

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL**

THURSDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 2025

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors R Butler (Vice-Chair), M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, L Way, T Wells, J Wheeler and G Williams

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
D Banks	Director of Neighbourhoods
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
E Richardson	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

Councillors J Cottey, R Walker and G Wheeler

36 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

37 Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 September 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 September 2025 were approved as a true record and signed by the Deputy Mayor.

38 Mayor's Announcements

The Deputy Mayor thanked the children from Crossdale Drive School for coming to sing Christmas Carols, which had been very enjoyable. He also thanked everyone involved with organising the successful West Bridgford Christmas Lights Switch On, which had been very well attended.

39 Leader's Announcements

The Leader referred to the recent event at the Sir Julien Cahn Pavilion

celebrating Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club winning the championship, in conjunction with a re-launch of the refurbished Pavilion. The event was very well attended and he looked forward to the Pavilion being well used, including by the Women's County Cricket Club.

The Leader referred to a fantastic achievement by the East Leake Community Care Association, which had been awarded the King's Award for Voluntary Service.

40 Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no Chief Executive's Announcements.

41 Citizens' Questions

No citizens' questions were received for this meeting.

42 Petitions

No petitions were presented at this meeting.

43 Rushcliffe Borough Council Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2025-2030

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Environment and Safety, Councillor Inglis presented the report of the Director – Neighbourhoods detailing the Rushcliffe Borough Council Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2025-2030.

Before introducing the report, Councillor Inglis proposed that he would be making an amendment to recommendation b) to read as follows, which was seconded by Councillor Regan, who reserved the right to speak.

- b) requires a review to be undertaken in respect of *potential mandating* of CCTV in Taxi and Private Hire vehicles within 12 months, and the findings be reported to the Licensing Committee

Councillor Soloman arrived at 7.11pm.

Councillor Inglis confirmed that the Policy had been subject to a six-week consultation, and then considered by the Licensing Committee, which had raised additional matters relating to mandating CCTV in taxis, which he would refer to later. The Committee had agreed the Policy, which proposed some significant changes to keep it legal, incorporate Government guidance and reflect the current climate of the taxi industry. It was hoped to address the decline in Hackney capacity, increase efficiency and lower costs, whilst maintaining safety standards and encourage new drivers. Councillor Inglis advised that the full summary of the proposed changes was in Annex 2 and he highlighted the main updates as detailed in Paragraph 4.2 of the report. He thanked the Assistant Director of Public Protection and his team for their continued hard work.

Councillor Inglis referred to CCTV and stated that whilst this was not part of this Policy review, it was an issue being considered at Chief Executive level across the county. It was recognised that nationally legislation needed to be updated, to bring uniformity and consistency. Councillor Inglis referred to taxis from other authorities, who overwhelmingly outnumbered Rushcliffe's own licensed vehicles, in particular from the City of Wolverhampton Council, and he referred to the importance of having locally licensed drivers, under Rushcliffe's control. It was positive that a review was a Government priority; however, time scales were unknown. Councillor Inglis advised that all the Nottingham authorities had concluded that mandating CCTV must be a national policy; however, he was concerned that this might not take place before Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). Council was reminded that Rushcliffe was proud to currently promote the White Ribbon Awareness Campaign and support the campaign to end Violence against Women and Girls. It was important that drivers were protected too, so waiting for change was not an option and Rushcliffe wanted to start the process. Councillor Inglis referred to the recommendation from Licensing Committee, which had been included as recommendation b), and believed that a review was necessary before any application for a mandatory CCTV scheme could be successful. The review would include engagement, offer support to Rushcliffe's drivers and operators and encourage voluntary implementation of a CCTV scheme. Councillor Inglis concluded by stating that he was passionate about safety for all and that this could be achieved by everyone working together.

Councillor Grocock acknowledged that this was an important issue, felt that the Borough was adopting a sensible approach and referred to the lack of national regulations, allowing operators to work anywhere, which could result in Rushcliffe losing more drivers, if it introduced mandatory CCTV. Safety was vital, he confirmed that the Labour Group supported the introduction of CCTV and felt that the current regulations prevented Rushcliffe addressing this issue alone and welcomed recommendation c). He referred to the importance of Rushcliffe increasing its driver and operator numbers, to increase oversight, improve economic development and ensure covering throughout the Borough. Referring to the review, Councillor Grocock stated that to ensure appropriate consultation, to allow the Borough to be prepared in 12 months' time, he proposed the following additional recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Chaplain, who reserved the right to speak.

