



## COUNTY COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

DATE: Wednesday 19th June, 2013 TIME: 10.15 am

VENUE: Shire Hall

#### Present

#### Membership:

Cllr Phil Awford (Vice-Chair)	Cllr Tony Hicks (Chairman)	Cllr Nigel Robbins
Cllr Dorcas Binns	Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Vernon Smith
Cllr Robert Bird	Cllr Paul Hodgkinson	Cllr Norman Stephens
Cllr Tony Blackburn	Cllr Richard Leppington	Cllr Lynden Stowe
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Sarah Lunnon	Cllr Klara Sudbury
Cllr Jason Bullingham	Cllr Stephen Lydon	Cllr Mike Sztymiak
Cllr Christopher Coleman	Cllr Steve McHale	Cllr Ray Theodoulou
Cllr John Cordwell	Cllr Paul McLain	Cllr Brian Tipper
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Paul McMahon	Cllr Pam Tracey
Cllr Bernard Fisher	Cllr Tracy Millard	Cllr Robert Vines
Cllr Jasminder Gill	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	Cllr Stan Waddington
Cllr Andrew Gravells	Cllr Nigel Moor	Cllr Simon Wheeler
Cllr Colin Guyton	Cllr Graham Morgan	Cllr Bill Whelan
Cllr Tim Harman	Cllr Brian Oosthuysen	Cllr Kathy Williams
Cllr Joe Harris	Cllr Shaun Parsons	Cllr Lesley Williams
Cllr Mark Hawthorne	Cllr Alan Preest	Cllr Suzanne Williams
Cllr Colin Hay	Cllr David Prince	Cllr Will Windsor-Clive

#### Honorary Aldermen

Mavis Lady Dunrossil

Terence Parker

Apologies: Liz Boait, Paul Drake, Cllr Barry Kirby and Cllr Roger Wilson

#### 50. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2013 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

#### 51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A copy of the declarations of interest is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

#### 52. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Queen's Birthday Honours

The Chairman congratulated the people in Gloucestershire who had received awards as part of the Queen's Birthday honours.

b) Learning disabilities

The Chairman reported that Gloucestershire had been working with organisations in Stockholm on a European funded project which was looking to share good practice and develop initiatives around employment for disabled people. A group of six people from the Swedish public sector had come to Gloucestershire in May and had left impressed with what they saw.

The county's partnership working was further recognised when the county was part of a presentation in Brussels which won a joint first prize. The Reves prize for partnership work with public authorities was awarded to Future Clean – a social franchise which is an initiative of one of our main partners Pluss. Future Clean operated at the moment in the Mall Car Park in Stroud and offered employment opportunities for people with learning disabilities and was a partnership between Hft, Pluss, Gloucestershire County Council and Stroud District Council. Other venues would be starting over the coming months.

c) Wynstones School

The Chairman welcomed students from Year 10 at Wynstones School, Whaddon.

d) Members' ICT

Capita staff would be on hand outside the Council Chamber after the meeting to resolve any outstanding member ICT issues. Details of member events were now published on the Members' Matter website. This included meetings and training sessions.

## **53. CORPORATE PARENTING**

Cllr McLain, the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People and Strategic Commissioning, reminded members of their role and responsibilities as corporate parents for the county's looked after children. He referred to the information provided in the briefing note at annex C, which detailed the numbers of looked after children in each division. He then drew members' attention to the Corporate Parenting pledge at annex B. In response to a question, it was explained that the pledges had been drafted in the previous Council and were looking to raise awareness of the implications on all members of being a corporate parent.

He provided an example of a child currently in the Council's care and the particular needs she had which required multiple services to engage. He was pleased to report the progress that had been seen with her.

A DVD entitled 'What do our children say?' was shown.

In response to members' questions Cllr McLain outlined that children in custody were considered children in care and that a briefing could be provided on this. There were also a number of placements that came from out of county, many relating to learning disabilities.

