

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL**

THURSDAY 26 SEPTEMBER 2013

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillor B Buschman – Mayor
Councillor R Hetherington – Deputy Mayor

Councillors L J Abbey, R A Adair, Mrs S P Bailey, J R Bannister, D G Bell, Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, N A Brown, R L Butler, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combella, L B Cooper, J E Cottee, J A Cranswick, G Davidson, J E Fearon, J E Greenwood, M G Hemsley, R M Jones, K A Khan, I I Korn, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender, S E Mallender, D J Mason, F J Mason, G S Moore, B A Nicholls, E A Plant, F A Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, D V Smith, Mrs J A Smith, P Smith, J A Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, B Tansley, J E Thurman, H Tipton, T Vennett-Smith, D G Wheeler

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

1 Member of Public

OFFICERS PRESENT:

A Graham	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Service Manager – Finance & Commercial
D Mitchell	Executive Manager - Communities
L Reid Jones	Democratic Services Manager
P Steed	Executive Manager - Finance & Commercial
D Swaine	Executive Manager - Operations & Corporate Governance

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors A M Dickinson, N C Lawrence, Mrs J M Marshall

OPENING PRAYER

The Meeting was led in prayer by the Mayor's Chaplain

22. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

23. Minutes

The minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 20 June 2013 and the Extraordinary Meeting held on Tuesday 16 July 2013 were received as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

24. Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Council that he had attended 36 functions over the last two months, many of which had been fetes and summer activities. He praised the enthusiasm and commitment of the communities and volunteers who helped make the events possible. The Mayor highlighted Sutton Bonington Show, Art Competition at Ratcliffe on Trent Show, Hickling Scarecrows, West Bridgford Allotment Society Show. The Mayor had also attended the Ashes Cricket Match at Trent Bridge and the activities at the Country Park. He informed Council of a charity event at Nottinghamshire Golf Club on 13 October, tickets for which were available from the Mayor's Secretary. He also acknowledged Councillor Bannister's efforts in running the half marathon for the Mayor's Charity, Hayward House.

25. Leader's Announcements

Councillor Clarke announced that in his role on the Local Government Association (LGA) he had taken part in the responding to the Government's consultation on proposal to divert the New Homes Bonus to Local Enterprise Partnerships. He informed Council that a cross party response had been made by the LGA to Government and it was hoped that the LGA would work to the benefit of all local authorities in the continuing dialogue.

26. Chief Executive's Announcements

The Chief Executive informed Council that it was proposed that the special meeting of Council scheduled for 31 October 2013 would be cancelled. This was because the Highways Agency was unable to complete their impact assessments to meet this deadline. The Planning Inspector had accepted a delay until December. The Core Strategy would now be considered at Council on 12 December and all Members would receive an email informing them of the change of dates.

27. Statement of Accounts 2012/13

Councillor Cranswick presented the Statement of Accounts for 2012/13 and the Council's Annual Governance Statement which in line with best practice had been agreed with the Leader and Chief Executive. He informed Council that the External Auditor had presented his 'Report to those Charged with Governance' to the meeting of the Corporate Governance Group on 17 September. Commenting further Councillor Cranswick informed Council of the Auditor's key findings summarised as follows:

- The Statement of Accounts gave a true and fair view of the financial position of the authority and of its expenditure and income for 2012/13;
- The Statement had been properly prepared in accordance with the relevant code of practice;
- The Council had put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources for the year 2012/13;

- The Council had fully addressed all recommendations made in the 2011/12 Annual Governance Report and, through its programme of improvement, had also successfully resolved the two key risks identified in the 2012/13 External Audit Plan.

Councillor Cranswick drew Council's attention to Appendix B which contained the management representation letter that was considered by the Corporate Governance Group alongside the Statement of Accounts and the Report to those Charged with Governance. He explained that the letter confirmed for the Auditors that the Council was satisfied with the validity of the financial statements provided by the Authority to KPMG. He added that the letter would be signed by the Mayor at the conclusion of the meeting.