- f) *consults with licenced operators and drivers in the Borough, and industry representative groups and drivers' trade unions, more broadly, to gain insights into developing and implementing the most effective CCTV schemes.*

Councillor Inglis confirmed that he accepted the amendment, which then became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Chewings advised that due to the amendment, he wished to declare that he was a trade union representative for the RMT, which represented taxi drivers. However, he felt that the matter under debate did not directly impact on the finances or well-being of his interest and he was satisfied that he could approach his decision making with an open mind.

Councillor Dellar advised that she did not agree with CCTV in taxis and felt that any reference to it in the Policy should be removed. There was no evidence that it was required or improved safety, it would incur costs and the Police had not advised the Council that there was a problem. Councillor Dellar felt that this could intrude on peoples' rights and suggested that if it was mandated by the Government, then it could be reviewed.

Councillor Soloman was pleased that a review had been proposed; however, she felt that by not making CCTV mandatory now, the Council was missing an opportunity to make taxis as safe as possible. She stated that the voluntary scheme was not working and that evidence overwhelming supported CCTV as a safeguarding measure. Those she had spoken to were in favour of this, and it would also protect drivers and she referred to two recent cases locally that had shown why CCTV was necessary. She agreed that the Government should make this mandatory and supported recommendation c); however, she felt that Rushcliffe should lead rather than follow. Councillor Soloman stated that 96% of taxis were licensed in Wolverhampton and proposed an amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Thomas, who reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Soloman hoped that by encouraging the City of Wolverhampton Council this would be a positive step given the number of taxis it licensed.

g) *Rushcliffe Borough Council writes to the City of Wolverhampton Council, as one of the largest licensing authorities in the UK, to lead by example by introducing mandatory CCTV (and where lawful, audio recording) within its Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy, recognising its national impact through cross boundary vehicle operations.*

Councillor Inglis confirmed that he did not accept the amendment as Rushcliffe was already taking the lead and it could not dictate actions to another Council, which could incur significant costs.

The Leader felt that the amendment took away from the recommendations, as Rushcliffe was asking the Government to mandate CCTV across the country, and writing to the City of Wolverhampton Council would not achieve Rushcliffe's goal of safeguarding passengers in its own, local vehicles. The Leader confirmed that James Naish MP had stated that he would be pushing for the Government to introduce mandatory CCTV across the country.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Thomas stated that in general it was better to have taxis licensed in the Borough. She felt that reaching out to the City of Wolverhampton Council would help to raise the profile of mandating CCTV and she did not agree that this would weaken the approach to the Government, as everyone agreed that any regulations needed to be applied nationally.

Councillor Soloman was surprised that the amendment had been rejected, as it would have no negative impact on Rushcliffe. A letter would acknowledge that Wolverhampton held all the power, and she felt that it would be a good thing to ask them to look at this issue, as continued delays were putting more people at risk.

Councillor Inglis stated that it would be illegal for the Council to mandate CCTV now, Rushcliffe was following the correct procedure by having a review, collecting evidence and looking at the legislation and engaging with other local authorities.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was defeated.

Councillor Thomas thanked officers in the Licensing Team for their continued hard work and was pleased that a review had been proposed. She agreed that CCTV would improve safety; however, there were implications that required consideration before making it mandatory. She felt that the review would highlight relevant issues and brief everyone.

In supporting the Policy, Councillor Brown referred to the importance of the Government making CCTV mandatory, which was now fitted to most public transport. He stated that he would like to see all local authorities introduce a mandatory practical driving assessment and expressed concern that drivers could hold a licence without having much experience. He called for all local authorities to have the same requirements when issuing a licence as this safety issue was as important as CCTV provision.