One member raised the importance of keeping a focus on supporting young carers. Cllr Gravells, the Cabinet Member for Older People outlined the work that had been carried out on these complex issues and provided assurance that the responsibility was taken seriously.

Training was available for foster carers with information provided in a regular newsletter. He encouraged families or individuals to come forward as potential fosterer carers.

He agreed to provide further information on how many young people who had been adopted had then returned back to foster care.

The Chief Executive provided an example of the great work of staff in supporting our looked after children. He outlined the importance of providing choices for our young people when they left the county's care. One young person had been provided with work experience at the Council and then found paid employment through the temporary staff register. He encouraged members to help support young people in finding job opportunities.

#### **54. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Two public questions had been received. A copy of the questions and answers as circulated and is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

The following supplementary question was asked:

Question 1 – Roseanne Steffen asked whether the Leader believed that £1m was a significant enough sum to put forward for environmental projects considering the scientific evidence of climate change.

In response, Cllr Hawthorne explained that the £1m pot of money was for particular schemes looking to reduce the carbon footprint and save money. This was the tip of the iceberg with regards to the investment looked at for green energy. 'Going green' was not just about saving the environment but also about reducing costs to local council tax payers.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Question 2 – Anne Griffiths referred to articles within the media relating to a new development called Elms Park, which would mean 4,500 new homes built on Uckington estate. She asked could this Council say what provisions would be made for tenants around the A417 and what opportunities there would be for them to continue in employment of agriculture and horticulture? She expressed concerns around clients that attended ‘Green Steps’, an organisation for clients with a full range of learning disabilities.

In response, Cllr Hawthorne stated that it was a proposal put forward by the developers and was a responsibility of the district council to determine planning applications. He referred to the removal of the requirements outlined in the previous Regional Spatial Strategy and stated that it was right that these decisions were made locally.

6 oral questions were asked:

Question 1 – John Firth asked

If the forthcoming consultation on the closure of Boots Corner indicates a lack of support, will the County Council still go ahead with it? And, if the proposed closure of Boots Corner with associated junction changes around Oriel Road go ahead, will the Council put measures in place to protect the residential area of St Luke’s from increased traffic before the junction changes are implemented?

In response, Cllr Windsor-Clive stated that the results of the consultation on the Cheltenham Transport Plan were not yet known. Once the public had expressed their opinions and the results had been analysed, the County Council and Cheltenham Borough Council would liaise with the Cheltenham Development Task Force to establish the best option for Cheltenham.

Question 2 – Chris Harmer asked what the Council saw its new role to be in relation to public health, and how it intended to carry this out.

As an example, Atrial Fibrillation or AF is the most common irregular heart beat, and is increasingly prevalent with advancing age. It is estimated that two thirds of the people with AF are unaware that they have it, and are undiagnosed. Without appropriate treatment, these people have around five times the normal stroke risk for people of their age. AF induced strokes are often serious and debilitating when not fatal. It has been shown that screening for AF at GP Flu Clinics represents a return on investment of 322% to the healthcare system in terms of costs avoided, let alone the consequences for patients and their families. The consequences of serious strokes will also be a cost to this Council in terms of disability services, etc.

Will this Council therefore consider putting pressure on the new Gloucestershire GP commissioning group to introduce AF screening at flu jab clinics in Gloucestershire?

In response, Cllr Binns stated that she would provide Mr Harmer with a full written response. She thanked Mr Harmer for the work he did as a volunteer for the Atrial Fibrillation Association, and as a patient member of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Atrial Fibrillation. The Council saw its new role as integral of promoting the well being of all its residents. The Health and Social Care Bill transferred the commissioning of responsibility for screening and immunisation programs from primary care trust to NHS England. Local Authorities are responsible for supporting reviewing and challenging the delivery of screening and immunisation services.

The UK National Screening Committee did not currently recommend a systematic population screening programme for AF, although all policies underwent regular review and the review programme for AF was scheduled to completed in November 2013. Should there be any change following this review, the Council would work with health partners to ensure eligible residents were able to access any screening programme if and when implemented.

