



Date: 16 July 2013

Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

A Borough to be proud of

To: **All Members of Council**

Copy to all other Members of the Council

(other recipients for information)

Dear Councillor,

Please see overleaf a Supplementary Agenda for the meeting of the **COUNCIL** on **TUESDAY, 16 JULY 2013 at 6.30 pm.**

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Owen'.

Rebecca Owen
Democratic Services Officer

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

3. **TO BE ADVISED OF ANY ADDITIONAL ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE MAYOR DECIDES BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL BE TAKEN AS MATTERS OF URGENCY AT THIS MEETING.**

The Mayor has agreed to accept an additional item (on this supplementary agenda as 23a) to appoint to a new Outside Body.

7. **TO DEAL WITH QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NUMBER 11.1.**

- (a) From Councillor WJ Crooks addressed to the Leader of the Council

Does the Leader agree with me that the Hinckley & Bosworth Executive's decision to keep out of the Leicestershire Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment was a good decision?

Response from Councillor SL Bray

Yes I totally agree that the decision to take a watching brief on the County wide GTAA and continue to progress with our borough wide GTAA was the correct one. The HBBC gypsy and traveller needs assessment has been completed and will be signed off by Executive in early September. Members will be please to note the positive position that HBBC are now in following the study compared with other districts who were involved with the county-wide GTAA.

The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment has used a fundamentally different methodology to calculate its' Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation requirement to that used to prepare the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's GTAA.

The HBBC GTAA did not rely on the 2007 GTAA but started from scratch based on the new national policy guidance. Our methodology has been to identify our own need where it arises by undertaking thorough interviews with the gypsy and traveller community within the borough. From those interviews an analysis of the population profile of the community was undertaken to establish the future need of that sector of our community. The HBBC GTAA then goes an extra step and looks at ways in which that need can be met on a sequential approach, firstly by looking at capacity within existing sites, then by extensions to sites and then looking at new sites.

The starting point for the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland study was the numbers identified in the 2007 study, and the methodology involved contacting only a sample of the Gypsies and Travellers living in the County. It does not follow the second part of the Hinckley & Bosworth BC study in identifying land availability and potential delivery mechanisms for the need where it arises.

Just so Members get a feel for those figures which emerged from the Countywide refresh of the GTAA, from 2012 to 2031

- Harborough require 80 pitches, plus 5 transit pitches and 25 plots for Showpeople

- N W Leicestershire 68 pitches plus 20 transit pitches and 9 plots for Showpeople

(b) From Councillor JS Moore addressed to the Executive Member for Finance

Could the Leader confirm that at the end of the 2011/12 Tax year the level of Council Tax arrears was in the region of £953,000.00? Information in my possession points to some of this debt originating as far back as 1998/99.

The recent changes regarding the introduction of "Universal Credit" benefits will, it is anticipated, bring about a significant increase in the incidence of arrears. Could I ask the Leader to provide this council with:

- a) The yearly level of Council Tax debt for the years 1998/99 through to 2011/12;
- b) The number of properties per year relating to this debt;
- c) Measures taken by this Council to recover these debt; and most importantly
- d) Any conclusions reached in respect of minimising the future level of debt, and any mechanisms being considered regarding the recovery of debt that arises from the changes in the regime of benefit payments.

Response from Councillor KWP Lynch

Thank you Councillor Moore for your question. The gross arrears to the financial year ended 31/03/12 was £673,940 and the number of cases in arrears in year was 2,035. Actions are being taken against all of the households who are in arrears as follows:

1. Cases with Bailiff
If the debt is subject to a Liability Order (court action) and we have been unable to secure a payment arrangement the case is passed to bailiffs for collection, where it is appropriate to do so.
2. Pre-bailiff Action
Bailiffs are used as a last resort and where every other avenue to collect the debt has been exhausted. We will always write to the taxpayer to alert them to the fact that if they fail to make an arrangement for payment we will be left with no choice other than to instruct bailiffs
3. Arrears subject to a payment arrangement
If the taxpayer has an on-going council tax liability we will ask that they keep their current and on-going charges up to date and make potentially smaller payments against the arrears.
4. Other reasons will include:
 - The debtor is being traced or further enquiries are ongoing
 - The debt has been returned from bailiffs and we are determining the next appropriate course of action.
 - Awaiting write off
5. Attachment of Earnings
The debtor's employer has been instructed to deduct the amount outstanding from the debtors salary/wages.
6. Attachment of Benefits

The debtor is in receipt of a DWP benefit from which deductions can be made.