Councillor Polenta stated that whilst CCTV cameras helped, prevention came through investment in community structures to improve safety and attitudes towards women and children, that security did not just come from surveillance and referred to the findings of the Jay report. Any new policies must be shaped alongside workers and community needs, and the risks to passengers and drivers should not be ignored. Councillor Polenta agreed that it was important to consult with the trade unions, as they were aware of positive and negative aspects of CCTV and called for clear rules on what information could be recorded and for community based reporting.

Councillor R Mallender stated that as a local authority, Rushcliffe had limited options. He referred to an inquiry launched by the Transport Committee in July, and although it did not specifically mention CCTV, it was looking at future reforms, including safeguarding, and he was pleased that this was taking place nationally as well as locally.

Councillor Birch stated that he disagreed with the motion primarily on privacy grounds and agreed with Councillor Dellar. He felt that it was a massive infringement on civil liberties and a burden on businesses. Whilst wanting everyone to be safe, previous incidents of child abuse already referred to were primarily caused by the inability of a local authority to take any action, with the abuse not taking place in taxis.

Councillor Chewings referred to the lengthy debate at the Licensing Committee meeting and that there were now only seven Hackney Carriage vehicles licensed in the Borough. He stated that it was important going forward to have a structure in place and any changes were made nationally, so he agreed with recommendation c). He referred to the 22 local authorities that had already mandated CCTV and questioned why Councillor Inglis had said that this would be illegal. Councillor Chewings referred to the railways and stated that CCTV

drastically reduce violent incidents and provided clarity and security for everyone. He agreed that if CCTV was mandated in Rushcliffe now, drivers were likely to move to another authority, and he called for the Government to bring in national legislation.

Councillor Parekh stated that putting CCTV cameras in taxis did not automatically make them safer, as the situation was complex, because unless cameras were part of a national, standardised and enforced system it would be fragmented, with different rules and regulations. She stated that CCTV alone did not stop violent crime, as evidence showed that they rarely prevented attacks and could not intervene when one was taking place, with figures showing that it was far more effective in reducing property crime. National legislation and oversight was also required, to ensure that CCTV could be as effective as possible.

Councillor Brennan agreed with comments made regarding the pros and cons of CCTV and stated that despite its flaws, she strongly supported mandating it. She appreciated that it would protect drivers but made it clear that women and girls were primarily the victims, and that it was vital that action was taken without having to wait for attacks to take place in Rushcliffe. Whilst privacy was an issue, Councillor Brennan felt that additional safety measures were more important, with compromises required, and she called upon the Government to bring in national legislation as soon as possible.

The Leader agreed that safety was the main issue and it was a fact of life that more cameras were being used, including on public transport, as it was important to safeguard both passengers and drivers. It was vital to lobby the Government and the Leader reiterated that in talks with James Naish MP, he had made it clear that he would be writing to him, about this issue, and he asked the Labour Group to do the same. He referred to the evidence given by Councillor Solomon that CCTV was effective, and whilst appreciating that it was after the event, the Leader stated that no system was perfect and public safety was paramount.

Councillor Combellack stated that as a mother she would have been happier knowing that her children were using a taxi with CCTV installed, and she was sure that most parents would agree. She acknowledged that there were cost implications; however, having CCTV was a unique selling point and it could give a perception of being safer.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Regan agreed that CCTV in taxis was a powerful safeguard, protecting passengers, drivers and protecting the reputation of the taxi trade. He understood the calls to mandate CCTV immediately, as the public expected the Council to act with urgency; however, to do so now, without following due process and procedures, would expose the Council to legal challenge and operational chaos. A duty would be imposed on drivers, without understanding the financial burden, technical requirements or regulatory implications, and could force drivers out of the Borough to be licensed elsewhere. He thanked Councillor Thomas for her recommendation to undertake a review in 12 months, giving adequate time for the Council to undertake research, produce a full cost analysis and ensure that it met national Government guidelines. Its introduction should be phased and supported by

the trade to ensure a safe, trustworthy policy and a blue print for a national standard. Councillor Regan requested that a recorded vote be taken, which was agreed by four Councillors.

