

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER
2009**

PRESENT

Mr. R. M. Wilson CC (in the Chair)

Mr. A. D. Bailey CC, Mr. D. C. Bill CC, Mr. R. Blunt CC, Mr. G. A. Boulter CC, Mr. S. L. Bray CC, Mrs. R. Camamile CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. J. G. Coxon CC, Mrs. J. A. Dickinson CC, Dr. R. K. A Feltham CC, Mrs. J. Fox CC, Mr. R. Fraser CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Mr. B. Garner CC, Mr. T. Gillard CC, Mr. M. Griffiths CC, Mr. P. S. Harley CC, Mr. G. A. Hart CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. D. W. Houseman CC, Mr. Max Hunt CC, Mr. D. Jennings CC, Mr. G. Jones CC, Mr. A. M. Kershaw CC, Mr. P. G. Lewis CC, Mr. K. W. P. Lynch CC, Mr. J. Miah CC, Ms. Betty Newton CC, Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, Mr. M. B. Page CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Mr. B. L. Pain CC, Mr. D. R. Parsons CBE CC, Mr. G. Partner CC, Mrs. L. A. S. Pendleton CC, Mrs. P. Posnett CC, Prof. M. E. Preston CC, Mrs. C. M. Radford CC, Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC, Mrs. J. Richards CC, Mr. P. A. Roffey DL, CC, Mr. N. J. Rushton CC, Mr. R. J. Shepherd CC, Mr. D. Slater CC, Mr. E. D. Snartt CC, Mr. D. A. Sprason CC, Mr. E. F. White CC, Mr. D. O. Wright CC and Mr. M. B. Wyatt CC

23. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Mr J A Davenport

The Chairman reported with sadness the death on 27 July 2009 of former County Councillor Jim Davenport aged 85 years.

Mr Davenport had been elected to the Council in 1985 and had served until 1997 representing the Market Bosworth Electoral Division. He had served mainly on the Finance and General Purposes, Policy and Resources, Resources and Investment Committees in each case serving for periods as the Conservative Group Spokesman.

Members to joined the Chairman in standing in silent tribute to the memory of Mr Jim Davenport.

Special Olympics

As an Ambassador for the Special Olympics, the Chairman indicated that he had been delighted to learn that two young men in the care of Leicestershire County Council had won medals at the Special Olympics held in July.

Bradley Folkard, aged 15, had won 2 gold medals and a silver medal in the equestrian events; and James Wright, aged 13, had won a total of 6 gold and silver medals in gymnastics.

Members joined the Chairman in extending congratulations to Bradley and James.

Events Over The Summer

The Chairman invited members to join him in acknowledging a tremendously successful Summer for some of the County Council's visitor attractions, as follows:-

- Bosworth Battlefield had its most successful re-enactment in 25 years with over 5,300 people attending the event in August;
- the Wood Fair at Beacon Hill had attracted 5,400 visitors (double last year's attendance);
- the second Miners' Gala at Snibston held last Saturday had attracted 3,400 people, another significant increase; and
- the launch of the Harborough Museum with the wonderful new gallery featuring the Hallaton Treasure had attracted 2,500 visitors.

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman between them had been able to attend those events and had seen for themselves how successful they had been.

Overall more than 16,500 visitors had enjoyed the County Council's country parks and heritage in the space of just three weeks. The excellence of the country parks had been recognised recently and the Chairman had been delighted to present Green Flag Awards, which are given to the best green spaces in the country, to both Beacon Hill and Market Bosworth Country Parks.

The Chairman, felt sure that he spoke for all members in expressing gratitude to everyone who helped make those events happen.

County Council Fun Day

The Chairman took the opportunity to congratulate County Council staff who had participated and supported the County Council's Fun Day which had taken place on 12th August.

A total of 16 teams had travelled from across the County to compete in the Gladiator-style events, which included bungee runs, human bar football, and rodeo riding. The eventual winners were the Vamps and Tramps team from Corporate Resources.