With regard to the final part of your question, the council's enforcement team work extremely hard to ensure the level of previous years arrears outstanding at the end of a financial year are kept to a minimum. All authorities within Leicestershire have anticipated that collection levels will fall as a consequence of the welfare reforms and the austerity measures.

What we are doing to improve collection?

- The recovery strategy has been revised in order to speed up the process and to establish the way we will deal with those payers who have not had to pay Council Tax previously
- The temporary employment of two enforcement officers (12 month contract) funded in the main by the major precepting authorities.
- Automating processes to free up capacity within the enforcement team.
- Promoting the ability to pay by 12 instalments
- The recovery notices now include guidance on the implications for late payment and the support available which has been shared with the customer service team.

(c) From Councillor RG Allen addressed to the Leader of the Council

Can the Leader please explain to members why this Council still has no policy on renewable energy, a situation which is leaving rural communities at the mercy of commercial interests? Does the council now have a timetable with a backstop date for putting such a policy in place? Can the Leader reassure members that all wind turbine applications will now be called in to committee as promised and not continue with the haphazard way members are still having to contact officers to justify their reasons for calling these applications in to the planning committee.

Response from Councillor SL Bray

We do have a policy on wind power, Policy BE27 within the 2001 Local Plan. This policy provides the criteria upon which wind power proposals must be considered which includes impacts on local communities. This policy will remain extant until the adoption of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. Following on from that, the council does have a timetable in place for further developing our policy position on renewable energy so that it is in line with current national policy.

The Borough Council also has adopted Core Strategy Policy 24: Sustainable Design and Technology which requires developments to meet the following standards;

- Residential developments in the Urban Area must meet Code 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes
- Residential developments in Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages are expected to meet sustainability targets set out in Building a Greener Future
- Schools, Hospitals and Office developments to meet a minimum of 'very good' BREEAM standard.

The NPPF requires that Local Planning Authorities should:

- Have a positive strategy for renewables
- Design their policies to maximise renewables

- Consider identifying suitable areas for renewables.

Therefore the Borough Council has no choice but to include a policy that embraces all renewable energy generation and promotes Low Carbon Developments which meets the national policy requirements which I have just outlined.

This is being addressed with the formulation of the emerging development management policy, DM2: Delivering Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development. This policy is directly supported by the completed evidence base, The Renewable Energy Capacity Study. The evidence base and policy were guided by the cross party Renewable Energy Task and Finish Group in 2012 / 13, but has yet to be formally adopted as an evidence base by Executive but is in the forward plan to consider in the next few months..

The development management policy (if agreed by Council) will proceed, as part of the Site Allocations DPD, to public consultation later this year with full adoption expected in early 2015.

Prior to the adoption of this development management policy the NPPF is the default document for determining applications on renewable energy and low carbon developments.

Any changes to “call in” arrangements for wind turbine applications will need to be addressed through an amendment to the Council’s constitution.

- (d) From Councillor RG Allen addressed to the Leader of the Council

In view of the fact that Earl Shilton Town Council appears to have lost somewhere in the region of £180k (one hundred and eighty thousand pounds) in S106 developer contributions earmarked towards the provision of a much needed sports pavilion, can the Leader please confirm whether the Barwell and Earl Shilton Area Action Plan, being so far behind the promised schedule, was a contributing factor. My point being that it would appear that Earl Shilton Town Council was unable to finalise plans and submit a planning application due to the uncertainty over the route of an access road over the recreation ground linking to the proposed Earl Shilton SUE. Would it be reasonable to suggest that this should not have been a problem had the AAP been completed within in the published time scales?

Response from Councillor SL Bray

The timing of the Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan **is not** a contributing factor towards the Earl Shilton Town Council not securing the S106 contribution referred to.

This particular s106 agreement included a contribution of £150,000 towards community facilities . This definition would have enabled the monies to have been spent on a wide range of relevant projects and was not specific to the delivery of a sports pavilion. It is acknowledged that Earl Shilton Town Council has an aspiration to deliver a sports pavilion at Weavers Springs Recreation Ground. However, there was sufficient flexibility within the s106 agreement for the Town Council to make full use of these funds on an appropriate alternative in the event that they were unable to deliver their Pavilion project within the timescales associated with that particular s106 agreement.