Commenting further Councillor Cranswick stated that the positive Auditor's letter was the result of the ongoing planned process which began with the appointment of the Executive Manager - Finance and Commercial and the Service Manager – Finance and Commercial. He believed that the Council was now seeing the results of that careful planning, which would continue to produce ongoing dividends. He thanked officers for their considerable work and congratulated them on the progress made. He added that the Auditors had been complementary of the process.

Councillor Moore, as Chairman of the Corporate Governance Group stated that he was pleased that the Auditors were satisfied with the accounts. He congratulated the staff on their work.

Councillor Davidson and Councillor S Mallender supported the approval of the statement of accounts and thanked officers for their hard work.

Councillor Plant reminded Council that in the previous year the Auditor had raised a number of issues regarding the accounting process which had prevented the accounts from being presented to Council at the correct time last year. She thanked officers for presenting information regularly to the Corporate Governance Group.

Councillor Clarke added his appreciation to the officers, and stated that the Council was now on track for an excellent record in managing its finances.

RESOLVED that Council approve:

- a) the Statement of Accounts for 2012/13 (Appendix A)
- b) the Management Representation Letter (Appendix B).

28. Community Governance Review – Shelford and Newton Parish

Councillor Clarke presented the report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance regarding a Community Governance Review in Shelford and Newton Parish. He reminded Members that in June 2013 Council had received a petition from residents of Shelford and Newton Parish requesting the cessation of the existing parish council and the formation of two separate parish councils. He explained that the Council was now required to

carry out a Community Governance Review in Shelford and Newton Parish in accordance with Part 4 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. The report set out the key issues to be considered and outlined the area to be reviewed. He stated that whilst the map submitted with the petition was not co-terminus with the existing parish boundary he did not anticipate that this would have a negative impact and that the Member Group would address this as part of their deliberations. Councillor Clarke proposed a revision to the recommendations which was tabled.

Councillor Davidson believed that the two communities believed it was necessary to make the changes, particularly with the increase in population in Newton. He supported the recommendations.

Councillors Bannister and S Mallender added their support to the proposal.

Resolved that Council:

- a) agree the process involved for the delivery of a Community Governance Review, the proposed timetable and the associated resource implications;
- b) agree the Terms of Reference for the Community Governance Review (**Appendix 2**) for approval in order that the process can commence in line with the proposed timetable (**Appendix 3**);
- c) extend the remit of the cross party Community Governance Review Member Group established for the Community Governance Review of Edwalton to consider the Council's position in response to the consultation to be undertaken as part of the review of Shelford and Newton;
- d) Approve the revised Member Group Terms of Reference (**Appendix 4**).

29. Proposed Changes to the Constitution – Member Champions

Councillor Clarke requested the withdrawal of the report.

The Mayor agreed that the item be withdrawn.

30. Standards Committee Recommendations and Update on the Appointment of the Independent Person

Councillor Adair presented the report of the Monitoring Officer regarding the Standards Committee. He reminded Council that at its meeting on 21 June 2012 Council had agreed a Code of Conduct and the composition and terms of reference of the Standards Committee. He added that Council had requested that these be reviewed after a year, and the Standards Committee had considered this at its meeting on 25 July 2013.

By reference to paragraph 5 of the report Councillor Adair explained that the Standards Committee had considered whether the provisions relating to

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests should be extended, whether membership of any external organisation or groups should be added to the list, and if so, how the disclosure of any interests would work. He informed Council that the Standards Committee was of the view that there did not appear to have been any difficulties with the Code in its first year of operation and therefore it was not necessary to make changes to it. Furthermore the Committee considered that the Code's principals and the provisions within it clearly indicated that Councillors must declare any private interest, pecuniary and non-pecuniary and must take steps to resolve any conflict arising in a way which protects the public interest.

In relation to the membership and terms of reference of the Standards Committee, Councillor Adair stated that the Standards Committee had considered that the system was working well and did not require any changes.

With reference to the report Councillor Adair informed Council that the Independent Person had resigned in July, and that no applications had been submitted in response to the vacancy. He proposed that the vacancy be re-advertised with a further report being submitted to Council once suitable arrangements had been made for finalising the appointment. In the meantime temporary informal arrangements had been made to utilise the Independent Person at Newark and Sherwood District Council should this be necessary.

