

EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held at Knowle, Sidmouth, on Wednesday, 12 December 2018

Attendance list at the end of document.

The meeting started at 6.00pm and ended at 8.32pm.

***38 Public speaking**

The Chairman welcomed those present and invited members of the public to address the Council.

Ed Dolphin wanted to take the opportunity of addressing the Full Council on the subject of Pegasus Life, the lower Car Park and parkland in Knowle Park, and the flood attenuation scheme.

He wanted to express concern about a decision that would have a long term effect on the town of Sidmouth. He stated that the Pegasus Life's Construction Phasing Strategy shows they could accommodate all the building works within the space they purchased. He pointed out that it had been suggested that without the extra storage space, large delivery vehicles might inconvenience residents by using Broadway and Knowle Drive which is not indicated in the Construction Phasing Strategy or Inspector's conditions. He stated his belief that Pegasus' plans will force Devon County Council to modify their planned flood alleviation scheme for Station Road which was bound to involve more cost and impact further on the park. He stated his understanding that Sidmouth Town Council has not debated building an extended car park on the ground and levying charges on it, for which they would have had to go through the proper planning process. He pointed out that such plans were a major event for the town and should be open to full scrutiny.

The Deputy Chief Executive responded by stating that East Devon District Council (EDDC) were aware of the concerns of Mr Dolphin and of the regard which Sidmouth Town Council has for the car park. EDDC have not yet agreed anything and are in discussion with the Town Council and County Council on the respective matters raised. Any extensions to the car park must go through the proper planning process and be included in the construction plan.

Andie Milne wished to address the Council on issues relating to food poverty in Sid Valley. She stated that food banks were needed across the whole of the East Devon District, and that there were growing numbers of people trying to access them. This high demand was an issue to be addressed, particularly with the introduction of Universal Credit. She stated that in Sid Valley it was estimated that over 70 families will need help over Christmas, and the Sid Valley food bank was the only one to provide fuel. It gave £160 of fuel to residents last week, and the number of families regularly assisted had recently risen from 15 to 35.

Councillor Jill Elson stated that EDDC works very closely with food banks, and that most had found premises to be located in. At Exmouth people are provided with food for two weeks and then also referred to the CAB for further advice and help.

***39 Minutes**

The minutes of the [Council meeting](#) held on 24 October 2018 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

*40 **Declarations of interest**

Councillor Pauline Stott – Minute *42, Question 6 on Queen’s Drive Exmouth
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Director, Community Interest Company, Queen’s Drive, Exmouth

Councillor Mark Williamson – Minute *42, Question 6 on Queen’s Drive Exmouth
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Director, Community Interest Company, Queen’s Drive, Exmouth

Councillor Philip Skinner– Minute *42, Question 6 on Queen’s Drive Exmouth
Type of interest – Personal interest
Reason – Chair of Exmouth Regeneration Board

Councillor Steve Hall – Minute *43, Minutes of Cabinet and Committees, specifically
Licensing & Enforcement Committee
Type of interest – Disclosable Pecuniary Interest
Reason – Licence holder within East Devon District

*41 **Chairman/Leader notices/announcements**

The Chairman had several announcements, starting with an obituary for former Councillor Bill Nash who sadly passed away in October 2018.

Cllr Nash was an East Devon District councillor for the Exmouth Town ward and an Exmouth Town Councillor for the Littleham ward.

He was elected to East Devon District Council in 2015 and was a member of the scrutiny, and audit and governance committees. He was also a member of the joint board of LED Leisure from 2016 and of the Exmouth Regeneration Board from this year. He was the lead councillor for Exmouth and for the council’s estates and property service.

Cllr Nash was elected to Exmouth Town Council in 2011 and served as Mayor of the town during 2014/15. He served on the town council’s planning committee and was instrumental in establishing the tourist information service for Exmouth in 2014, as well as being an enthusiastic and supportive member of the town team. He had served as lead councillor for finance since May 2018.