I understand the Town Council were prompted about the need to commit the funds on a number of occasions preceding the deadline for clawback of the funds.

The Council's preferred option masterplan for the Earl Shilton SUE was first published in October 2010 and showed the proposed route at the northern edge of Weavers Springs Recreation Ground, linking the SUE to Astley Road. This masterplan was built into the consultation draft Area Action Plan in December 2010 and remains unchanged in the pre-submission draft Area Action Plan. This is a long established element of the Earl Shilton SUE masterplan proposals. The delays to the AAP, which have been the result of Leicestershire County Council's requirement for the use of the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model, have not changed this position in any way between October 2010 and now.

The exact alignment of this road proposal will not be established until a detailed planning application has been submitted for this element of the SUE. However, this would not have prevented a planning application for a Pavilion at Weavers Springs from being progressed by Earl Shilton Town Council within a timescale that could have enabled the use of the Montgomery Gardens s106 funds. The proposal would have needed to demonstrate that it would not jeopardise the comprehensive delivery of the SUE proposal. Indeed, I understand that the Town Council has actually now submitted a planning application for the development of a pavilion at Weavers Springs which has sought to do just that.

- (e) From Councillor LJP O'Shea addressed to the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services

Can the Executive Member please confirm the number of actual hours (not including travelling time) of parking enforcement allocated to Ratby and Groby per week and whether this just covers "office hours", because people who tell me they rarely if ever see the wardens in Ratby, believe there is no out of hours enforcement. As a result we have to contend with situations such as a complete disregard in the evening for the double yellow lines outside the chip shop on Main Street, Ratby on a dangerous bend. Can regular out of hours enforcement in such cases be arranged or not?

Response from Councillor WJ Crooks

Members are reminded that on street enforcement is a Leicestershire County Council responsibility as the Highways Authority – not HBBC, and that the Borough Council have no control over where or when on street enforcement takes place on the highway. Our only jurisdiction is for car parks in our ownership.

We are, however, provided with both the on street and out our car park enforcement activities and can advise the hours spend on street for the first six months on this year are:-

- 12hrs 25 mins in Ratby, during which seven Parking Contravention Notices (PCN) were issued.
- 18hrs 45 mins in Groby, during which 30 PCN's were issued.

The comment from LCC's Traffic and Safety Manager Greg Payne is:

"Leicestershire County Council (LCC) has previously organised our of hours

enforcement in Ratby at the request of local Members. This proved to have an impact when the enforcement officers were on site, with very few enforceable contraventions taking place whilst the enforcement officers were visible. A 90 minute evening patrol in the area in June 2012, produced on Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) outside the chip shop and 1 PCN at another location on Main Street.

Any decision on the on-street deployment of enforcement resources is the responsibility of LCC. We cannot commit to undertaking regular out of hours enforcement at such locations, but would consider organising further out of hour ad hoc enforcement, something we are already looking at following contacts being made to LCC."

If Councillors wish for there to be a change to on-street enforcement, then they are recommended to contact LCC direct.

(f) From Councillor LJP O'Shea addressed to the Executive Member for Housing

In the light of the Executive's recent commitment to the Community Covenant (Armed Forces Covenant) can the Executive member please confirm the council's full commitment, not only to the letter of the Covenant but also to the spirit of the Covenant, particularly when addressing the housing needs of a member of the Armed Services who has served his Country on active duty and under enemy fire but now suffers from a debilitating medical condition.

Response from Councillor MT Mullaney

The aim of the community covenant is to encourage local communities to support the armed forces service community in their area and promote understanding and awareness among the public of issues affecting the armed forces community. I am pleased to advise you that HBBC supports the Community covenant in many ways, for example

- Support the National annual Armed Forces celebration event held every June
- £700 external funding was secured to enhance this years event
- Support Veterans at annual Remembrance Day event in November
- HBBC has a dedicated War Memorial Officer to ensure our war memorials are kept in good condition etc

Further, through the implementation of the Housing Act 1996 (additional preference for Armed Forces) (England) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/2989), the Council further supports the Community Covenant by including within its allocation scheme that persons who are in the statutory reasonable preference categories and in urgent housing need and who meet certain criteria regarding their army forces service receive additional preference for the allocation of accommodation. This includes those who are serving members of the regular forces who are suffering from a serious illness or disability which is wholly or partly attributable to their service and those who are former members of the regular forces.

