

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL,
HELD ON TUESDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 2016 AT 7.30 PM
PRINCES THEATRE, TOWN HALL, CLACTON-ON-SEA, CO15 1SE**

Present:	Councillors Chapman (Chairman), Platt (Vice-Chair), Amos, Baker, Bennison, Bray, BBrown, Broderick, JBrown, MBrown, Bucke, Callender, Calver, Cawthron, Chittock, Coley, Cossens, Davis, Everett, Fairley, Ferguson, Fowler, Griffiths, CGuglielmi, VGuglielmi, Heaney, JHenderson, Hones, Honeywood, Howard, Hughes, Khan, King, Land, Massey, McWilliams, Miles, Newton, Nicholls, Pemberton, Parsons, Poonian, Raby, Scott, Skeels Jnr, Skeels (Snr), Steady, Stephenson, Talbot, Turner, Watling, White, Whitmore, Winfield and Yallop
Also Present:	None
In Attendance:	Ian Davidson (Chief Executive), Martyn Knappett (Corporate Director (Corporate Services)), Paul Price (Corporate Director (Operational Services)), Lisa Hastings (Head of Governance and Legal Services), Richard Barrett (Head of Finance, Revenues and Benefits Services), Karen Neath (Management and Members' Support Manager), Ian Ford (Committee Services Manager) and Katie Sullivan (Committee Services Officer)

54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors I J Henderson and Watson.

55. MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council, held on Tuesday 5 July 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

56. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were none.

57. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman's and Vice-Chairman's engagements for the period 5 July 2016 to 6 September 2016 were tabled at the meeting.

Chairman's Charity Pig Race

The Chairman thanked those Members who had attended her Charity Pig Race and informed Council that a total of £1,183 had been raised. Members showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

The Chairman congratulated Councillor Scott on winning the 'Leader's Race'. Councillor Scott thanked the Chairman and informed Members that he had given his winnings to the Mayor of Brightlingsea Town Council's Charity Fund.

Pride of Tendring Awards

The Chairman informed Members that the nomination forms for this year's Pride of Tendring Awards would be circulated to them at the end of the week.

58. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

There were none on this occasion.

59. STATEMENTS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

There were none on this occasion.

60. STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Clacton Air Show 2016

The Tourism and Culture Portfolio Holder (Councillor Ferguson) made the following statement on the Clacton Air Show 2016:-

"I am sure that Council will indulge me for a few minutes to mention the 2016 Air Show.

What an event, what a two days and what an experience!

I attended pre-show briefings that made me gasp with the attention to detail that was discussed and considered. There are many amazing people who put in hours and hours above and beyond their contracts ensuring the safety and enjoyment of our visitors. I have been truly humbled by their dedication, professionalism and positivity even in the face of security concerns after Nice and a small traveller incursion that nearly derailed the plans.

Estimates of visitor numbers seem to range from 250,000 to 330,000 but however many there were I think that everyone could not have been wowed by what Tendring District Council delivered.

It is too early to know the final totals for programme sales, bucket collections and total costs but I will let everyone know how it all panned out as soon as I know. What I do know though is that this must have been a massive boost for the local economy and that at the end of the day is what it is all about. I walked through the town on both days and was staggered at how busy it was.

The night flights seemed to have gone down really well this year and anyone who stayed on was treated to a spectacular display of neon lights and pyrotechnics, the like of which many of us had never seen before.

Many of us fell in love with Otto the Helicopter lighting up our skies. I was amazed to see tens of thousands of people still along the seafront and in town late into the evening. One of the long term traders on the seafront said that he

thought that there were more people than during Clacton's heydays of the 1950's and speculated that some of the food outlets had probably had their best day EVER. Judging by the queues out of some of the outlets I think that he could well be right.

It was undoubtedly a massive party atmosphere, however, it was reassuring to know that behind the scenes security and safety was being closely monitored and controlled and we must not forget that back in the Council business still continued, thanks to the staff who make sure that it is business as usual.

For those Councillors and their guests who attended the VIP area I hope that you enjoyed your visit.

Every year dignitaries from across Essex attend the Air Show and wonder how Tending does it. Well having now worked behind the scenes I have started to get an insight and I can tell you that it isn't through luck but it is a very well honed and managed process that many people will never see. It is no wonder that places such as Jersey come to see how we do it.