With an emphasis on fun, the event had raised £2,500 for Wishes 4 Kids.

Visitors

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting all visitors and guests of members.

24. MINUTES.

It was moved by the Chairman, seconded by the Vice-Chairman and carried:-

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8 July 2009, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.”

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to make declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

All members of District and Borough Councils declared personal non-prejudicial interests in all matters relating to those Councils.

The following further declarations were made:-

<u>Member</u>	<u>Minute No.</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Mr. S. J. Galton	27	Personal non-prejudicial as Members of CASCET
Dr. R. K. A. Feltham	27	Personal non-prejudicial as Chairman of CASCET
Mr. P. A. Roffey	28A	Personal non-prejudicial as a Governor of Brooksby with an interest in Rearsby Gravel

26. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(1)(2) AND (5).

(A) Mr Wright CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- "1. According to this Council's own figures for 2009/10, the average per-pupil funding in primary schools is £3,033. Whilst many of the 225 primary schools do not vary greatly from this average, there are some notable exceptions.

28 schools receive funding in excess of £4,000 per pupil, 3 schools receive in excess of £5,000, 1 school in excess of £6,000 and 1 school in excess of £7,000, the latter two being more than twice the average.

What are the reasons that explain these large differences?

2. The total number of pupils in the 5 schools receiving in excess of £5,000 per pupil is 176. Collectively those schools receive £1,045,197 in funding.

In comparison, taking two examples from different areas of the county, Kegworth Primary - no. on roll 168, figures adjusted to 176, receives £534,022. Richard Hill C of E - no. on roll 174, figures adjusted to 176, receives £504,176.

Is this a fair distribution of available resources?

3. Using comparator councils, can the Leader please provide figures illustrating:
 - a) the average per-pupil funding in primary schools
 - b) respectively, the smallest and largest variation from the average?"

Mr Hart replied as follows:

- "1. The formula applied to calculate school budgets takes into account a number of factors to recognise the individual needs of schools and the pupils within them. Although the formula is applied consistently across all schools, there are differences where funding allocations are made in respect of some but not all pupils. The following pupil led factors influence the level of budget received by school:

- The deprivation score arising from the pupils within the school;
- The level of pupil prior attainment;
- The need for schools to meet the Key Stage 1 class size legislation;
- The number of pupils eligible for free school meals;
- The presence of schools with units serving SEN needs.

Schools also receive funding not directly attributable to pupils which affects the total level of budget received, for example:

- The physical size of the building and its grounds;
- Allocation of small school protection.

The calculation of unit funding per child is based upon the total budget divided by the number of pupils on roll, the level of surplus places within schools can also result in funding differences per pupil.

2. Small school protection has been a factor within the Leicestershire formula for funding schools for a considerable amount of time and provides additional funding for the overheads incurred by a school irrespective of the number of pupils within it; this type of protection is prevalent in the formulae of many Councils.

A balance needs to be drawn between supporting small schools financially to remain able to provide for the needs of children and young people and the additional costs that could be incurred in the absence of such schools, for example home to school transport.

A review of the funding formula commissioned by the Schools (Funding) Forum is currently underway with any changes to the formula being implemented in 2011. Any changes to the formula need to be subject to consultation with all schools with changes agreed by the Schools (Funding) Forum before implementation.

3. (a) The information available from the national publication of local authority spend within the annual Section 52 Budget Statement compiled by local authorities does not separate primary, secondary or special schools but an overall school average can be obtained. Unfortunately, the 2009/10 information has not yet been published nationally but can be compiled when that information becomes available.

Average per-pupil funding, across school phases, however, is available for 2008/09. The average overall per-pupil funding for Leicestershire was £3,365, the figures for our comparator authorities were:

South Gloucestershire	£3,315
Warwickshire	£3,401
Worcestershire	£3,446
North Somerset	£3,357
Hampshire	£3,280
Staffordshire	£3,486
Essex	£3,556
West Sussex	£3,457
Bedfordshire	£3,580
Kent	£3,534

- b) The nationally published Section 52 benchmarking data only details the average Individual Schools Budget per pupil and information on this level is not available."