Cllr Bill Nash was extremely well respected for the community work he carried out on behalf of the district council in Exmouth. He was a strong advocate for sport and recreational initiatives throughout East Devon.

The Chairman stated that he would remember Bill as an excellent Town Mayor and a great supporter of all things good about Exmouth, who would be sadly missed by all councillors and staff at East Devon District Council. On behalf of the District Council, the Chairman would send condolences to his wife and family.

He then invited comments from other members who knew Cllr Bill Nash.

Councillor Philip Skinner stated that he had come to know Bill Nash well and had huge respect for him. He was a strong character who had been open in his views.

Councillor Pauline Stott stated that another former Councillor, Brian Worts had passed away recently, and that his funeral would take place on Friday 14th December in Exeter.

The second announcement was about Long Service awards. The Chairman welcomed the opportunity to present service awards to long-serving staff, as a chance for the Council to thank them for their valued contribution.

There were two long service awards to be given to Nick James, (Housing Officer in Estates Management) who had worked for the Council for ten years, and Anna Herbert, (PA to the Deputy Chief Executive & Managers of the Economy Service), who had worked here for thirty years. Both received a certificate and gift from the Chairman on behalf of the Council, and a vote of thanks from Members.

The Chairman then referred to EDDC hosting a Royal event in the summer which had subsequently been referred to in an issue of 'Country Life' magazine, in an article co-edited by HRH Prince Charles. In it he stated that, "This year's highlights included visiting Honiton's first Gate to Plate event, which saw this market town in East Devon showcasing some marvellous local craft, food and drink. The High Street was full of stalls with more than 60 businesses taking part. It was encouraging to see a market town fulfilling its ancient function so admirably, just as it has since Roman times."

The Chairman went on to confirm that the handover of Blackdown House in Honiton was scheduled for 21 December 2018. Staff would be moving in during the early part of January 2019, and the phased relocation would be completed by mid-February. The Deputy Chief Executive, Richard Cohen, would organise visits for members before it is fully occupied.

*42 **Questions (Procedure Rules 9.2 and 9.5)**

Six questions had been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 9.2 - the [questions and answers](#) were circulated prior to the meeting. Councillors submitting questions are entitled to put a related supplementary question (Procedure Rule 9.5). The response to the supplementary question asked is set out below.

- a) Question 1 – The supplementary question queried how the compostable items referred to in the response to the original question are recycled, and whether the unwanted plastic items, such as pens from the Knowle prior to relocation, would be sent to an appropriate recycling centre such as the one in Sidmouth.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Cllr Tom Wright, stated that the key issue about recycling was responsible disposal, and that he would make enquiries specifically about how items from the Knowle would be disposed of.

- b) Question 2 – The supplementary question queried what more the Council could do, and asked if the Leader and Portfolio Holder would form a cross-party group to ensure that measures were included in the Service Plans and new Procurement strategy and that alternatives to plastic were pursued and were comprehensive.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Cllr Tom Wright, stated that EDDC had a great deal to be proud of in terms of its green credentials. The decision to have three-weekly rubbish collections had been a brave one not replicated by many other Councils, but it had worked. EDDC had very committed officers, strong leadership and an effective communications strategy. He referred to an article in the

Daily Telegraph newspaper this week which stated that recycling rates nationally are reducing, but EDDC is bucking that trend and is one of the few councils to be increasing its recycling at an accelerating rate. Its achievements have been applauded and EDDC is regarded as an international green world ambassador winning several awards. However, Cllr Wright acknowledged that there was more to do in relation to reducing waste in the first place. EDDC is consistently recycling about 60% of its waste, whilst other areas, such as Brighton & Hove have a rate of 30.4% and Exeter has one of 30% and reducing. Blackdown House meets high environmental standards and EDDC will continue to improve its contribution to the sustainability of the local environment.