Question 3 – Ian Richens asked:

Since the planning refusal of Javelin Park in March a new incinerator has been given approval after appeal by the Secretary of State in South Glos. It has a capacity to burn 400,000 tonnes and has some 100,000 tonnes capacity for local waste. Have Gloucestershire County Council considered using this facility to burn the residue after using mechanical biological treatment to recycle the rest? By the way the South Glos Incinerator is on the site of an old gas works and not in the middle of the Severn Vale.

In response Cllr Theodoulou stated that he was unaware of any negotiations or discussions but that he would find out and let Mr Richens know.

Question 4 – Diana Shirley asked whether the delegated Gloucestershire County Council officer who gave Urbaser Balfour Beatty permission to appeal had sight of advice given to Urbaser Balfour Beatty by their Counsel. If the answer was yes, would the advice be available to councillors?

Cllr Theodoulou asked the Chief Executive to comment. The Chief Executive outlined that the Council did have access to the advice provided to Urbaser Balfour Beatty, but that the Council separately sought legal advice which stated there were

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

no reasonable grounds to not approve an appeal going forward. He believed that the legal advice was commercially confidential.

Question 5 – Diana Shirley asked for Gloucestershire County Council to publicly reaffirm its commitment that the Council will defend the refusal from the planning committee for the development on Javelin Park. She stated that the proposal to build a large incinerator was not a green solution and that there were alternative solutions available.

Cllr Theodoulou said that the answer to the question was yes.

Question 6 – Anne Griffiths referred to the proposed Elms Park development and stated that she understood that it would be one of the largest developments in the county. She asked how the Council proposed to improve the infrastructure along the Tewkesbury Road to improve access to the town of Cheltenham and surrounding area in response to this.

Cllr Hawthorne stated that if the authority was contacted regarding housing allocation they would sit down and talk about the infrastructure needs.

## **55. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

Eighteen member questions were received. A copy of the questions and answers was circulated and is attached to the signed copy of the minutes.

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1 – Cllr Hilton noted that Urbaser Balfour Beatty had lodged an appeal against the decision of the County Council's planning committee to refuse planning permission for a waste incinerator at Javelin Park. He asked whether the member agreed that the sooner the planning inspectorate determined the appeal, and hopefully dismissed it, the sooner the Council could get on with plan B and an alternative.

Cllr Theodoulou agreed that the sooner a decision was made the better due to the costs implications of delays.

Question 2 – Cllr Hilton asked whether it was reckless for the administration to proceed with a waste project that had 39% over capacity.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Cllr Theodoulou responded that the configuration of the energy for waste plan was done with careful consideration and consultation. The Council would await the outcome of the inspector's deliberations.

Question 3 – Cllr Hilton asked whether the Cabinet Member would join him in congratulating Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service for being so cost effective and efficient.

Cllr Theodoulou stated he was delighted to join in the congratulations and that the work of the service was admired.

Question 9 – Cllr Hilton asked whether Gloucestershire County Council would follow other councils in paying the Living Wage to all staff employed.

Cllr Theodoulou stated that the member was right to raise the issue and that he was aware of the activities of other councils, but that he was also aware of the ramifications this could have on the current pay scales and contractors that the Council employs. This needed to be entered into carefully and officers were beginning to examine it.

Question 10 – Cllr Lydon asked whether the commercially sensitive information around the 'long-stop date' of the incinerator contract would be available to the cross party working group that was being set up.

Cllr Windsor-Clive replied that he did not believe that it would be available as the working group were considering a 'plan B'.

Question 11 – Cllr Lydon asked for a fuller answer on consultants employed by the Council. He asked: what exactly is the County supporting, how many people were being used as consultants and what were the individual roles, timescales and costs that had been incurred?