Councillor Inglis hoped that CCTV would increase crime prevention, with Rushcliffe wanting to lead by example having realistic and achievable goals. He confirmed that without considering relevant legal obligations and procedures it would be illegal to introduce mandatory CCTV. The review would look at issues related to privacy, together with all the regulations that would have to be complied with and he noted the points made about practical driving assessments. He agreed that it was imperative that this was looked at and everyone was united to do the best for Rushcliffe.

In accordance with Standing Order Paragraph 4.23, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors M Barney, J Billin, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings N Clarke, T Combellack, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, L Way, T Wells, J Wheeler, and G Williams

AGAINST: Councillors T Birch and S Dellar

It was RESOLVED that Council:

- a) approves the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy (Appendix 1);
- b) requires a review to be undertaken in respect of potential mandating of CCTV in Taxi and Private Hire vehicles within 12 months, and the findings be reported to the Licensing Committee;
- c) sends a letter to the Secretary of State for Transport requesting Government take action to mandate CCTV provision within Taxi and Private Hire vehicles nationally;
- d) shares this letter with the Nottinghamshire Licensing Group, to request their endorsement of the Council's position;
- e) engages and encourages licensed operators and drivers operating in the Borough to implement the voluntary CCTV scheme in their vehicles; and
- f) consults with licensed operators and drivers in the Borough and industry representative groups and drivers' trade unions, more broadly, to gain insights into developing and implementing the most effective CCTV schemes.

44 **Update on the Political Composition of the Council and Committee Membership**

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke MBE presented the report of the Chief Executive providing an update on the political composition of the Council and committee membership.

The Leader advised that this was a technical item and moved the recommendations set out in the report.

Councillor Brennan seconded the recommendation and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Calvert referred to Paragraph 4.3 of the report, which stated that where there was a majority party, it must have a majority of seats on all committees and referred to the rules of proportionality, as set out in Paragraph 4.7, which explained the proposed changes. He referred to the appointment of the new Vice-chair of Planning Committee, which he was happy to support; however, he felt that it was not ideal that the Chair and proposed Vice-chair represented the same ward.

Councillor Soloman stated that she appreciated that this had not been a straightforward exercise, and thanked officers for their hard work in dealing with this process. Turning to her appointment onto the Member Development Group, she expressed her disappointment, as this was an inward facing Group, as in previous years she had been an active member across a number of committees and now she felt that she would be unable to participate and scrutinize matters which affected local residents. Nevertheless, Councillor Soloman stated that she would continue to work hard and to contribute constructively where she could, to ensure that her residents' voices were heard.

It was RESOLVED that:

- a) the revised allocation of committee seats as set out in Appendix 1 be confirmed;
- b) the changes to the appointments of the Chair of Standards Committee and Vice-chair of Planning Committee as set out in Paragraph 4.8 of the report be confirmed; and
- c) the changes in membership of committees as set out in Appendix 2 be confirmed, in line with Group Leaders' wishes.

45 **Notices of Motion**

The following notice of motion was proposed by Councillor Birch and seconded by Councillor Chewings.

This Council resolves to:

1. Formally support the Committee on Standards for Public Life (CPSL) recommendations for a mandatory minimum Code of Conduct, a ladder scale of sanctions (including suspension and disqualification where necessary), and an independent appeals mechanism.
2. Request that the Leader of the Council write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to communicate this Council's support for these reforms.
3. Commit to reviewing this Council's own Code of Conduct and Standards Committee arrangements in response to any legislative changes, ensuring that they are robust, transparent, and in line with best practice.

In moving the motion, Councillor Birch felt that these were sensible actions, and in respect of potential concerns regarding sanctions, which he shared, particularly around suspensions, the report stated that this would only be for the most egregious cases, and he hoped that everyone would endorse this.

Councillor Chewings seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor J Wheeler confirmed that he was happy to accept the motion and advised that the Government had responded to the consultations and it seemed that they would not be going forward with all of the recommendations, and the Council would be happy to write to the Government to ask it to reconsider. Councillor Wheeler referred to point 3. and stated that if national legislation changed, that would be implemented, and the Code of Conduct reviewed as a result of that.

The Leader reiterated that this was likely to become law, and as and when that happened, Rushcliffe would adhere to that, as part of its Code of Conduct.