- c) Question 3 – The supplementary question referred to the answers given as 3a and 3b, which appeared to indicate that an application to EDDC to make an Asset of Community Value (ACV) designation is much more likely to be unsuccessful if the owner objects. Does the Leader of the Council agree that this appears to be at odds with the fundamental principles of British justice, and the reason for protecting community assets, and would he ask the Local Government Association to consider the ACV guidance to seek to ensure that equal weight is given to the arguments for and against ACV designation?

In response, the Leader, Cllr Ian Thomas, stated that the numbers of applications referred to in the answer did not seem to be a large enough sample to be statistically significant to draw the conclusions indicated by Cllr Giles, although on the face of it, that would seem to be the case.

- d) Question 4 – The supplementary question queried whether the Council leader agreed that in the interests of openness and transparency there should be Member involvement in the ACV decision-making process, and would he ensure that full details of decisions made are available to the public on the council's website?

In response, the Leader, Cllr Ian Thomas, stated that all local members were consulted as part of the process and their views taken into account. In terms of decision making, this was delegated to the Council's Economic Development Officer, who was currently Alison Hayward.

- e) Question 5 – The supplementary question queried the answer previously provided which states: "the weight given to the NHS objection in this case was high". Should not the Council deal with all ACV applications in exactly the same way, irrespective of whether there is an owner objection, and irrespective of whether there is a submission made by solicitors on behalf of owners?

In response, the Leader, Cllr Ian Thomas, stated the NHS had provided a response with legal advice, as outlined. The Strategic Lead – Governance and Licensing, Henry Gordon-Lennox explained that the designation as an ACV was a technical process, and that what weight should be given to a particular representation was a matter for the decision taker. To treat all representations with equal weight would be fundamentally wrong.

- f) Question 6 – The supplementary question referred to the answer provided as confirming that Grenadier had not signed the final agreements despite assurances given to members to the contrary. Grenadier were also appealing its Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) contribution. This fact was known before the Cabinet meeting on 31 October but was not raised as a material consideration before the decision was made, without the knowledge of members.

In response, the Deputy Chief Executive, Richard Cohen, summarised the current situation including specific further commitments from the developer, Grenadier estates, and stated that there was already a written agreement in place. He further advised that although not all of the conditions precedent had been finalised, reassurance had been given by Grenadier sufficient for the Council to feel that progress was being made.

Councillor Thomas commented that regardless of the issue relating to the late receipt of the report to Cabinet, he was content that the Cabinet had made the right decision in the light of the information available. The risk of not making the decision had also been taken into account.

*43 **Minutes of Cabinet and Committees**

RESOLVED

that the under-mentioned minutes be received and the recommendations approved

Cabinet

Minutes 77-96, 97-116

Scrutiny

Minutes 29-40

Overview

Minutes 17-23

Housing review Board

Minutes 17-39, 40-51

Strategic Planning Committee

Minutes 22-34

Development Management Committee

Minutes 22-25

Audit & Governance Committee

Minutes 25-35

Licensing and Enforcement Committee

Minutes 9-15

Licensing and Enforcement Sub Committee

Minutes 29-34, 35-37, 38-41

Arising from consideration of the above minutes:-

➤ **Cabinet, minute number 93 – Transformation Strategy and Financial Plan (2019-2029)**

Councillor Giles referred to Recommendation 2 that “£200,000 be allocated from the Transformation Fund to meet one-off costs associated with the ‘fit for purpose’ strategic theme in the Transformation Strategy”. He stated that the reason for calling this minute was because EDDC had a particular system for dealing with budget setting, which involved a Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting scheduled in January where such recommendations were assessed. Cllr Giles asked why the system established was being pre-empted by the decision to allocate £200,000 at Cabinet on 31 October.

In response, the Deputy Chief Executive explained that the Transformation work was already budgeted for and was not part of the budget to be considered at the Joint Committee meeting. Cllr Barrow confirmed that £1.8m was in the Transformation Fund and already agreed could be spent for one-off items.