(B) Mr Charlesworth CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"The present system of Shire Community Plus grants works on a first come first served basis. A better system might be that those who missed out this year are first on the list next year, or that smaller grants are given so that all applicants benefit. Will the Leader therefore consider introducing a system of distributing Shire grants which is fair to all?"

Mr White replied as follows:

"This question refers to SHIRE Community Plus grants which are provided to community groups and organisations to help with the cost of using premises each financial year. The existing system of administering the grant offers up to 50% of hire costs up to a maximum of £500 to groups and this year 383 groups have been

offered funding.

At the beginning of the financial year all groups and organisations that had previously applied for the grant were contacted regarding the scheme. They were informed that there is a fixed limit to available funding and that applications should be submitted as soon as practicable. To date 112 later applications or enquiries have been unsuccessful. The current system does however give groups an equal opportunity and allows early applicants to commit to premises charges in the knowledge that funding is available.

The current system is considered to be the fairest way of distributing a fixed budget and balancing help to a large number of groups with the provision of a significant and useful funding contribution to individual groups. Reducing the level of grant would be less helpful for funded groups with additional administration costs overall for groups and for the County Council.

I am grateful for suggestions to improve the grant scheme but at the present time I believe that the arrangements in operation are the fairest and most effective means of distributing the grant."

Mr Charlesworth asked the following supplementary question:

"In view of the answer, could I ask the Lead Member whether consideration could be given to the maximum grant being restricted to £200, thereby ensuring all applicants get a grant?"

Mr White replied as follows:

"I hear what is said and I acknowledge that it is difficult to make this process totally fair to everybody, but I am not sure reducing it to that level would be fair to many groups. I will look at this again and discuss this with the Director. However, I think that unless we are going to have some kind of sifting committee that will assess the merit of each grant before awarding it, which itself will cost money and take time, it may not be possible to get to a system that is absolutely fair to everybody. I will look at it again, I promise."

(C) Mr Charlesworth CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- "1. Has there been an inventory kept of all the artworks donated to this County Council since the end of the Second World War including those donated to schools?
2. Are artworks donated to individual schools the property of that school or are they the property of the County Council?"

Mr White replied as follows:

- "1. The works of art in the Artworks collection have been acquired by the County Council since the 1950s for educational

purposes and are loaned out on a termly or annual basis to schools, colleges, and community venues. There is a complete inventory of this collection and a catalogue available.

There is also a collection of museum works of art which is displayed in the County Council's museums, loaned to other museum services and used for research purposes. This is also fully accessioned and catalogued.

2. In addition to the County Artworks there are some 6,000 pieces of artwork located in schools and at Beaumanor Hall. The majority of these pieces were donated to the County Council and are therefore the property of the local authority. A few pieces have been donated specifically to individual schools - in these cases the governing body of the school is the responsible authority."

(D) Mr Bailey CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Can the Leader please tell me:

1. Whether the Council's current social care eligibility threshold is still 'Moderate'?
2. If plans are being considered to change the Council's eligibility threshold?
3. Whether there is any likelihood of the Council's eligibility threshold level being changed in the foreseeable future?"

Mr Sprason replied as follows:

- "1. Yes.
2. There are no plans at present to change the Council's eligibility threshold.
3. Given the extent of the financial challenge on the Adult Social Care Service from demand and cost pressures and the need to make savings, it is inevitable that all options will have to be reviewed. Consideration of eligibility criteria will be informed by the outcome of national consultations currently being carried out by the Department of Health on eligibility criteria for adult social care and the future design and funding of the care and support system."

(E) Mr Galton CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- "1. Could the Leader please give details of the exact final cost of the eco-towns process to the County Council and therefore the tax payers of Leicestershire?"