Councillor Adair informed Council that the Government had recently produced a revised paragraph within the illustrative text for the Code of Conduct. This related to paragraph (vi) of the code with the new wording being (*additional wording underlined*):

- vi. You must declare any private interests, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary, including your membership of any Trade Union, that relate to your public duties and must take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest, including registering and declaring interests in a manner conforming with the procedures set out in the box below.

Councillor Jones informed Council that he would be withdrawing the Notice of Motion 12 (b) in his name, which he had submitted prior to seeing this report. He moved an amendment in the following terms:

Recommendation:

- a. *changes be made to the Councillor Code of Conduct so that Member's membership of any external organisations or groups, beyond those that reflect a 'pecuniary interest', should be added to the list of disclosable interests.*

In moving the amendment Councillor Jones accepted that this option had been considered by the Standards Committee and that it was not required by current legislation. He stated that under the previous ethics regime of the Standards Board, Members had to declare any organisation or society which they belonged to but that the Council had dropped this requirement when it was able to make its own rules.

Commenting further Councillor Jones stated that he believed it was good practice for Councillors to be seen to go the extra mile to be open and transparent, particularly when the Council was engaged in contracts with private organisations providing services and major developments were proposed. He stated that the amendment called for Cabinet to go beyond the minimal requirements and re-establish the requirement to declare interests in the register.

Councillor Clarke stated that he could not accept the amendment. He believed that the existing code of conduct specified the expectations of Members and drew Council's attention to paragraph 6 of the report which stated that the Standards Committee believed that the principles of the Code clearly indicated that Councillors must declare any private interests, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary. He believed that the code set out clearly the principles of integrity and honesty and there was no reason to go beyond this.

Councillor Cranswick believed that the existing Code was sufficient.

Councillor D Boote stated that public perception of Councillors was not positive and referred to recent IPSOS Mori research which showed that perceived relatively low levels of trust and honesty in politicians. She added that by supporting the amendment Councillors showed they could be trusted.

Councillor S Boote believed that the amendment resulted in an extra level of clarity which would bring the Code up to the highest level.

Councillor Purdue-Horan believed that amendments for Council should be introduced with notice to give Members time to consider them. He believed this to be an inappropriate amendment and that it would be better scrutinised at the Standards Committee.

Councillor MacInnes stated that he declared interests so there were no misunderstandings. He commented that there had been considerable discussion at the Standards Committee and the majority had agreed that it was not necessary to extend the list of disclosable pecuniary interests. He believed that the issue could be referred to the Committee to ask for it to be reviewed in 12 months.

Councillor S Mallender stated that she believed the Code of Conduct was robust and that the amendment added strength to the Code.

Councillor Jones stated that it was for Councillors to make a decision as to the appropriateness of a declaration and that the amendment sought to address transparency.

Councillor Adair stated that the Standards Committee had debated the issue and agreed that the current arrangements worked well for the Council, and therefore did not require changes.

The amendment was put to the vote and declared lost.

Councillor MacInnes stated that he supported the recommendations in the report. He added that it was premature to judge the overall success of the new regime, and that a national report had highlighted weaknesses in the system, particularly the lack of sanctions. He believed that the old regime had been bureaucratic and cumbersome and that the majority of complaints were now dealt with by the Monitoring Officer rather than a sub-committee. He added that a significant amount of officer time had been saved.

Councillor R Mallender supported the recommendations and stated that he was pleased that Rushcliffe Councillors did not get involved in vexatious complaints that Councillors in other authorities appeared to.

In conclusion Councillor Adair stated that last year had been good in terms of a fall in the number of complaints received.

RESOLVED that:

- a. no changes be made to the Councillor Code of Conduct, other than the inclusion of the words 'including your membership of any Trade Union' to paragraph (vi) of Appendix A;
- b. the terms of reference and composition of the Standards Committee remain as they are;
- c. the temporary arrangements with regard to the vacant 'Independent Person' position be noted;
- d. Council receives a further report once suitable arrangements have been made for a formal appointment.

31. Scrutiny Annual Report 2012/13

In presenting the Scrutiny Annual Report Councillor Clarke stated that a significant amount of work had been carried out by the Scrutiny Committees.

Councillor Davidson supported the recommendations and recognised the excellent work of the committees.