***44 Appointment of Co-opted Tenant Representative Members on Housing Review Board**

Following interviews which were held on 14 November 2018 to fill the two vacant tenant representative positions, members formally co-opted Pat Gore and Cat Summers to the Board.

***45 Motion - Processes for dealing with settlement agreements**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Ben Ingham, seconded by Councillor Megan Armstrong and supported by Councillor Peter Faithfull, Councillor Val Ranger, Councillor Marianne Rixson, Councillor Cathy Gardner, Councillor Roger Giles and Councillor Matt Booth

“In light of the publicity around settlement agreements entered into by this Council in recent years there are concerns that this Council is not taking decisions with openness, transparency and accountability. Will the Council agree that for settlement agreements there should be a robust process in place for dealing with them which should include Member oversight and, if so, will the Council agree to such a process being put in place as soon as possible?”

The proposer of the motion, Councillor Ben Ingham, made the following comments;

- That settlement agreements referred to are agreements that contain a confidentiality clause. Such agreements can be used to settle outstanding claims and liabilities and draw together the terms of a settlement that has been reached. Their use is authorised under the Employment Rights Act 1996 and there exists a guide and code of practice for their use.
- Confidentiality clauses are found towards the end of most settlement agreements and are used to confirm the terms and existence of the settlement agreement are confidential.
- The general public's concerns about settlement agreements and their confidentiality clauses has been the effect that they might have on freedom of speech and the public's right to know about the state of local government.
- The Public Sector Exit Payment Regulations cap pay outs at £95,000 and the current Guidance Notes of The Localism Act 2011 stipulate that any severance package above £100,000 needs to be approved by a full council vote.
- Some councils have used settlement agreements as a matter of routine when people take voluntary redundancy or early retirement, but the real fear is that local authorities are using them as gagging clauses to stifle criticism.
- Recent guidance makes it clear that confidentiality clauses should only be used in extreme circumstances and cannot be used to hide the value or nature of any severance payments. They should not be used to stop, stifle or control individuals from speaking out about their employer.
- Most decisions taken by a local authority are made with the best of intention. However, over the course of time a situation may develop whereby a decision is taken in isolation or a process is followed that appears so right that there is a failure to perceive how actions, behaviours and decisions appear to others. Local authorities then become defensive when others judge or criticise them.
- It is easy to achieve the necessary outcome, but in so doing compromise reputation.
- Councillors and officers know how essential it is to work overtly to Lord Nolan's seven principles for public life. This council should put in place a robust process for dealing with settlement agreements and confidentiality clauses as

soon as possible. Councillors have not been involved in these agreements to date, so it is suggested that a robust process for dealing with these must include Councillor oversight and accountability whenever it is used.

The seconder of the motion, Councillor Megan Armstrong, referred to the expenditure of £200,000 over the past four years on settlement agreements, and made the following points;

- That just because use of such agreements was common practice was irrelevant because the Council is a publicly funded body
- Use of agreements to protect itself from tribunal costs implies that tribunals have been swept aside by agreements
- Exactly what are confidentiality clauses – how are they drawn up, by whom and why
- Do confidentiality clauses prevent genuine whistle-blowing
- Councils are funded by public money and every effort should be made to spend it wisely and transparently

Other points made during the debate included the following;

- Concern was expressed about agreements becoming routine, and preventing people from talking about their employers, the implication being that there is something to cover up.
- Settlement agreements are used in the public and private sector in circumstances when an employment contract should be brought to an end. Individuals are given help to obtain independent legal advice.
- EDDC is a Gold Investors in People organisation, and settlement agreements are not used as gagging orders. Since 2014 there have been 10 cases when both individuals and the organisation have sought to bring employment to an end.
- Such situations often involve serious health issues and employment is ended for medical reasons. They provide cost effective and pragmatic solutions which are sensitive to individual circumstances.
- Members expressed an interest in knowing whether staff who leave through redundancy have to sign a confidentiality clause. If this were the case, there has been no member involvement, and residents prefer their money to be spent on services.
- Members are not involved in the detail of decisions taken by managers, and it is not required when they are focussed on individual's personal circumstances. Experience of EDDC HR practice is that it is of a high standard and does not require members to be involved.