2. Has any payment been made by the Co-op towards the transport assessment and if not what action is being taken?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

- "1. The full cost to the County Council of responding to the eco-town process, including the substantial Member and officer time involved, is not known. The revenue costs have totalled nearly £300,000 including the costs of the transport assessment (£211,000). If Member and officer time is taken into account we might speculate that the total cost is well over £0.5m.
2. Officers are still seeking to reach agreement with the Co-operative Group regarding the costs of the transport assessment. No payments have yet been made."

(F) Dr Hill CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Will this Council answer the call for evidence by the East Midlands Select Committee on regional and local funding?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"We are aware of the call but have no record of being approached directly. We will submit evidence, although our very poor level of Government funding is now widely recognised. I have to say I am not hopeful of any positive outcome."

(G) Mr Boulter CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Does the Leader agree with me that the Biffa announcement of a 300,000 tonne EfW incinerator:

1. If built would act as a direct competitor to anything developed by Leicestershire County Council?
2. Poses a question regarding the original planning permission for the site?
3. Would require the importation of waste by lorry to feed it?"

Mr Rhodes replied as follows:

- "1. Biffa was one of three companies shortlisted in June to continue with the procurement process with the County Council to develop new waste treatment facilities within Leicestershire. The award of the final contract is likely to be towards the end of 2010 and the successful company would be required to

manage up to 180,000 tonnes of residual waste by 2040.

If Biffa was unsuccessful the company has stated publicly that it would still go ahead with its proposal but in these circumstances would have no access to the County Council's residual domestic waste and would not therefore be in competition with any new facilities procured by the County Council. Biffa would need to source suitable commercial and industrial waste equating to approximately 33% of the total waste arising in Leicestershire (over twice as much as household waste).

2. The planning process is separate from the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) procurement and companies are free to apply for planning permission for any type of proposal at any time. The County Council, as the Planning Authority, will deal with any planning application for new waste management facilities.

The planning permission most recently granted to Biffa Waste for a Materials Recovery Facility, in-vessel composting and landfilling, is in place and capable of being implemented. If a different planning permission is granted then the developer will have a choice as to which planning permission to implement.

3. There has never been any other mode of access other than by road to the Newhurst site and therefore any waste importation would be by road. The planning permission most recently granted restricts vehicle movements per day. Any new planning application will require a traffic impact assessment."

(H) Mrs Posnett CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Could the Leader please provide this Council with an update, broken down by district, of the number of people and businesses who have been helped by Citizens Advice Bureaux with issues such as home repossession, debt advice, domestic violence etc as part of their Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with the County Council since the start of the recession in Leicestershire?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"The County Council has for many years provided funding to the County's Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx) to help those residents who are suffering from debt problems. The County Council put in place SLAs with the CABx, to provide help for a specified number of cases in each district council area. From 1 April 2009 the County Council provided a further £100,000 of grant funding to respond to the effects of the 'Credit Crunch', which has resulted in a doubling of the cases that CABx are able to handle. I have asked the Trading Standards Service to gather information on what effect the County Council funding has had, so that I am able to respond to your question more fully."

Mrs Posnett asked the following supplementary question:

"Can the Leader ensure that when the information is available it can be released to members through the Members' Information Service please?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"I am happy to do that."

(I) Mr Pain CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"At the 2009 County elections, the Conservatives were re-elected with a pledge to freeze Council Taxes in Leicestershire for at least 3 years. Can the Leader reaffirm to this Council that this is still the intention of the Administration over this and next year's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and will he continue to resist calls from the Opposition parties to look again at raising Council Tax levels in order to balance the need for £70m savings now that the Prime Minister has agreed the need to cut the level of public expenditure?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"The Conservative Manifesto made it clear that Council Tax would be frozen for 2 years but this is dependent on a Conservative Government providing extra support to reduce a budgeted increase of 2½ % to 0 % in 2011/12 and 2012/13. Our revised MTFS is based on a 2½ % increase in 2010/11 and a 0% increase in 2013/14. I will certainly resist calls from the Opposition to increase Council Taxes to avoid taking difficult decisions on savings, as we have a clear mandate for our policy. Indeed I cannot imagine many authorities will pass up the offer of a new Conservative Government reducing a 2½ % increase to 0 %. Effectively, the choice would be 0 % or an increase substantially above 2½ % which I think is completely unacceptable in the current and likely future circumstances."