Councillor MacInnes welcomed the report and highlighted a number of successes including the work undertaken by the Joint Scrutiny Committee, the call in of the decision relating to the Nottinghamshire County Cricket funding, the review of corporate governance and the ongoing work of the Member Groups. He commented that the Labour Group welcomed the opportunity to be involved in shaping future services. He recognised the challenges ahead and in particular increasing public awareness and involvement in the scrutiny process. Councillor MacInnes commented on the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meetings, which he believed had no formal powers or terms of reference. He expressed concern that the notes of meetings were not circulated and that its activities and purposes were not understood. He believed that the meeting should be chaired by a Councillor and stated that he would be writing to the Chief Executive in order to further outline his concerns.

Councillor R Mallender commented that the scrutiny function was valuable, although the Green Group would prefer to return to a committee system. He requested that the Council should look again at re-introducing the committee system.

Councillor Moore believed that the Scrutiny Chairmen's meeting was useful for administrative purposes to co-ordinate work programmes. He stated that it had been a busy year for Corporate Governance Group scrutinising treasury management, protection against fraud, internal audit and risk management. Councillor Moore thanked Councillor Plant for her support and he looked forward to continuing to scrutinise the Council's governance arrangements.

Councillor Wheeler thanked officers and Members involved in the Performance Management Board. He commented that data presentation had improved and this was useful and he recognised the work undertaken by officers in reviewing the Performance Management Framework.

Councillor Combellack spoke as Vice Chairman of the Community Development Group and highlighted the variety of topics scrutinised by that Group, including maintaining vibrant communities, choice based lettings, housing allocation and support for the business economy. She added that the scrutiny of the Service Level Agreement for the Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Services and Rural Community Action Nottingham had now been passed to the Partnership Delivery Group for continuing scrutiny. She thanked all Members of the Group, in particular the outgoing Chairman, Councillor Lawrence.

As former chairman of the Partnership Delivery Group Councillor Hetherington stated that the Group had been robust in its scrutiny of partners, including police, fire service and social housing providers. He believed that the scrutiny had been undertaken in an impartial way. He thanked Members for their input.

In conclusion Councillor Clarke stated that scrutiny was an important part of the Council's activities. He added that he was grateful to everyone who had contributed to the scrutiny committees.

RESOLVED that Council endorses the work undertaken by the four scrutiny groups.

32. **Notice of Motion**

- a. Notice of Motion to be put to Council by Councillor R Jones and seconded by Cllr S Boote:

"Council resolves that residents of the Borough in social housing and in receipt of housing benefit should not be penalised when, as a result of the under-occupancy benefit capping (the so-called "bedroom tax"), they want to downsize but are unable to do so because no property of the appropriate size is available. Council recommends that a hardship fund be set up to ensure that housing association rent arrears which are not the fault of the resident are paid until the resident is offered a reasonable alternative property and declines it."

In introducing the motion Councillor Jones stated that he was not seeking to debate government policies but wanted to consider how the Council could support residents and claimants, and how the Housing Payment Scheme could be extended. He believed that housing and benefits were complex subjects and that overcrowding and spare rooms were not simple issues to resolve. He commented that there was a pressing need for more social housing, and that sending residents into rent arrears and debt was not the best way to square a circle. In continuing, Councillor Jones stated that it was heartening to hear that officers were working with social housing providers and that they were making progress. He believed that the Housing Team would be seeking to ensure that residents were offered sources of advice prior to homelessness.

Councillor Jones acknowledged that the Council had established a Discretionary Housing Payment Scheme but stated that the motion proposed a sister hardship fund be set up. He added that an increasing number of councils had worked with their local housing associations to set up such a scheme and introduce a non-eviction policy to protect people from arrears due to under-occupancy. He outlined details of how the scheme could work, including how the Housing Association could isolate any arrears that were accrued due to under-occupancy once a resident has said they wanted to downsize. Furthermore once the resident has moved to smaller accommodation the rent arrears would be paid off by the hardship fund and not the resident. He added that the protection would be withdrawn if people refused two reasonable offers of rehousing into smaller social housing accommodation, and that the hardship fund would not cover arrears that had come about through other reasons.