Henry Gordon-Lennox referred to the fact that the £100,000 limit, as referenced by Cllr Ingham, would act as a safety net in relation to the use of settlement agreements, and that EDDC has policies governing the use of such agreements. In the ten cases since 2014, most have involved serious illness and have worked both ways to protect the individual and organisation. Cases are not always clear cut, and sometimes it is more cost effective to the Council to simply not have to fight a case through tribunal. It may save costs to a Council to have an agreement rather than go to a tribunal.

Members agreed that since there had been so few cases over recent years, it would be easy to identify who the individual recipients were and that it was not appropriate to discuss individual circumstances.

The Chairman requested that the motion be now put. This was proposed by Cllr Barrow, seconded by Cllr Gazzard and agreed by a show of hands.

The Chairman invited Cllr Ingham to give his right to reply.

Cllr Ingham stated that he wanted to make sure under no circumstances would anyone be persuaded to leave the Council and induced by payment to stop them talking about the Council. He asked the Leader if he was sure that this had never happened.

The Chairman then invited those present to vote.

The Chairman stated the outcome of the vote was 9 in favour, and the majority against by show of hands.

RESOLVED:

that following a vote, the motion proposed by Councillor Ben Ingham and seconded by Councillor Megan Armstrong was lost.

***46 Motion – Financial decisions to be taken in accordance with the Council’s Code of Corporate Governance**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Ben Ingham, seconded by Councillor Megan Armstrong and supported by Councillor Peter Faithfull, Councillor Val Ranger, Councillor Marianne Rixson, Councillor Cathy Gardner, Councillor Roger Giles and Councillor Matt Booth.

“Following the urgent decision taken recently regarding Queens Drive there are concerns that this Council is not taking decisions with objectivity, integrity, honesty and accountability. Does the Council agree that all financial decisions should be taken in accordance with the principles set out in the Council’s Code of Corporate Governance?”

The proposer, Councillor Ben Ingham, made the following points;

- EDDC’s Code of Corporate Governance states, “In essence, governance is about how to make sure that the Council is doing the right things, in the right way, for the right people, in a timely, inclusive, open, honest and accountable manner. Governance comprises the systems and processes, culture and values by which people act and account to, engage with and, where appropriate, lead the community.”
- Principles within the Code, include behaving with integrity, demonstrating strong commitment to ethical values, and respecting the rule of law; ensuring members and officers behave with integrity and lead a culture where acting in the public interest is visibly and consistently demonstrated thereby protecting the reputation of the Council.
- Cllr Ingham suggested that a significant proportion of the Exmouth community may take the view that the council puts its own interests above those of the community.
- In relation to Queens Drive, Exmouthians have told Cllr Ingham that they think it is officers that are driving the principles and values of the Council and that they are not always the seven Nolan principles.
- In providing clear reasoning and evidence for decisions in both public records and explanations to stakeholders and being explicit about the criteria, rationale and considerations used, it appeared that the Cabinet on 31 October were willing to hear

the officers recommendations and adopt them as proposals without any debate, as if they had already been briefed beforehand in order to avoid debate and openness.

- In striking a balance between providing the right amount of information to satisfy transparency demands and enhance public scrutiny for users to understand, there are occasions when it may not be done for members to understand or to assist public scrutiny.
- In ensuring that when working in partnership, arrangements for accountability are clear and the need for wider public accountability has been recognised and met, a significant proportion of the Exmouth community may not agree this is being done.

The seconder, Councillor Megan Armstrong, stated that she wanted to second the motion with reference to Queen's Drive. She was concerned that the latest decision involved financial risk and had concerns about the way the project had been handled from the outset. It appeared that decisions were not being taken in accordance with EDDC's own Code of Corporate Governance, and that members needed to be sure that the right things were being done in the right way.