Mr Pain asked the following supplementary question:

"I believe it is true to say that we are living in a time where people all over Leicestershire and every business are adjusting their forecasts and having to find savings within existing budgets in line with the current economic conditions. So, therefore, please could I ask the Leader to confirm to this Council that we are not a special case and that, in line with every other business and family outside these chambers, we will find the necessary savings through reductions of our own expenditure?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"Clearly we are going to have to and we are trying to avoid as much as we can the savage cuts which the Liberal Democrats are

attempting to hoist on us."

(J) Mrs Richards CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Can the Leader please outline the support this Council and officers have given (capital, revenue and specific grant) to 'GreenTowers' the Hinckley Club for Young People and indicate whether he is confident this facility, when completed, will have satisfactory arrangements in place (fixtures, fittings, equipment, ICT etc) to enable this facility to maximise its full potential for the local community?"

Mr Hart replied as follows:

"The voluntary youth sector organisation, Clubs for Young People, together with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, prepared and submitted the MyPlace bid for the 'GreenTowers' project.

MyPlace bids require sign off by the Chief Executive of the top-tier authority (i.e. Leicestershire County Council) and this was provided in July 2008, with feedback to the Chief Executive of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. That proposal required the bidding organisations to engage better with the County Council's Youth Service and the Connexions Service, and acknowledged that the revenue aspects of the Business Plan looked very challenging. No financial contribution from the County Council has been requested by the bidders.

Almost £5m has been secured from the national lottery and this should guarantee a superb facility. The bidders are to be congratulated on their ambitious plan. The County Council's Youth Service has met with the club management committee to discuss how the youth service might be involved (it had been hoped that youth workers could be based at the facility but it has been confirmed this week that this will not be possible because of limited office space).

The approach to Integrated Youth Support Services recognises that many agencies provide excellent facilities and services to young people and this is a good example of that approach. The County Council will do whatever it can to maximise the potential of this wonderful new resource, however, it should be noted that the County Council is not leading the project and is not accountable for it."

(K) Mrs Radford CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Will the Leader please comment upon how the 43% reduction in New Growth Point (NGP) Funding allocation for the 6Cs area (Derby County and City, Nottingham County and City and Leicester County and City) by the Government has impacted upon agreed schemes and projects within the County?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"New Growth Point funding is playing a key role in supporting the provision of new homes to meet local needs and to ensure that they are supported by the infrastructure and services needed to ensure new developments are sustainable. I was therefore extremely disappointed by the Government's shortsighted decision to cut funding to the 6Cs NGP partnership. The impact of this on Leicester and Leicestershire has been a damaging reduction in funding of £2.1m. As a direct result of this, the Leicester and Leicestershire Leadership Board, of which I am joint chairman, has had to reverse earlier decisions to allocate funding to projects.

I am pleased to report that several key schemes for the County and the sub-region, including Birstall Park and Ride, Loughborough Eastern Gateway, Earl Shilton Town Centre and several regeneration schemes in the City have had their NGP funding confirmed through this process but it has been necessary to shelve the allocation of funds to several regeneration schemes in the City and public realm investment of £100k in Loughborough. Officers are currently seeking to identify alternative funds to enable these key investments to proceed.

I am concerned that the Government appears determined to continue imposing high levels of new housing provision on local communities but is cutting funding for the essential infrastructure needed to make those communities attractive and sustainable."

Mrs Radford asked the following supplementary question:

"Will the Leader please use his influence and contacts with the Labour Government to put the case to reinstate these monies that local authorities have planned and budgeted for receiving?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"Whilst I do not over-rate my influence with Her Majesty's Government, I think the message has got to be that if they are not going to fund the infrastructure growth then they will not get the growth in the East Midlands that they want. So no funding - no growth."