I would also personally like to thank Councillor Stephenson for rallying his troops and helping out on the programme sales and bucket collection. I know from the officers and event staff that they were really grateful for the help they got, particularly on the Thursday evening, when staff who had been working all day were flagging. Thank you!

I hope you indulge me in thanking a few others; I worked alongside Mike Carran and his team pre and during the show and the hard work they put in made me very proud to be part of it all.

A few notable thank yous; Sarah Daniels, Jo Needham, Jennie Weavers, Chris Ball, Scott Lawrence, Tim Sutton, Mick Simpson, The parking teams, Catherine Boyer-Besant, Sam Wright - the tweet man, all the Emergency services and the security team headed up by Mark Peck - a nicer more hard working professional bunch of people I have ever had the good fortune to work alongside.

Special thanks must go to Mike Carran who brings all of these people together with his wonderful positivity and attention to detail. Paul Price and his hat, Nigel Brown, Martyn Knappett and the sartorially elegant Ian Davidson deserve a mention too.

Whilst I know that budgets are going to be tight going forward I hope that we can make an early decision to commit to the 2017 Air Show and let us see if we can make next years event even bigger and better than this years!"

Members showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

Councillor Ferguson then responded, as appropriate, to questions and matters raised on her statement asked by Councillors Parsons, Turner Scott, Raby and Broderick.

61. PETITIONS TO COUNCIL

There were none submitted on this occasion.

62. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Subject to the required notice being given, members of the public could ask questions of the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holders or Chairmen of Committees.

There were none on this occasion.

63. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.2

The Council had received questions from Members in relation to:

- (1) Open Spaces;
- (2) Street Cleaning in Harwich and Dovercourt;
- (3) Proposed TIC in Clacton Town Centre;
- (4) Public Conveniences on Harwich Quay;
- (5) Temporary Traffic Lights at Thorpe-le-Soken; and
- (6) Ban on Trade Waste at Recycling Centres at Kirby-le-Soken, Lawford and Dovercourt

Notice of the questions had been given in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2.

Question One

From Councillor Andrew Pemberton to Councillor Michael Talbot, Portfolio Holder for the Environment:

“What are we doing about our OPEN SPACES that you keep leaving open year on, year off?”

This doesn't only affect the area that I live in but all our area. There needs to be some sort of sign saying “no overnight camping” or “no motorised vehicles” like the ones up at Holland-on-Sea. As it's Tending that has to foot the bill, can we enforce this or would it have to go to Essex County Council?”

Councillor Talbot responded as follows:

“I would like to thank Cllr Pemberton for his question.

The Council is responsible for many areas of open space throughout the District and, where possible, these spaces remain accessible in order that our residents and visitors are able to fully enjoy them.

However, where open spaces are regularly misused such as by the presence of unauthorised vehicles, or as a consequence of travellers / campers or any similar activity, the Council does take action as can be seen in a variety of open spaces across the District.

Some areas are cordoned off by means of low level fencing, wooden or metal posts and / or gates which effectively prevent vehicle access at all times. Where others may remain more open, but with clear signage indicating what activities

are permitted. I would also add that evidence shows that even with lockable posts being installed to prevent unauthorised access, they seldom if ever deter the determined incursion onto public land.

Any action taken to restrict access to open spaces or to place signs on them will be in proportion to problems as reported and monitored, but in general open spaces will remain open if possible. In this way they remain available for public use and enjoyment and invariably look much better in terms of appearance if free from posts, gates, warning signs or other obstacles.

I'm not quite clear from the question whether Cllr Pemberton has a specific area in mind because he makes reference to open spaces being left open, "year on, year off.." and a requirement for signs to in place about camping and vehicles, which sounds rather specific Chairman.

If Councillor Pemberton has a specific area of concern I would be very pleased to investigate this on his behalf and to work with him to identify and to recommend appropriate action is taken if he is referring to a specific site.

Councillor Pemberton then asked the following supplementary question:

"Yes, there are a few areas of great concern so if we could arrange a date, a few residents of my area and other areas will also be grateful to meet to put the views if that is okay?"