(g) From Councillor PR Batty addressed to the Executive Member for Housing

Can the Executive member please advise me whether the Council's "Choice Based Letting" policy has proved to be of a positive benefit to this council or not? What I mean by this is whether more applicants from outside of the Borough have been allocated social housing within the Borough than those who have moved

elsewhere under the scheme. Specifically, can the Executive member please advise the council of the relevant numbers in respect of the rural areas, being mindful of the need to promote sustainable communities? Finally, can the Executive member please confirm that affordable homes provided under S106 agreements will not be advertised under the "Choice Based Letting" scheme unless positive high profile advertising for applicants with a local connection fails to find sufficient applicants?

Response from Councillor MT Mullaney

I can advise that in the year April 2012 to March 2013, 278 properties were allocated through the Choice Based Lettings scheme. Of these 264 were allocated to people who had a local connection to the Borough. Of the 14 properties that were allocated to people without a connection to the Borough, 11 had a connection to the subregion i.e. the county. Only 4 properties were allocated to people with no local connection to the subregion, these being people fleeing violence from other areas to whom we have a homeless duty and the allocation of sheltered schemes where there was no demand from people in either the Borough or the subregion.

In terms of the rural areas, of the 12 properties allocated to people without a HBBC connection, 7 of these were in the rural areas, with 6 of these having a connection to the sub region.

Properties developed under Section 106 agreements will continue to be advertised through the Choice Based Lettings scheme, with the local connection criteria contained in the Section 106 agreement included in the lettings criteria. This means that applicants who don't meet this criteria will not be allocated these properties. Choice Based Lettings is promoted through the council's and partners website. All have a responsibility to ensure local communities understand the process for applying for properties on new developments, including the Register Provider development partner, Parish and Borough councillors and officers.

(h) From Councillor PR Batty addressed to the Leader of the Council

Can the Leader please confirm in the light of recent Appeal decisions whether or not outline planning consents can safely be included in the Council's 5 year housing land supply figures, bearing in mind that Inspectors when challenged by applicants now tend to look at deliverable completions and can the Leader please confirm whether this council has in fact included outline planning consents in its' 5 year housing land calculations.

Should an Appeal Inspector reject the inclusion of outline planning consents in the 5 year housing land supply figures, could the Leader please confirm what the council's 5 year housing land supply would actually be?

Response from Councillor SL Bray

I can confirm to Members that the council has a 5 year supply of land. Furthermore, I can confirm that outline planning consents can be included in the Council's five year housing land supply figures. The NPPF states 'sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until planning permission expires'. The council has followed this guidance and included sites with outline planning permission unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years.

At the most recent planning appeals within our borough (261 Main Street, Stanton Under Bardon; Land east of Groby Road Cemetery, Ratby; Land at Shilton Road, Barwell) all the Inspectors concluded that outline planning permissions could be included within the five year housing land supply. Indeed the principles of paragraph 47 of the NPPF which states that 'sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years' were applied by all parties and the Inspectorate in all these cases.

I think the final part of your question is immaterial considering the answers I have just given regarding the inclusion of outline planning permissions within the calculation.

(i) From Councillor C Ladkin addressed to the Leader of the Council

Bearing in mind the difficult challenges faced in providing renewable energy within the Borough, should this Council take the sensible approach of introducing a supplementary planning policy for new planning applications for commercial, industrial and other employment sites compelling applicants to include appropriate renewable energy initiatives within applications, such as appropriate sized wind turbines, solar panels, heat exchangers or ground source heat pumps etc?

It would appear that opportunities have been missed, for example while the Borough Council included solar panels on the roof of its' new offices at the hub were all other opportunities for including renewable energy initiatives fully maximised and was this a consideration at the Council's new depot?

It would also appear that Mira who the Borough Council have supported so well, despite alluding to be a hi-tech futuristic development and employment site and a major energy user are very reluctant to include let alone maximise renewable energy initiatives on their vast site, allegedly being opposed to wind turbines and solar panels as Mira believes they are not visually attractive on the landscape.

Would the Leader agree that developments such as this with so much potential on site should be making a major contribution to the Borough's renewable energy targets by including renewable energy initiatives on its site and can the Council meet with Mira to encourage them to do so?