(L) Mr Galton CC asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- "1. In the September issue of 'Leicestershire Matters' an article on 'Hard times and hard choices' appeared inviting the residents of Leicestershire to comment on whether 'aiming for a 0% council tax increase is right in the circumstances'. Why are we inviting people's views when the Leader has made a clear statement that he is committed to a 0% council tax rise?"

2. As this is not the only option to achieving the required savings why are we not engaging in a genuine debate about all options, instead of focusing on a single emotive issue of council tax at this stage?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

- "1. As the answer to Mr Pain's question makes clear we have a mandate for the Administration's policy on Council Tax but it is dependent on a new Conservative Government providing extra support. In my view the attractiveness of the offer of support to reduce a 2½ % increase to 0% in 2011/12 and 2012/13 is such that it would be folly to refuse it. The only real debate on Council Tax is around 2010/11 and 2013/14.
2. I am always interested in the views of the people of Leicestershire. If there was very strong evidence of a groundswell of public opinion to have higher Council Tax increases in these years I would have to consider the position very carefully."

Mr Galton asked the following supplementary question:

"I am quite clear of the Leader's mandate and commitment to this policy but is he aware of the growing body of opinion which suggests that this is going to be extremely difficult if not impossible to achieve in the current economic situation and, in such circumstances, is this likely to become a resigning matter?"

Mr Parsons replied as follows:

"What we are trying here is to make sure that the residents do not have any increase in their Council Tax. I think the logic of what is being argued from the Liberal Democrat benches is that Council Taxes will be increased above the rate of inflation and if that is the case then they should come clean."

27. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.

The Leader presented a position statement on the following matters:

Medium Term Financial Strategy
Total Place
Pennbury
Performance
Examination Results
School Development
Park and Ride
Rail Electrification
National Transport Awards

The Lead Member for Adult Social Care and Health presented a position statement on the following matters:

Safeguarding Adults: Summary of Roles and Responsibilities
Valuing People Now
Older People's Champions in Leicestershire

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission presented a position statement on the development of the scrutiny work programme and the effective operation of scrutiny more generally.

Copies of the position statements are filed with these minutes.

28. REPORTS OF THE CABINET:

(A) LEICESTERSHIRE MINERALS AND LEICESTERSHIRE AND LEICESTER WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - ADOPTION OF THE CORE STRATEGIES AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES.

It was moved by Mr Rhodes, seconded by Mr Orson and carried:-

- "(a) That the Leicestershire Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, as amended to accord with the recommendations in the Inspector's report dated 1 May 2009, be formally adopted by the Leicestershire County Council;
- (b) That the Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, as amended to accord with the recommendations in the Inspector's report dated 1 May 2009, be formally adopted by the Leicestershire County Council;
- (c) That the Chief Executive be authorised to take all actions necessary to give effect to the decisions in (a) and (b) above (including agreeing with Leicester City Council a date from which the adoption will take effect)."

(B) COUNTY COUNCIL FINAL END OF YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR 2008/09.

It was moved by Mr Page, seconded by Mr Rhodes and carried:-

"That the County Council's Final End of Year Performance Report for 2008/09, as referred to in Section B of the report of the Cabinet, be approved."

29. JOINT REPORT OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEES:

(A) REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Motion 1

It was moved by Mr Parsons, seconded by Mr Snartt and carried:-

"That the proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to the joint report of the Corporate Governance and Constitution Committees, other than those which relate to changes to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules), be approved."

Motion 2 – Procedural Motion

It was moved by Mr Parsons and seconded by Mr Rhodes:-

Revision of Standing Orders

"That, in accordance with Standing Order 37, the County Council is recommended to approve the changes to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules) as set out in Appendix 2 to the joint report of the Corporate Governance and Constitution Committees."

(The Council noted that under Standing Order 37 this procedural motion having been moved and seconded now stood adjourned until the next ordinary meeting of the Council.)

2.46 pm – 4.40 pm
23 September 2009

CHAIRMAN