Cllr Theodoulou stated that when looking at the various cost centres of the council an answer could be provided. There was a range of people and services that did not come under the heading of 'management consultants'. This included those who performed a temporary function, for example architects who worked on schools. He explained that it made no sense to keep people on the payroll if they were only fulfilling a temporary function. The use of consultants was considered very carefully in order to provide professional services that the Council could not afford to provide on an ongoing basis.

Question 12 – Cllr Lydon asked for a fuller answer, detailing what the County Council is supporting or planning to support with regards to the regeneration of villages and town centres, specifically Dursley, Uley, Nymphsfield and Coaley.

Cllr Will Windsor-Clive stated he would provide the information to the member.

Question 13 – Cllr McMahon asked whether the cabinet member would meet with him and other interested members and officers to discuss the options for the future of the Wilderness Centre at the earliest opportunity.

Cllr Binns stated that she was happy to meet with fellow councillors and the voluntary sector and officers who worked hard for the Council in difficult financial times to discuss this matter.

Question 14 – Cllr Lydon asked whether he was right to assume that only one elected person was involved in the decision to increase the price of school meals. He asked whether the member had taken into account the effect it would have on low-income families and for those people who have more than one child of primary school age.

Cllr McLain stated that this would have been taken into account and that Cllr Lydon had been provided with a detailed briefing. The previous government grant subsidised the price, but this had ceased in 2012. The aim of the contract negotiated was that by the end of the contract the meals should be self subsidising. The schools currently subsidised it and if they wished to in future years it would have to come out of dedicated school budget. He would be happy to raise the member's concerns with the Schools Forum.

Question 15 - Cllr Lydon asked whether response times would be a part of the new highways contract, he asked where the Council was with the new contract and asked whether councillors would be able to comment on the contract.

Cllr V Smith stated that this was a priority area and explained that there was a highways advisory panel for councillors to feed information into. The new highways contract would look to follow government legislation.

Question 16 – Cllr Hodgkinson asked the cabinet member if he would comment on media reports stating that 'the road network will be brought to its knees if substantial investment is not made'. In recognising the member's response that 'Fix First Visit' was national best practice, he asked why this method was not substantially increased in this council.

Cllr V Smith referred to the LGA report discussing significant under funding in roads across the country and stated that he felt that there should be greater funding. He explained that 'Fix First Visit' best practice was 'an extra' in line with government legislation and that the Department for Transport would like to see other authorities follow Gloucestershire's lead.

Question 17 – Cllr Hodgkinson stated that passenger numbers were up across the county. He explained that the 'Cheltenham to Kingham' railway line was a route to connect west to east and, in particular, Cheltenham, Cotswold and Oxford. The organiser of the group suggesting this re-opening, Alfred Roberts, had produced detailed maps for deviations South of Cheltenham and West of Bourton on the Water that avoided any need for railway to run through Cheltenham or Bourton on the Water and thereby avoiding the huge compensation costs of reinstating the railway.

Cllr Windsor-Clive responded that the Council was always happy to look at ideas but that the costs for this would be substantial. He referred to the missing link at Birdlip, which was a higher of priority but had still not been able to be delivered despite being at a lower cost. With regards to the Cheltenham to Kingham proposal, some of the land was not owned by the railway and there was a viaduct involved. It was highly unlikely this would move forward at this time given the cost.

Question 18 – Cllr Joe Harris stated that with regards to the sub-lease of Keynes Country Park in the Cotswold Water Park there were still questions to be answered.

Cllr Hawthorne responded that the Council had commissioned an independent review of its relationship with the Cotswold Water Park in October 2011. Professor Garbutt published his report in March 2012 and the recommendations were being implemented. It was important to consider the facts outlined within the report.

## **56. PETITIONS**

Cllr Klara Sudbury presented a petition to Cllr Vernon Smith, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, relating to traffic flows on streets east of Bath Rd in Cheltenham.