Councillor S Boote stated that the bedroom tax should be used for its intended purpose of reducing public expenditure. He gave an example of whether the Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) scheme had been used to good effect in his ward. He believed the introduction of a hardship fund would strengthen the DHP.

Councillor MacInnes believed that the motion missed the point and that the bedroom tax was fundamentally wrong and should be abolished. He believed that creating a hardship fund was not the answer and that the motion did not go far enough. He added that some families were seeing a significant loss of benefits and people were being forced out of their homes to go into private housing.

Councillor Boughton-Smith moved an amendment in the following terms:

Delete all after the words "is available" (line 5 of the substantive motion) and replace it with text highlighted in yellow

Council:

- 1. Resolves that residents of the Borough in social housing and in receipt of housing benefit should not be penalised when, as a result of the under-occupancy benefit capping (the so called "bedroom tax") they want to downsize but are unable to do so because no property of the appropriate size or location is available*

2. *Requests that officers draw up a “council protocol” that advises, supports and offers eligible tenants information and financial support designed to stop evictions and homelessness. This support would continue until the tenant is offered a suitable home or declines it or the “bedroom tax” is abolished.*
3. *Supports the abolition of the so-called “bedroom tax” and resolves to work with any government that is committed to abolishing it.*

In moving the amendment Councillor Boughton-Smith said that a fall in under occupancy and freeing up social housing was a good idea but using the bedroom tax to achieve it had caused hardship. He believed that there was a threat to community cohesion, in that families had lived in homes for most of their life and were an integral part of the local community with family nearby, therefore it was important to rehouse people near their family. He explained that part 2 of the amendment came at a time of austerity when benefits and income were falling. He added that people couldn't afford to live where they were but couldn't afford private accommodation either. He believed that a robust system was needed for those affected and therefore a council protocol should be introduced. He envisaged that it would have an agreed procedure and common processes to deal with people affected, and that examples of protocols existed in other areas. This, he felt, would ensure everyone affected was treated fairly and on a uniform basis. Councillor Boughton-Smith stated that part 3 of the amendment was necessary as the bedroom tax was 'a sticking plaster over a festering wound' and by keeping the bedroom tax the wound wouldn't heal. He believed that the current motion dealt with the consequences and not the causes and that it was important to think of the long term consequences and the flawed legislation.

Councillor Cranswick stated that he could not support the amendment because it called for the abolition of the bedroom tax.

Councilor S Mallender spoke in support of the amendment. She said that there was a lack of small accommodation in Rushcliffe and that the issue was brought to them frequently as Ward Councillors. She highlighted the number of planning applications at Development Control Committee seeking approval to extend smaller properties into larger accommodation. She believed that under occupancy was an issue but plunging people into poverty was not the answer: providing suitable housing was the answer. Furthermore the Council needed to consider the effect of the tax on people and she gave example of students going to university and the remaining family having to move to smaller accommodation or pay the tax. She added that this acted as a disincentive for poor people to go to university. She stated that location was an important point and that people could become homeless as they tried to remain in the area.

Councillor Vennett-Smith stated that the tax hurt people when the original intention was to help people. He added that he had always supported the idea of building social housing but the Government did not provide the funding to build it. He believed that Council had to help people. He stated that Councillor Jones had tried to put forward an idea to alleviate the problem and that the Council should consider it. He believed that part 3 of the amendment

was a waste of time and that it was fantasy that any government would change. He agreed that location was an important issue.

Councillor S Boote stated that he was disappointed by the amendment, in that part 3 was irrelevant to this debate and it was not necessary to bring it up. He believed the motion was trying to alleviate the effect of the bedroom tax and that the Council needed to find ways of helping people.

Councillor Tansley commented that the main blockage with the amendment was part 3 and as such he couldn't support it. He added that the Labour Group had used the name 'bedroom tax' but its real name was Under Occupancy Charge and it was about making better use of social housing. He believed that 95% of people would not be affected by the proposal. Furthermore the Council had a proven record of building social housing in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Clarke stated that the amendment was at best hypocritical and that part 3 was totally against what the Council was trying to achieve. He stated that a protocol would restrict the Council by narrowing flexibility and therefore he would not be supporting it.