Councillor Way supported the motion and stated that Rushcliffe already had a comprehensive Code of Conduct, which it was good to review, and to remind everyone of their responsibilities, in particular in relation to showing respect to each other, officers and the public.

Councillor Parekh referred to the seven Nolan Principles of Public Life and stated that since becoming a Councillor and being in this Chamber, she felt that not everyone was adhering to the Code of Conduct and she hoped that those standards would be adhered to not just in Rushcliffe but everywhere.

Councillor Birch thanked everyone for supporting the motion and he agreed with Councillor Way. He stated that he had been shocked at some of the behaviour that had been levelled at him and his family during the 2023 election by a member of Cabinet and the lack of action taken by the Conservative Association. He stated that this was why the Code of Conduct needed to be followed and that the current standards system was not fit for purpose.

The motion was put to the vote and carried.

The following notice of motion was proposed by Councillor J Walker and seconded by Councillor Billin.

Council resolves to:

1. Approve the establishment of *Councillor Policy Panels* on a pilot basis to strengthen member engagement in policy development.
2. Authorise the Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services to finalise detailed operating procedures for the Panels, including membership, scope, and reporting arrangements.
3. Request that at least two pilot Panels (for example, on a West Bridgford Town Council and a Participatory Budget) be launched between January and June 2026.
4. Request that Overview and Scrutiny review the pilot outcomes after 12 months and report findings to Cabinet in Autumn 2026.
5. Commit to considering full implementation of Panels from 2027 onwards, subject to the pilot's evaluation and considerations around Local Government Reorganisation (LGR).

In moving the motion, Councillor J Walker stated that she was bringing forward this proposal to strengthen governance, broaden democratic participation and improve policy development, by providing a new mechanism to give Councillors a meaningful role in shaping policy at an early stage. She stated that under the current Cabinet system, executive authority rested with Cabinet, with the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny groups reviewing decisions; however, over recent years she felt that participation for minority Group Leaders had declined, with Members having little input until late in the process. The current structures did not allow Councillors to explore ideas and bring forward their community knowledge and Councillor Walker believed that Policy Panels would broaden Member engagement at the earliest stage of policy development, increase transparency and trust and build cross party collaboration. The Panels would complement the current system, giving Councillors space to look at matters in more depth and propose solutions, reviewing issues of interest and producing a report to Cabinet. Councillor Walker stated that this process would increase democratic engagement, draw in diverse perspectives and strengthen collaboration across political groups. She believed that costs would be modest and largely absorbed within existing resources and suggested two pilot Panels be held next year, with a report to Cabinet in the Autumn and full rollout from 2027.

Councillor Billin seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Viridi agreed with the need for robust governance but stated that this motion was unnecessary, uncosted and completely out of step with both the demands of the Council and the direction of national policy. He said that it would create unnecessary bureaucracy, additional costs and would not survive for more than two years, with the Council already having a scrutiny system in place, that worked. He referred to the various major items coming through the

scrutiny process next year and said that the framework and structures for policy review already existed. He noted the lack of reference to resource implications and estimated that costs could be up to £70,000 and questioned the timing given impending Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). He questioned which other local authorities in Nottinghamshire had Policy Panels and thought that they would bring additional responsibilities for already busy Councillors and create unrealistic resource demands for officers. Recent feedback from Councillors was that the current system worked and Councillor Viridi noted that the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny had confirmed that new unitary authorities would need to adopt the Cabinet system and he felt that the Panels would create cost without having any value or a future.

Councillor Polenta thought that democracy could not be monetized and that this motion would amplify scrutiny and allow Members from across the Chamber to shape policy before decisions were made, rather than only examining them afterwards. Minority groups had become spectators rather than participants and Policy Panels would provide opportunity for meaningful participation and collective deliberation, drawing on the knowledge of residents and strengthening relationships. She referred to a number of local authorities and countries offering participatory systems and said that this motion offered a chance to shape the future.

Councillor Williams highlighted the importance of the scrutiny process, which not only reviewed policies and decisions but looked at policy development going forward. He said that many strategies and policies had been through the scrutiny process and provided input into wider Nottinghamshire strategies. He referred to existing scrutiny cross-party membership and that Councillors had recently been asked to consider a potential review of the scrutiny process, with little response and felt that this motion would create a duplicate of existing processes.