## **57. MOTIONS**

### **Motion 684**

Cllr Hilton moved and Cllr Sudbury seconded the following motion:

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

*That this Council notes that both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat manifestos proposed the freezing of on-street car parking charges for the life of this Council.*

*Council asks the Cabinet to confirm that there will be no rises in on-street car parking charges for the next four years.*

*Council also asks the Cabinet to consider reducing the annual charge for residents' parking permits from the current fee of £80 to £50.*

Cllr Hilton recognised that both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat manifestos committed to freezing on street car parking. He stated that 3,400 resident parking permits were issued every year for 5,000 spaces subject to the scheme. He referred to a survey he had undertaken with residents in Kingsholm, which indicated that residents felt that around £50 or less for a permit was reasonable. He felt that the current charges needed to be reduced to increase take-up of the scheme. He suggested that other areas of the country charged less for parking permits such as in Somerset, Worcestershire and Herefordshire. He explained the difficulties caused by the displacement of cars due to the failings of the current parking scheme and suggested that it was time Cabinet reconsidered the scheme. He explained that the additional cost to the Council would be less than the savings from the virtual parking service and that this was an affordable change that could really help residents.

Cllr Hay supported the motion suggesting that it could be a useful piece of work for scrutiny to consider the scheme. He alluded to concerns he had with the consultation process and a 'one size fits all' approach to parking times, which did not work in some areas of the county. In particular, he referred to the issues in Cheltenham with parking around the football ground. He felt a better balance needed to be found and a better use of space; he gave the example of 'zoning', which was used in parts of London. In addition he discussed how the current scheme did not encourage less congestion causing modes of transport such as motorbikes.

Some members spoke about the parking issues in their areas and agreed that that there would be value in examining the issue further.

Cllr Hawthorne urged caution with regards to considering issues where there were long-term budget implications. He suggested that it was not appropriate to set the budget 'one motion at a time'. He felt that it was right that motions such as the one currently being debated were passed to scrutiny following the debate to then feed into the budget process.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

In seconding the motion, Cllr Sudbury referred to the impacts on commuters parking, as well as the implications on businesses in the area. There was a need to encourage commuters to use public transport rather than to park in the towns and cities.

Members discussed the way in which they might refer the motion to scrutiny to consider the financial implications. Some members felt that the motion should be amended and voted on to reflect this change, while others wished to refer it directly as detailed in the constitution procedural rule 11.5.2: *Refer the motion to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee who will consider the matter in the light of any views expressed by the full Council.*

The discussion had been positive in reviewing the scheme, but some members felt that in voting on the motion as it stood they would be pre-empting any consideration or recommendations from scrutiny. Other members felt that it was right to have a Council view on the principle of the motion. Cllr Hilton explained that he was looking for support for the content of the motion and that a direct referral to scrutiny did not achieve that.

Cllr Hilton and Cllr Sudbury withdrew the motion.

### **Motion 685**

Cllr Preest moved and Cllr Leppington seconded the following motion:

*That this Council resolves to politely write to David Cameron MP to request that a yes/no referendum on the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union takes place on the date of the next General Election, if not sooner.*

Cllr Preest referred to the private members bill proposing a referendum on the European Union in 2017. He expressed concern as to whether this proposal would carry through to the final Act. He emphasised the need to give people the right to make a decision on Europe outlining that over 60% of people according to opinion polls desired a referendum. He noted that the next General Election in 2015 would be an ideal date in which to hold it. He suggested that in 2012, £53m a day was heading towards the European Union away from local councils.

In speaking against the motion some members outlined that when speaking to the public on the doorstep, Europe was not the main issue being raised. While many members recognised the democratic right for the public to have their say on Europe, it was suggested that this was not a good time given the economic

situation. There was concern that a referendum would lead to uncertainty that would dissuade investment from businesses.