Response from Councillor SL Bray

I am pleased there has been real progress in developing our policy approach on renewable energy from the work of the cross party Renewable Energy Task and Finish Group. I agree that it would be a good idea to have a supplementary planning document (SPD) on renewable energy however we firstly need to adopt a renewable energy policy, as the purpose of an SPD is to provide additional detail and guidance for developers on how they can meet the requirements of the policy, so there firstly needs to be a policy in place before an SPD can be prepared. I will ask Officers within the Planning Service to schedule this work into their work programme.

Regarding the Council's property, Members should note that the Hub is predicted to deliver BREEAM Excellent without the introduction of renewable energy. The decision to include Photovoltaic roofs was made much later on as an addition to

the project as an additional investment for the project. With regard to the Depot, I have been advised that following a cost benefit analysis, it was decided not to install appropriate renewable energy into the project specification as this would have meant that the build costs would have exceeded the amount required to give the Council the target £500,000 net capital receipt from the re-location of the depot from the current Middlefield Lane site as agreed by Members in agreeing the Council's capital programme. However the same priority methodology was followed at the project feasibility stage as was carried out for the Hinckley Hub. Renewable energies are one of a number of factors to consider when procuring a building project and should be considered once the lean and clean solutions have been considered first.

1. **Be lean:** Energy demand reduction through consideration of passive design principles. In the case of the Jubilee Building challenging the office and operational areas and reducing them wherever possible with the use of reduced storage, office accommodation and car parking. Reducing the footprint of the operational site reduces the amount of materials in the project build and size of accommodation requiring heating / lighting etc.

2. **Be Clean:** Promote energy efficiency through specification of engineering services and consideration of clean technologies. In the case of the Jubilee Building a modern BMS (Building management System). Energy efficient boilers, lighting systems and heat exchangers on extracted / incoming airflow

3. **Be Green:** Consideration of renewable energy to enhance the carbon emissions ratings once stages 1 & 2 have been assessed. In the case of the Jubilee Buildings no renewable energy systems were specified. It is worth noting that there is substantial cost in obtaining BREEAM certificate. In the case of the Hinckley Hub this cost was carried by the developers MRP Development Limited.

With regard to your points about MIRA, I will take this up directly with their senior representatives to seek their commitment to high quality, sustainable development.

8. TO RECEIVE THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITION STATEMENT.

Madam Mayor, Fellow Councillors, Officers, Members of the Public and Media.

Tonight marks two 'firsts': the first meeting of the Council in the Hinckley Hub and your first full meeting as the Mayor of this Borough. I am sure that, despite the length and complexity of the agenda before us, you will ensure that business is conducted fairly, but also efficiently.

I think all Members will join me in welcoming the move to this new energy efficient building. Not only have Borough Council teams moved into the Hub, but both Adult Social Care and Children's Services teams have relocated from their County Council bases and have been welcomed into the building. We also have family workers engaged in the locality-managed Supporting Leicestershire Families initiative and other agencies will be hot-desking as part of the Community Safety 'Endeavour' programme. By the end of September, JobCentre Plus will have relocated to the Ground Floor and we will be nearing 100% occupancy. This will bring immediate financial savings to all the public bodies located in the Hub. The next step, of course, will be to begin to integrate those functions and teams around the people and communities on whom they can have the greatest impact, thereby improving further the overall efficiency and effectiveness of public services in Hinckley and Bosworth; Community Budgeting made a reality!

Can I thank those Officers who have been particularly involved in the effective delivery of

this project – the Assets Team, led by Malcolm Evans, and the ICT Team (vital to any such project, but often forgotten), led by Paul Langham.