Councillor Talbot responded as follows:

"Yes, just as I said at the end of my reply, if you have got any particular areas of concern come to me with it we'll have a discussion together with the appropriate Officers and see whether they agree with us as Councillors on what should be done and what we can do about it within the various constraints we suffer under."

Question Two

From Councillor Garry Calver to Councillor Michael Talbot, Portfolio Holder for the Environment:

"There is a growing sense of annoyance amongst the residents of Harwich and Dovercourt with the poor state of cleanliness of the roads, gutters and pavements within the town.

In order to confirm to residents that TDC is meeting its obligation to clean the streets and in order to allow residents to monitor the frequency of the work would the Portfolio Holder agree to publish the TDC schedule for street, gutter and pavement cleaning for Harwich and Dovercourt?"

The Chairman of the Council informed Council that Councillor Calver, pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 11.9, had withdrawn his Question prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Council noted the forgoing.

Question Three

From Councillor Lis Bennison to Councillor Tanya Ferguson, Portfolio Holder for Tourism and Culture:

"I used to own a small hotel in Clacton town centre when the Tourist Information Centre was located at the junction with West Avenue, Pier Avenue and Station Street in what is now the Vodaphone shop. I visited the office several times a week for information and to advise of any vacancies. The office was always busy with tourists, people here on business, those looking for places to stay, residents, people buying theatre tickets and air show programmes and those just picking up brochures. I found the centre invaluable in helping to promote my business, as did many of my colleagues in the tourism trade.

The building was subsequently disposed of about fifteen years ago and the office moved into the town hall. I occasionally visit the office now but the through traffic appears vastly reduced. By comparison, when I'm in the town centre I am often approached by visitors to the town asking for directions and information, which I am only too happy to give to the best of my ability. If I give directions to the Tourist Information Centre, the response is invariably 'I'm not walking all that way'.

Has the Portfolio Holder for Tourism and Culture, Councillor Tanya Ferguson, given any thought to the possibility of either using one of the empty shops in Clacton town centre or the prospect of providing a kiosk close to the seafront, preferably in Christmas Tree Island, to enable a Tourist Information Centre to be located where one is needed rather than where there is available space?

It appears to work on Walton seafront. I understand that money is tight, but as the old saying goes, you have to speculate to accumulate. There is currently an empty premises in Pier Avenue available at £6,750 pa or £563 per calendar month, not a lot when you consider what business could be generated for the town."

Councillor Ferguson responded as follows:

"I would like to thank Councillor Bennison for her question.

Whilst I would agree that the location of the Information centre within the Town centre was ideal at that time for the old style Tourist Information Centre's, the vast majority of modern visitors now tend to undertake research on-line about an area before they visit, borne out by a survey undertaken a few years ago with less than 8% of visitors using the TIC prior to visiting.

I think that this is also reflected in the increased traffic on the Essex Sunshine Coast website which has gone up from around 9,500 hits in the summer of 2012 to around 68,500 in the summer of 2015.

Discussions have taken place with businesses based at the seafront to host an electronic and interactive facility and I will continue to those discussions.

As Councillor Bennison will, I am sure appreciate, the TIC at the Town hall is multifunctional and staff deal with many other duties as well as the tourist information centre function and it would not be practical to relocate them elsewhere in the town.

However, I am keen to explore other options such as apps, information booths etc. but not another physical tourist information centre but I am very grateful to Councillor Bennison for this suggestion.”

Question Four

From Councillor Maria Fowler to Councillor Nick Turner, Portfolio Holder for Commercialisation:

“There are a growing number of complaints from visitors and residents about the condition of the TDC operated toilets on Harwich Quay.

Will the Portfolio Holder please confirm where these toilets are on the list for refurbishment and when it is likely to take place?

Will he further ensure that additional support is given to the routine maintenance of TDC operated toilets in the vicinity of major community events on the occasions when such events are taking place?”

Councillor Turner responded as follows:

“Thank you Councillor Fowler for your question. I’m sure you are aware that this Council is currently preparing a Public Conveniences Strategy for the District as already reported in draft form to the Service Development and Delivery Committee of which you are a member.