Cllr Hawthorne moved and Cllr Moor seconded the following amendment:

*This Council calls on all Gloucestershire MPs to support James Wharton's European Union Referendum Bill which, for the first time in generations will give people in the UK a say about their membership of the EU. This Council resolves to politely write to both David Cameron and James Wharton MP outlining this resolution.*

Cllr Hawthorne outlined that the last time the public had voted on Europe was in 1975 regarding the UK membership of the European Union. He suggested that it was time that the public had their say again. The amendment sought to move the debate on into what sort of relationship the UK would have with Europe going forward. The bill would put the right for a referendum into law which would be the best way forward and would ensure a referendum by 2017.

In supporting the motion, some members outlined that once a date was set for a referendum then there would be a stronger and better informed debate. Other members outlined that time was needed to see the changes take place in Europe before a referendum was called.

Some members, in speaking against the amendment outlined the importance of the European Union in terms of the legislation it had put in place. Furthermore, members emphasised the role of the European Union in maintaining peace across Europe. In addition, members reiterated their concerns around the effect on the economy caused by any uncertainty around the UK's position in Europe. It was again suggested that Europe was not a significant issue for the public.

Cllr L Williams stated that the Labour Group would be abstaining on the motion.

In seconding the amendment, Cllr Moor suggested that it was right to renegotiate the UK's position in Europe before putting the vote to the people. He stated that this was an issue that resonated in the chamber and that he welcomed the debate that had been had.

In summing up, Cllr Hawthorne outlined that it was inappropriate for a referendum on a single issue to be held on the same day as the General Election when voters were being asked to consider and vote on multiple issues. He felt that the amendment represented a way of establishing a principle and to move the debate on.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

On being put to the vote the amendment was accepted and became the substantive motion.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and was carried. It was therefore

## **RESOLVED**

*That this Council calls on all Gloucestershire MPs to support James Wharton's European Union Referendum Bill which, for the first time in generations will give people in the UK a say about their membership of the EU. This Council resolves to politely write to both David Cameron and James Wharton MP outlining this resolution.*

## **Motion 686**

Cllr Hay moved and Cllr Hodgkinson seconded the following motion:

*This Council notes that the number one issue on the doorstep in the recent County Council elections was the number of 'potholes' and other road damage found on Gloucestershire roads. That in order to address this number one issue and show the Council is listening, Cabinet immediately releases £4 million from Council reserves to be spent over the next two years on road repairs.*

Cllr Hay recognised that money had been put into this area by the administration recently but felt that this was only replacing previous reductions in budgets. He detailed that the state of the roads in the county were in a poor state and that it was important for extra resources be put in place specifically for road repairs. He believed that more time needed to be taken to ensure the quality of the work undertaken for lasting repairs. Cllr Hay stated that there was sufficient money in reserves to be directed into this area. It was an opportunity to send a clear message to the public that road repairs were a priority. He suggested that this issue could be considered by scrutiny or by another appropriate Council body.

Cllr Hodgkinson, in seconding the motion, expressed his concern about the poor state of the roads. He acknowledged that a lot of the work that had been carried out by the Council in recent months but stated that further money needed to be spent and there was money in the reserves to do that. He recognised the financial pressures and the amount of resource required just to keep the road network at a 'standstill' position. The motion sought to provide a properly maintained road network that the county deserved.

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Cllr Vernon Smith, as Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood, accepted that the condition on the roads was a high priority and that he accepted what the public were saying. He explained that £5m had recently been put into this programme and work relating to this was starting which included fourteen extra resurfacing works, £2.5m for surface dressing working through the summer and extra six crews doing patching and minor defects. He stated that, subject to further agreement, each member would receive £20,000 for repairs on the roads in their own areas.

Some members were critical about previous reductions in budget and made suggestions around moving money from other areas of the budget. Other members discussed the importance of understanding why the state of the roads was so poor and why past repairs required further work after a relatively short period of time.

It was suggested that there was a need for an in depth look at the issues, taking on board councillor experiences and a fresh look at the resources available. It was recognised that there was a role for groups' spokespersons to discuss the amount of reserves available, and that the Highways Working Group would consider the ongoing issues with the road network.