Other points made during the debate included the following;

- Views were expressed that a similar situation had occurred in 2015 regarding discussions about re-location of the Council when members were not given information.
- Issues prompting this Motion relate to a lack of transparency at Cabinet on 31 October, when a report was received with less than 24 hours' notice, and which would potentially commit the Council to spending large amounts of public money without greater consideration by members or independent audit advice.
- The Queen's Drive project is an excellent one led by Cllr Skinner on the Exmouth Regeneration Board, and aimed at yielding positive benefits to the people of the town.
- Corporate partners and contractors should not push EDDC into making decisions which cannot be made at the same pace as the private sector drive to act quickly.
- Despite views to the contrary held by some members, it is well known that the public has had concerns about decisions during the lifetime of the project.
- Members of the Exmouth Regeneration Board considered that matters had been dealt with properly.

Cllr Williamson stated that this Motion was an example of 'dog whistle politics' when words like concern were used without any evidence, to lay seeds of doubt about mismanagement and impropriety. The Code had many ways of monitoring compliance in relation to Council activities. The Audit & Governance Committee has a specific role to play and a separate section within the Code. The External Auditors' judgement for 2018 reflected their view that EDDC demonstrated the highest level of assurance. In 2017, EDDC volunteered as one of the first Councils to participate in an inspection, an eight themed internal audit covering Corporate Governance; Financial Management; Risk Management; Performance Management; Commissioning & Procurement; Information Management; Programme & Project Management and Asset Management. This led to a result of High Assurance in dealing with all matters.

Cllr Skinner pointed out that the whole Council was responsible for decisions made about the Exmouth Project, and that extensive local consultations had taken place with many responses from the public. Everyone was working hard to deliver a good project in consultation with the people of Exmouth.

The Deputy Chief Executive, Richard Cohen, summarised debate that had occurred over recent years about funding streams and options for development in Exmouth. In terms of a timetable, EDDC considered that Grenadier were taking too long and had challenged them to keep up with the Council rather than the other way round. EDDC had a written agreement with Grenadier and were working through the conditions with them to move forward. EDDC are accordingly content with the progress being made.

The Chairman requested that a vote take place on the proposal that the motion be now put. The proposal was put by Cllr Gazzard, seconded by Cllr Stott and agreed by a show of hands.

The Chairman invited Cllr Ingham to give his right to reply.

Cllr Ingham made further comments about the integrity of decision making and the fact that independent advice and guidance which could have been obtained was not sought.

The Chairman then invited those present to vote.

The Chairman stated the outcome of the vote was 11 in favour, 3 abstentions and the majority against by show of hands.

RESOLVED:

that following a vote, the motion proposed by Councillor Ben Ingham and seconded by Councillor Megan Armstrong was lost.

***47 Motion – Findings on extreme poverty and human rights in the United Kingdom**

The following motion was proposed by Councillor Cathy Gardner, seconded by Councillor Marianne Rixson and supported by Councillor Ben Ingham, Councillor Roger Giles, Councillor Matthew Booth, Councillor Peter Faithfull, Councillor Dawn Manley, Councillor Val Ranger.

“Following the findings of both the UK Equalities and Human Rights Commission and the UN Special Rapporteur on the impact of benefits changes and other spending cuts on people living in the UK, this Council will receive a report on the potential impacts on residents in East Devon and the need for further support from this Council, for example in supporting the roll-out of Universal Credit, homelessness prevention or for local food banks.”

The proposer, Councillor Cathy Gardner, made the following points.

The purpose of the Motion was to ask for a report to be brought for further consideration by Council. She had been shocked by the numbers of people affected by extreme poverty in the UK in 2018, and wanted to establish if there was anything more that EDDC could do to help them. EDDC had a civic duty to help people and the Service Plans were full of good intentions. The Motion was not a criticism of the Council but a request to examine what more could be done. It has been reported in the media that people are struggling with the Introduction of Universal Credit; there

are difficulties in processing Housing Benefit claims causing delays in assisting people; returning empty homes to better use is difficult.

