knowle site conditional upon subsequent satisfactory planning approval and such other matters as the Service Lead (Legal and Democratic Services) may advise.
9. EDDC operations be located to Honiton and Exmouth.
10. The Council to conduct consultation with relevant and interested parties to ensure Best Value outcomes are addressed within the relocation to Honiton and Exmouth.
11. A net project budget of £2,221,445 be noted and agreed, (the target being to achieve a break even position) , this being the estimated cost for a new build office accommodation in Honiton (BREEAM very good option) and for the modernisation of Exmouth Town Hall as identified in the table in paragraph D5.6 (of the Cabinet and combined meeting report) less the Capital Receipt for the Knowle. In addition, a budget of £900,630 is required to meet loan interest costs relating to short term and long term funding. Short term cash flow funding will be required totalling £9.2m to meet design and build costs prior to receiving the sale proceeds of £7-8m from the Knowle (financial risks are mitigated by Gateway 7 process detailed in the report). Once the capital receipt is received, the balance of funding required is £2.1m to be funded from a long-term loan over a 20-year period.
12. Officers investigate and progress the opportunity to bring forward the refurbishment of Exmouth Town Hall and take forward new offices in Honiton.
13. Commence detailed discussions on the Council's intention to transfer the retained 3.5196ha of Knowle parkland and the lower car park to Sidmouth Town Council following disposal of the Knowle site and if the principle is accepted by Sidmouth Town Council to progress such transfer including compliance with the relevant statutory procedures for disposal of open space.
14. As part of the negotiations with Sidmouth Town Council on land transfer, a covenant be proposed to ensure that the land is not built on and remains as public open space.

Attendance list - Councillors present:

Graham Godbeer, Chairman  
Christine Drew, Vice Chairman  
Mike Allen  
David Atkins  
Ray Bloxham  
Susie Bond  
Roger Boote  
Peter Bowden  
Peter Burrows  
Bob Buxton  
David Chapman  
Maddy Chapman  
Iain Chubb  
Trevor Cope  
David Cox  
Deborah Custance Baker  
Alan Dent  
Paul Diviani  
Vivien Duval Steer  
Jill Elson  
Martin Gammell  
Roger Giles  
Pat Graham  
Steve Hall  
Peter Halse  
Tony Howard  
Stuart Hughes  
Douglas Hull  
John Humphreys  
Ben Ingham  
Stephanie Jones  
Sheila Kerridge  
David Key  
Andrew Moulding  
Frances Newth  
John O'Leary  
Helen Parr  
Geoff Pook  
Ken Potter  
Pauline Stott  
Peter Sullivan  
Brenda Taylor  
Ian Thomas  
Graham Troman  
Phil Twiss  
Chris Wale  
Mark Williamson  
Tim Wood  
Steve Wragg  
Claire Wright  
Tom Wright

**Honorary Aldermen**

Bernard Hughes

**Officers:**

Mark Williams, Chief Executive

Richard Cohen, Deputy Chief Executive

Simon Davey, Strategic Lead – Finance

Henry Gordon Lennox, Strategic Lead – Legal, Licensing and Democratic Services

Steve Pratten, Office Relocation Manager

Diana Vernon, Democratic Services Manager

Hannah Whitfield, Democratic Services Officer

**Councillor apologies:**

Geoff Chamberlain

Steve Gazzard

Mike Howe

John Jeffery

Jim Knight

Philip Skinner

Eileen Wragg

**Honorary Aldermen apologies:**

Ann Liverton

Chairman .....

Date.....