Councillor Bannister stated that private rented housing and social housing were affected and that he didn't agree with the spirit of the motion or the bedroom tax. He believed that tenants were getting into financial difficulty through no fault of their own. He added that families should be able to remain in their locality when their children grew up and moved away.

Councillor Boughton-Smith believed that some Councillors had misinterpreted the amendment and although some thought the bedroom tax was not a good idea they wanted to keep it. Commenting further he said that part 1 and 2 of the amendment would not be needed if Council supported part 3. He stated that the amendment was not a criticism of those working in housing and added that a number of Councils had adopted a similar policy. He added that the amendment was intended to enhance dealings with homeless and housing issues, not restrict them.

Councillor Jones stated that it was not in the Council's gift to abolish the bedroom tax and therefore he would not be supporting the amendment.

The amendment was put to the vote and was declared lost.

Councillor Cranswick concurred with Councillor Jones in that it was not in the Council's gift to abolish the bedroom tax. He said it was important to address some of the problems. He reminded Council that the tax allow one bedroom for each person or couple living as part of the household with a number of exceptions. He stated that there just over 6,100 housing benefit claimants within the Borough and that at the start of the financial year 615 of these were affected by changes. By the 31 August 2013 this had reduced to 517. Of these 465 were subject to the 14% reduction for one spare bedroom, and 52 were subject to the 25% reduction. Councillor Cranswick highlighted that the Council had been proactive in identifying individuals who would be exempt from the SRS and as a result the following exemptions have been awarded:

- 25 in respect of overnight carers
- 16 where disabled adaptations had been made to the property.
- 14 in respect of disabled children who cannot share a bedroom
- 2 Foster Carers.

In relation to the DHP Councillor Cranswick informed Council that to date 107 applications have been received. 74 of these have been made on the basis of the impact of SRS Changes. Of this 74, 27 cases have been awarded DHP and seven are still being assessed. The remaining 40 have not had a DHP award or have withdrawn their application. Of these 21 related to customers who had sufficient income to meet the additional costs from within their household budgets. A further quarter either withdrew their application or failed to attend the interview which had been arranged to discuss their financial position.

Councillor Cranswick believed that the Council had a thorough approach to dealing with hardship, by giving advice on budgeting, working with the Citizens Advice Bureau, JobCentre Plus and other partners. He added that the numbers involved were small. Commenting further he stated that the Council had the ability to top up the DHP and that less than one third of the DHP had been allocated thus far. He believed that there was sufficient in the pot to cover the requirements and it was important that the Council should approach this in a sensible, measured way. He acknowledged the difficulties people were facing but believed the Council should try to mitigate it as much as possible.

Councillor Davidson stated that the motion did not aim to give out money to everyone, but the hardship fund would be there to help people who needed it in an attempt to alleviate other potential social problems.

Councillor S Mallender believed that the motion attempted to alleviate some of the problems. She considered that the tax was unfair and gave several examples to highlight this.

Councillor Clarke stated that hardship was a serious matter and everyone agreed that it should be treated seriously. He reminded Council that the DHP was already in existence and questioned why a duplicate fund was required. Commenting further he said that the Council prided itself on flexibility and therefore he did not want the Council to create too many rules which may not provide this flexibility in future.

Councillor Vennett-Smith believed that this was the weakest reason why the ruling Group should not support the motion. He added that the Leader had promised that the hardest hit people would be looked after and that in his view officers would need to consider how to deal with this.

Councillor Jones agreed that the number of people affected was small. He believed that people of working age on low incomes were ok, however people on the border line were in a difficult position. He called for flexibility and judgement in what was classed as a 'reasonable' property. He added that the DHP was tightly regulated and therefore there was little flexibility. Furthermore there would come a point when the cash would run out and the Council would

need to add to the fund. He re-iterated that other Councils had set up a hardship fund and called on Council to support the motion.

The motion was put the vote and declared lost.

- b. Notice of Motion to be put to Council by Councillor R Jones and seconded by Councillor D Boote:

“This Council calls upon the Cabinet to re-introduce the requirement for Councillors to make transparent declarations of personal and professional interests”.

Councillor Jones withdrew the notice of motion.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm.

MAYOR