As part of this strategic review the Council is addressing many issues relating to public conveniences which will achieve the overall aim of providing: ‘Accessible, Safe, High Quality Public Conveniences for Residents and Visitors alike’.

The toilets at Harwich Quay have been identified as one of the Council’s main priorities for future refurbishment but the issue of accessibility is currently under investigation at this location due to the absence of a disabled toilet on Harwich Quay. It would be prudent for this Council to investigate and resolve this issue before the refurbishment is undertaken at these particular toilets.

The Council has already obtained positive planning advice in respect of this issue and further to this has commissioned plans which will include indicative costs for both the installation of a disabled toilet as well as the refurbishment of the whole toilet block on Harwich Quay.

Further to this there is a requirement on this service to investigate operational savings as part of the budget overview. To that end I would very much like to ask Councillor Fowler to reconsider her position and accept my invitation to join my Budget Working Party set up to investigate savings associated with the operation of public conveniences in Tendring which, among other things, will help to

establish the future priorities of this very important service. I hope you will say 'Yes' this time."

Councillor Fowler then asked the following supplementary question:

"I thank Councillor Turner for his reply. I'd like to point out that in that particular area on Harwich Quay there are 10+ large events every year plus coming up this weekend we have two big events: the Essex Air Ambulance Motorcycle Run and also the Heritage Weekend. That area is a heavy footfall especially for the public conveniences. Throughout the year there are big events like the New Year's Eve fireworks; the Harwich Sausage Festival; the International Shanty Festival and many others. Of course a key part of these events are the public conveniences. I'm also sorry Councillor Turner but I'll have to decline your invitation."

Councillor Turner responded as follows:

"Thank you Councillor Fowler for your supplementary. Yes, we are aware of these and my teams – seafronts, public conveniences and parking – do put in extra resources as and when required and they will be there this weekend. And it's a shame that you are not putting in on the working party what you would like to see as a Ward Councillor. Thank you."

Question Five

From Councillor Jack Parsons to Councillor Neil Stock, Leader of the Council:

"It is not right that temporary traffic lights are erected in the middle of the day in the height of the summer season."

We are a District that relies on its tourist footfall and the disruption caused by temporary traffic lights at peak times has completely decimated the potential trade flowing through our District.

I completely support the comments made by, among others, Cllr Nick Turner. Essex County Council should be supporting and working with us but instead, seem to be sending us up the river without a paddle.

Is there anything that we as a Council can do to ensure that pressure is applied to ensure that the interests of this District are put in a higher regard within Essex County Council than current activities suggest?"

Councillor Stock responded as follows:

"I would like to thank Councillor Parsons for his question and I certainly agree with his premise in what he says that we as a local authority must do all that we can to promote tourism within the District and as a fundamental part of that clearly we need to ensure that unnecessary obstacles are not hindering visitors coming into Tendring or indeed hindering or delaying local residents and businesses from going about their daily activities.

I am not at all certain whether Councillor Parsons has any particular location or specific set of temporary traffic lights in mind in what he says but what is

important to remember is that utility companies have the right to carry out urgent works for public safety or to restore failed services and neither we as a District Council or Essex County Council as the Highways Authority can prevent them from doing that..

When works are undertaken by Utility companies, over whom we have no control, it is very difficult to influence them as their right to undertake the works are enshrined in legislation under the "New Roads and Street Works Act 1991". Furthermore they do not have to give any notice. When it is planned works then notice is given to the highway authority (ECC) who ensure disruption to the travelling public is minimised as much as possible. Essex Highways employ Street Works Coordinators who oversee and inspect such works.

I know that Members and officers at TDC do work very hard to ensure that all statutory and utility undertakers are mindful of the timing of necessary works. I'm grateful that Councillor Parsons has commented on what Councillor Turner is doing and I can assure Members that we will continue to press our case and if Councillor Parsons is referring to a particular location or a specific issue then I can assure him that I will ask officers to review the matter and if necessary I will ensure that this is raised at the Local Highways Panel."

Councillor Parsons then asked the following supplementary question:

"I'd like to thank Councillor Stock for his response and I completely understand the difficulties we face with regards to utility companies basically disrupting our roads with little or no notice given. However, I am slightly confused given that both the District Council and the County Council are run by Conservatives and yet there is no cohesion with regards to communication. I would understand it if the Conservative Party was as divided as the Labour Party. Can I ask if Councillor Stock intends to contact Essex County Council with regards to negotiating with utility companies as to a suitable time to carry out their non-emergency works?"