Councillor Gaunt stated that he did not think that the proposed panels would create additional work and stated that they would provide an opportunity for people to meet, including members from the community, stakeholders and experts to help shape policy early in their formation, rather than scrutinise existing policies. He noted reference to the mechanism for those panels already existing within the Constitution and asked how they could be actioned.

It was proposed by Councillor Gowland and **RESOLVED** by Councillors that the meeting be extended and would finish no later than 10.30pm.

Councillor Gowland stated that she did not agree with Government getting rid of committees, as they provided an effective way of working through detailed problems and she found the current scrutiny process to be extremely negative.

Councillor Parekh recognised the intentions behind the motion and supported strong engagement and a collaborative council but thought that creating more complexity and bureaucracy would cause more confusion and deliver little meaningful improvement. She stated that any Councillor could propose items for scrutiny or policy development and thought this proposal would increase costs and require more officer resources, taking them away from delivering frontline services. She did not think that the proposed timeframe for evaluation

was realistic and it might be scrapped under LGR. She stated that the Cabinet system provided clarity and accountability and suggested stronger and better use of existing scrutiny structures, with a more open culture of collaboration.

Councillor Grocock clarified that the motion was not requesting an entirely new structure, just two pilot panels, noted that many Councillors had only just learned that there was an existing mechanism for Policy Panels within the current scrutiny process and referred to a previous panel that he had been a member of that had worked very effectively.

Councillor Simms stated that he was here to represent the people of his ward and to develop policies and procedures on their views. He questioned the amount of time required for the proposal and said that the mechanisms were already in place within this organisation and that better communication was required.

Councillor Chewings referred to LGR, which had been debated by Full Council several times and suggested that it would have been preferable to have set up a Policy Panel to work through options prior to a Cabinet position being put forward. He did not support having a Panel regarding a West Bridgford Town Council and thought this should be instigated through a petition. He supported having Policy Panels as a positive proposal.

Councillor S Mallender stated that the motion would not result in a committee system and as the Council already had facility to create panels she did not see why it would result in significant cost and supported the motion in the interests of democracy, collaboration, and cooperation. She also agreed that West Bridgford should have a Town Council and that with LGR looming it would be an appropriate time to discuss that.

Councillor J Wheeler emphasised that there was an existing scrutiny process, which worked, through which all Councillors could influence policy. He referred to LGR and officers' considerable input into that, and the additional costs this proposal would create and suggested that Councillors used the current system more effectively.

Councillor Combella felt that this motion would create more layers and result in less efficiency, could delay policy development and stated that enormous changes would be taking place with LGR, which would require focus and resources, and it would be inappropriate to change things now. Councillor Combella also questioned the suggested proposed timescales in the motion.

Councillor Birch proposed that Council moved to vote on the motion and this was seconded by Councillor Chewings. The vote was lost.

The Leader believed that the proposal would be a duplication of current scrutiny functions, which included both review and policy development, and a facility to set up Policy Panels within it. He said it which would create a new system of administration and bureaucracy with additional costs incurred to administer it. The Leader stated that it was incumbent on Councillors to bring forward items for scrutiny and noted that they could submit scrutiny requests. He referred to the continued work required for LGR and stated that this would

be likely to bring forward many changes.

Councillor Billin supported the motion as he believed it to be at the heart of democracy, it was not about duplication, it was about informed decision making. He stated that it would not replace the Cabinet's role in approving policies, it would be informing the policy decision making process. He requested that a recorded vote be taken, which was agreed by four Councillors.

In accordance with Standing Order Paragraph 4.23, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, S Dellar, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Mallender, S Mallender, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, D Soloman, C Thomas, J Walker and L Way

AGAINST: Councillors M Barney, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, A Edyvean, S Ellis, E Georgiou, R Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, N Regan, D Simms, R Upton, D Virdi, T Wells, J Wheeler, and G Williams

The motion was not carried.

46 Questions from Councillors

The questions from Councillors were not considered. A written response would be provided after the meeting.

The meeting closed at 10.30 pm.

CHAIR