Cllr Hay in summing up explained that, while he would have liked to have received full support for the motion as it stood in order to move things forward quickly, he was happy that the motion be considered further through the appropriate Council body before coming back to the next Council meeting. He recognised that the debate had been positive and looked for there to be a consensus going forward. This would be an opportunity to show how the political groups could work together.

Following procedural rule 11.5.2 of the constitution it was put to the vote and it was

## **RESOLVED**

*That the motion be referred to the Highways Working Group and for discussions with group spokesperson to report back at the next Council meeting.*

## **58. CABINET DECISION STATEMENT**

Cllr Lunnon asked a question in reference to item 7 on the decision statement: appointment to the joint waste committee.

She stated that nominees for the joint waste committee had failed to achieve the support of important local partners for their residual waste project (two of them objected formally at the Planning Committee meeting). She asked Cllr Hawthorne

how the chair had faith in the individuals to act and gain the respect of the other partners on the joint committee.

Cllr Hawthorne replied that he had faith that they would do that, and continue to do that.

In view of the limited time available further questions were not asked. Members were encouraged to forward their questions by email to be asked by the relevant cabinet member.

## **59. ADOPTION PANEL**

**RESOLVED** that Cllr Chris Coleman be appointed to the Adoption Panel with a further member to be appointed at the next full Council meeting on 4 September 2013.

## **60. CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**

The Chairman of the Constitution Committee, Cllr Hawthorne, presented the recommendations from the meeting held on 10 June 2013.

### **a) Political Group Spokespersons**

A role description for the Political Group Spokesperson had been circulated with the briefing note. It was noted that the principle of paying only one special responsibility allowance would be re-examined by members of the Independent Remuneration Panel when they reviewed the allowances payable to group spokespersons later in the year.

**RESOLVED** that

- i) The level of Special Responsibility Allowance for each Political Group Spokesperson be set at £1,500 and be effective from 1 June 2013.*
- ii) In line with the current allowances scheme, each councillor should continue to be entitled to receive only one Special Responsibility Allowance.*
- iii) Special Responsibility Allowance should not be paid to any Cabinet Project Champions beyond the end of the 2013-14 financial year.*

### **b) Travelling allowances for journeys to and from parish and town council meetings**

**RESOLVED** that travelling allowances be payable to county councillors on journeys to and from parish and town council meetings within their division

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

*with effect from 19 June 2013. This should apply to full council meetings only and the county councillor should not be a member of that particular parish or town council.*

**c) Changes to the constitution flowing from the recommendations of Mr Graham Garbutt**

**RESOLVED** *to adopt the changes to the officer scheme of delegation set out in Appendix A of the report (Annex 3).*

**d) Amendments to the constitution following the transfer of the Monitoring Officer role from the Director of Law and Administration to the Director of Strategy and Challenge.**

**RESOLVED**

- i) To approve the changes to the constitution set out in Annex 4 following the transfer of the Monitoring Officer role from the Director of Law and Administration to the Director of Strategy and Challenge.*
- ii) To change call-in procedure rule 4 in part 4 of the constitution to reduce the number of members required to call-in a key decision from six to five.*

**61. HONORARY ALDERMEN**

**RESOLVED** *that the title of Honorary Alderman be conferred on the following former councillors and this be confirmed at the Extraordinary Council Meeting convened specifically for this purpose immediately following the full Council meeting.*

*Ron Allen - 18 years*

*Basil Booth - 34 years*

*Bill Crowther - 20 years*

*Barry Dare – 20 years including five years as Leader of Council*

*Chas Fellows - 16 years*

*Rob Garnham - 16 years*

*Jackie Hall - 16 years*

*Deryck Nash – 16 years (1993 to 2009)*

*Charmian Sheppard - 20 years*

*Gordon Shurmer – 16 years including two years as Chairman of Council*

*Mike Skinner - 32 years including one year as Chairman of Council*

*Mike Williams - 20 years*

**CHAIRPERSON**

*Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting*

Meeting concluded at 13:30