Councillor Stock responded as follows:

"First I must clarify that this is not a Conservative Administration that there are three other political groups that work with the Conservatives to run this Council. There are only 23 Conservative Members and yes, the County Council is a Conservative Administration. I'm not aware of any issues or concerns about communication between this Council and the County Council. As I said utility companies have the right to carry out works without even the County Council having any powers in which case the way to get that changed is through primary legislation so I would encourage you to ask your Party's MP, Douglas Carswell to put a Bill through the House of Commons. I am happy to take up any specific issues and if it requires me to fly a missive off to County, trust me, I've done it before and I'll do it again."

Question Six

From Councillor Roy Raby to Councillor Michael Talbot, Portfolio Holder for the Environment:

“Can I ask Cllr. Talbot, the Portfolio Holder for Environment, for his response to the announcement from Essex County Council (ECC), who plan from 31st October to ban trade waste from three sites in Tendring, namely Kirby-le-Soken, Lawford and Dovercourt and place restrictions on Clacton?”

All three sites are part of an Essex-wide crack down on illegal waste left at recycling centres for household waste (RCHWs). Whilst I agree that a problem exists and ECC needs to find a solution I was wondering if the Portfolio Holder agrees with me that this is the wrong way to go about it. There are many different solutions ranging from payment-to-throw-away schemes to the setting up of licensed specialist sites at a cost to the trader, both of which are already in action in other counties.

I understand that there is no duty on local authorities to accept or dispose of DIY and construction waste but the lines become blurred when some sites won't accept a van or pick-up truck with normal household waste whilst others will accept a car with what could be considered trade waste.

This also does not take into account those residents whose only form of transport is a van or pick up truck. If these residents are willing to travel further to dispose of their waste they will only be able to go the Clacton RCHW on Rush Green Road as this is the only site able to allow entry to such vehicles in the whole of Tendring.

Is the Portfolio Holder in agreement with me that despite ECC promises that this will not lead to increased fly-tipping that this will be contrary to what will actually happen and that it will be an extra financial burden on this Council passed on indirectly from ECC?”

Councillor Talbot responded as follows:

“I would like to thank Councillor Raby for his question and I can confirm that I share a lot of your reservations about the proposals.

I think that it is difficult at this distance to accurately assess what the impact will be of these proposals and therefore difficult to effectively persuade ECC away from taking this course of action.

Having said that I can also understand why ECC are attempting to prevent the illegal dumping of Trade waste at recycling sites, which of course costs all Council tax payers to deal with.

I have no doubt in my mind that there is a very high possibility that fly tipping of building waste materials will result from these changes but until this happens and until we are able to judge the scale and extent it is difficult to predict the additional costs which TDC may have to bear.

There is a suggestion that ECC may provide some funding if fly tipping does increase but as yet this is unquantified.

However, I can give Councillor Raby my assurance that I will be working with officers and if it is identified that there is an increase in fly tipping of such

materials we will be looking to firstly prosecute those responsible and secondly to get ECC to review this decision.”

Councillor Raby then asked the following supplementary question:

“I thank Councillor Talbot for his response. I’d like to ask him if he has been in contact with his opposite number at Essex County Council regarding the statement that ECC has put out?”

Councillor Talbot responded as follows:

“We actually have a joint committee between District and Borough Councils and Essex County Council – the Waste Partnership Committee and I, as Portfolio Holder, represent this Council on that Committee. Lots of Councils have raised their concerns on that Committee that these changes will lead to an increase in fly-tipping. However, you can understand that ECC is trying to prevent professional builders and developers from illegally taking their waste to Household Recycling Centres. This matter will be kept under review by Councils all over Essex and I will keep this Council informed through Portfolio Holder Statements as appropriate.”

64. REPORT OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Council would receive a report on any Cabinet decisions taken as a matter of urgency in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.4, Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rule 6(b) and/or Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 18(i).

There was no such report on this occasion.

65. MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

It was moved by Councillor Stock, seconded by Councillor G V Guglielmi and:

RESOLVED that the minutes of the following Committees, as circulated, be received and noted:

- (a) Corporate Management Committee of Monday 27 June 2016;
- (b) Audit Committee of Thursday 30 June 2016;
- (c) Community Leadership and Partnerships Committee of Monday 11 July 2016; and
- (d) Service Development and Delivery Committee of Monday 18 July 2016.

It was then moved by Councillor Heaney, seconded by Councillor Stock and **RESOLVED** that:

- (a) the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 29 June 2016, as circulated, be received and noted; and

- (b) the recommendation to Council, as contained in Minute No.9(4) of the Standards Committee of 29 June 2016, be approved.

66. MOTIONS TO COUNCIL

No motions to Council, pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 12, had been submitted on this occasion.

67. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET

There were none on this occasion.

68. REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL BY AN OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

There were none on this occasion.

69. REPORT OF THE MANAGEMENT AND MEMBERS' SUPPORT MANAGER - A.1 - ELECTORAL REVIEW

Council's approval was sought to a submission document to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), including a proposed Council size and forecast electorate.

Members were aware that the submission document had been produced by the Electoral Review Working Party, chaired by Councillor Honeywood and that the Working Party had broad representation from across the Council.

It was reported that the guidance from the LGBCE advised that the submission on Council size should take four broad areas into consideration:-

- Governance and Decision Making
- Scrutiny
- Representational Role (of Members)
- Future

Each of the above areas had been considered and addressed in the submission document in reaching a proposal on Council Size. The submission document was before Council as Appendix A to item A.1 of the Report of the Management and Members' Support Manager.

Council was informed that the Council's submission on Council size would be considered by the LGBCE alongside any other submissions received. The Working Party's submission proposed a Council size of 48. The LGBCE would consider all submissions received on Council size and make a final decision. The LGBCE decision on Council size would be final.

Members were advised that the forecast electorate in 2022 had been undertaken following the guidance of the LGBCE and was forecast to be 116,000. This included an assessment of the number of new electors arising from additional housing build. The data for house build was the same as that used in the Council's emerging Local Plan

although the Local Plan had a timescale to 2033 and beyond whilst the electoral forecast was to 2022.

Council was made aware that, once the revised Council size and forecast electorate were agreed they would inform the second stage of the review. One of the elements considered in looking at ward boundaries was electoral equality and the figures of Council size and both current and forecast electorate would be used to judge where electoral equality was significantly different in any ward from the average.

It was brought to Members' attention that, when the stage of looking at ward boundaries was reached, the use of electoral equality was a guide to how boundaries should change. Another very important factor was the local community in geographical, social and demographic terms and all Members of the community – individuals, residents associations, Town and Parish Councils etc. would be able to provide submissions on where they believed the ward boundaries should lie.

The Chairman of the Electoral Review Working Party (Councillor Honeywood) thanked the Members of the Working Party for their hard work and constructive input into the submission document.

Councillor Honeywood moved and Councillor Stock seconded: *“that the submission attached at Appendix A to item A.1 of the Report of the Management and Members' Support Manager be agreed and be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.”*

Councillors Stephenson, Everett, Stock and Howard participated in the debate on Councillor Honeywood's motion.

It was then moved by Councillor Everett and seconded by Councillor Bray that Councillor Honeywood's motion be amended to read as follows:

“that the submission attached at Appendix A to item A.1 of the Report of the Management and Members' Support Manager be amended to agree to 60 Councillors and be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, following agreement by the Working Party of the figures.”

Councillors Scott, Broderick, Stock, Honeywood, Miles, G V Guglielmi, Bucke, Parsons, Calver, Newton, Steady, Cossens and Bray participated in the debate on Councillor Everett's amendment.

Councillor G V Guglielmi asked that, in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 18.4, a record of the vote on Councillor Everett's amendment be taken.