The seconder, Councillor Marianne Rixson, also referred to the impact of Universal Credit and on people on low pay. Successive government policies had led to real hardship and the need for food banks, and too much delay in getting the first payments of Universal Credit to people.

Other points made during the debate included the following;

Cllr Rylance had read the report referred to in the Motion and was shocked at the damning of services required by people. She referred to the need for better access to Broadband so that people could access services and claim benefits. 2.5 million people were living just above the poverty line. It is inappropriate to expect volunteers to take up the slack of services needed and plans needed to be put in place for a 'No Deal Brexit'. National Government would need to make the necessary changes.

Cllr Elson stated that many of those present at the meeting were involved in volunteering, and summarised the many ways in which EDDC was offering practical help to people, for example, by providing discretionary Housing Benefit payments; helping people complete benefit forms and giving food bank vouchers.

Cllr Godbeer expressed his shame at the way the system does not seem to be working well in some areas, as well as acknowledging the good work done by EDDC. He invited Cllr Gardner to identify what could be done and bring it to the Overview Committee to progress further work.

Members considered that it would be helpful to catalogue what the Council does presently, in order to identify what improvements could be made, and also to remember that everyone can contribute individually to the local effort.

Cllr Thomas thanked Cllr Gardner and Cllr Rixson for bringing the Motion, and Cllr Elson for highlighting the practical work being done to date. He stated that the comments in the reports about Brexit were timely. He invited members to attend a third workshop on Universal Credit to be arranged shortly, to update them on recent developments and its impact on local residents.

Cllr Thomas then proposed that the Motion was now put, which was seconded by Cllr Howe.

The Chairman invited Cllr Gardner to give her right to reply.

Cllr Gardner reiterated her thanks to those working on practical support but also the need to ask people and agencies like CAB to identify the gaps and cracks in the system which people fall through when seeking help.

The Chairman then invited those present to vote.

The Chairman stated the outcome of the vote as being carried unanimously by show of hands.

RESOLVED:

that following a vote, the motion proposed by Councillor Cathy Gardner and seconded by Councillor Marianne Rixson was carried unanimously.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed.

Attendance list

Councillors present:

Mike Allen
Megan Armstrong
Brian Bailey
David Barratt
Dean Barrow
Susie Bond
Matthew Booth
Colin Brown
Jenny Brown
Peter Burrows
Paul Carter
Maddy Chapman
Iain Chubb
Alan Dent
Bruce de Saram
Tim Dumper
John Dyson
Jill Elson
Mark Evans-Martin
Peter Faithfull
Cathy Gardner
Steve Gazzard
Roger Giles
Graham Godbeer
Simon Grundy
Steve Hall
Mike Howe
Stuart Hughes
John Humphreys
Ben Ingham
Geoff Jung
David Key (Vice Chairman)
Jim Knight
Dawn Manley
Andrew Moulding (Chairman)
Cherry Nicholas
Helen Parr
Geoff Pook
Marianne Rixson
Eleanor Rylance
Philip Skinner
Pauline Stott
Brenda Taylor
Ian Thomas
Phil Twiss
Mark Williamson
Eileen Wragg
Tom Wright

Honorary Aldermen:

Frances Newth
Tim Wood
Steve Wragg

Officers:

Richard Cohen, Deputy Chief Executive
Henry Gordon Lennox, Strategic Lead – Governance and Licensing
Sue Howl, Democratic Services Manager

Councillor apologies:

Paul Diviani
Ian Hall
Marcus Hartnell
Douglas Hull
Rob Longhurst
Darryl Nicholas
John O’Leary
Christopher Pepper
Geoff Pratt
Val Ranger

Honorary Aldermen apologies:

David Cox
Trevor Cope
John Jeffreys
Steph Jones
Ann Liverton
Graham Liverton
Bob Peachey

Officer apologies:

Mark Williams, Chief Executive

Chairman

Date