Accordingly, the result of that vote was as follows:

<u>Councillors For</u>	<u>Councillors Against</u>	<u>Councillors Abstaining</u>	<u>Councillors Not Present</u>
Bennison	Amos	Land	Gray
Bray	Baker	Scott	I J Henderson
Broderick	B E Brown		Porter
J A Brown	M Brown		Watson

Bucke	Callender
Cawthron	Calver
Davis	Chapman
Everett	Chittock
Hones	Coley
Khan	Cossens
King	Fairley
Newton	Ferguson
Parsons	Fowler
Pemberton	Griffiths
Raby	G V Guglielmi
Stephenson	V E Guglielmi
Whitmore	Heaney
Winfield	J Henderson
	Honeywood
	Howard
	Hughes
	Massey
	McWilliams
	Miles
	Nicholls
	Platt
	Poonian
	M J Skeels
	M J D Skeels
	Steady
	Stock
	Talbot
	Turner
	Watling
	White
	Yallop

Councillor Everett's amendment was thereupon declared **LOST**.

It was then moved by Councillor Everett and seconded by Councillor Bray that Councillor Honeywood's motion be amended to read as follows:

"that the submission attached at Appendix A to item A.1 of the Report of the Management and Members' Support Manager be amended to agree to 54 Councillors and be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, following agreement by the Working Party of the figures."

Councillor Everett asked that, in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 18.4, a record of the vote on his further amendment be taken.

Accordingly, the result of that vote was as follows:

<u>Councillors For</u>	<u>Councillors Against</u>	<u>Councillors Abstaining</u>	<u>Councillors Not Present</u>
Bennison	Amos	None	Gray

Bray	Baker	I J Henderson
Broderick	B E Brown	Porter
J A Brown	Bucke	Watson
M Brown	Callender	
Cawthron	Calver	
Cossens	Chapman	
Davis	Chittock	
Everett	Coley	
Griffiths	Fairley	
Hones	Ferguson	
Khan	Fowler	
King	G V Guglielmi	
Land	V E Guglielmi	
Newton	Heaney	
Parsons	J Henderson	
Pemberton	Honeywood	
Raby	Howard	
Scott	Hughes	
M J Skeels	Massey	
Stephenson	McWilliams	
Whitmore	Miles	
Winfield	Nicholls	
	Platt	
	Poonian	
	M J D Skeels	
	Steady	
	Stock	
	Talbot	
	Turner	
	Watling	
	White	
	Yallop	

Councillor Everett's further amendment was thereupon declared **LOST**.

It was then moved by Councillor Parsons and seconded by Councillor Bray that Councillor Honeywood's motion be amended to read as follows:

"that the submission attached at Appendix A to item A.1 of the Report of the Management and Members' Support Manager be amended to agree to 51 Councillors and be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, following agreement by the Working Party of the figures."

Councillor Parsons asked that, in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 18.4, a record of the vote on his amendment be taken.

Accordingly, the result of that vote was as follows:

<u>Councillors For</u>	<u>Councillors Against</u>	<u>Councillors Abstaining</u>	<u>Councillors Not Present</u>
Bennison	Amos	Broderick	B E Brown

Bray	Baker	J A Brown	Callender
Davis	M Brown	Calver	Gray
Everett	Bucke	Cawthron	I J Henderson
Hones	Chapman	Fowler	Porter
Khan	Chittock	J Henderson	Watson
Newton	Coley	Khan	
Parsons	Cossens	Raby	
Pemberton	Fairley	Winfield	
Stephenson	Ferguson		
Whitmore	Griffiths		
	G V Guglielmi		
	V E Guglielmi		
	Heaney		
	Honeywood		
	Howard		
	Hughes		
	Land		
	Massey		
	McWilliams		
	Miles		
	Nicholls		
	Platt		
	Poonian		
	Scott		
	M J Skeels		
	M J D Skeels		
	Steady		
	Stock		
	Talbot		
	Turner		
	Watling		
	White		
	Yallop		

Councillor Parsons' amendment was thereupon declared **LOST**.

Councillor Honeywood's motion, on being put to the vote, was declared **CARRIED**.

NOTE: in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 19.5, Councillors Bennison, Bray, Broderick, Bucke, Cawthron, Davis, Everett, Hones, King, Khan, Newton, Parsons, Pemberton, Raby, Stephenson, Whitmore and Winfield each requested that they be recorded in the minutes as having voted against Councillor Honeywood's motion.

70. URGENT MATTERS FOR DEBATE

There were none on this occasion.

The Meeting was declared closed at 9.53 pm

Chairman