The Chief Executive and I attended the recent annual LGA Conference in Manchester, which was generally low-key; perhaps not surprisingly, given the announcements in the Spending review for 2015/16, made the previous week. Steve and I did pick up on a number of leads from the Exhibition, which we will follow up with Members in due course, on Community Covenant and various benchmarking tools. We heard also Lord Heseltine's view of how the country might make progress on economic development and regeneration nationally and locally. Whilst there may be little disagreement with his prescription of the 'Single Local Pot', I think most of us will have a disagreement with his view of how that might be governed – via the unelected Local Enterprise Partnerships and with Districts subsumed within new County Unitaries. As you might imagine, there was some clear division in the audience when he made that latter point; but it is one he has made before and not one which is shared by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Speaking of whom, Mr Pickles was the centre of attention for Districts during the Conference, both for his main address on the Wednesday and for his appearance, with Brandon Lewis, at the District Councils' Network Assembly on the Thursday. The reason for his 'celebrity' was his defence of the 'hidden' announcement the previous Thursday on New Homes Bonus and the use of up to 40% of it from 2015/16 to support Lord Heseltine's 'Single Pot', much reduced from his recommended £70 billion to a figure of £2 billion! This announcement contradicts Mr Pickles' clear statement at the Conference in 2012, where he pledged that Districts would continue to receive 80% of the 'bonus' for six years. Both of these promises have been shot down by the announcement in the Spending Review.

As Members are aware, whilst this Council is one of the few which reallocates some of this income (25%) to those Parishes and communities who accept housing growth in their areas, the rest of the income is used, legitimately within the rules, to support revenue expenditure across our services. Passporting up to 40% of our total 'bonus' will seriously affect our income projections, once the term of our current Medium Term Financial Strategy is completed. In 2013/14 alone the total 'bonus' for this Council is over £1 million. Whilst I am confident that our Officers, particularly in Finance, Planning and Housing, will address this issue, using the sound basis in the current MTFs, which Members will discuss later this evening, it is yet another example of the 'smoke and mirrors' tactics of a central Government, which again and again squeezes local authorities tighter than the rest of the public sector. Perhaps our biggest weakness, especially in this Council, is that again and again we absorb the pain and continue to meet all our objectives and the needs of our communities... but it is getting much harder!

I have mentioned growth already, and we continue to be active players in the City Deal discussions either side of the A5. The timetables, set nationally, for these negotiations are now in parallel – with final submissions to the 'Ad Hoc Ministerial Group' (AMG) being around October this year. Whilst the 'pot' available from 2015 might not be what we once envisaged, it will be up for grabs, and there is every indication that it will grow thereafter. So, we need to put this Council in the best position possible to ensure that we get our fair share (and more, if we can!) and being part of a City Deal will enhance that potential. I expect that I will be presenting more information on this initiative to Members over the summer.

Madam Mayor, I commend this statement to the Council.

23. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

To agree membership of committees as follows (those with changes are indicated, the remainder are included for completeness):

(1) Planning Committee (17 Members)

Cllr R Mayne (Chairman); Cllr DM Taylor (Vice-Chairman); Cllr RG Allen; Cllr JG Bannister; Cllr T Chastney; Cllr WJ Crooks; Cllr A Hall; Cllr M Hulbert; Cllr DW Inman; Cllr KWP Lynch; Cllr J Moore; Cllr K Morrell; Cllr LJP O'Shea; Cllr H Smith, Cllr BE Sutton; Cllr R Ward; Cllr BM Witherford.

(2) Scrutiny Commission (12 Members)

Cllr MR Lay (Chairman); Cllr C Ladkin (Vice-Chairman); Cllr DM Taylor (Vice-Chairman); Cllr PR Batty; Cllr PS Bessant; Cllr MB Cartwright; Cllr A Hall; Cllr M Hulbert; Cllr DW Inman; Cllr JS Moore; Cllr K Morrell; Cllr K Nichols.

(3) Hinckley Area Committee (10 Members)

Cllr SL Bray (Chairman); Cllr L Hodgkins (Vice-Chairman); Cllr JG Bannister; Cllr DC Bill; Cllr DS Cope; Cllr KWP Lynch; Cllr MT Mullaney; Cllr K Nichols; Cllr DM Taylor; Cllr BM Witherford.

(4) Licensing Committee (11 Members)

Cllr K Nichols (Chairman); Cllr M Hulbert (Vice-Chairman); Cllr PR Batty; Cllr SL Bray; Cllr MB Cartwright; Cllr DM Gould, Cllr MT Mullaney; Cllr LJP O'Shea; Cllr J Richards; Cllr H Smith; Cllr S Sprason.

(5) Licensing (Regulatory) Committee (11 Members)

Cllr K Nichols (Chairman); Cllr M Hulbert (Vice-Chairman); Cllr PR Batty; Cllr SL Bray; Cllr MB Cartwright; Cllr DM Gould, Cllr MT Mullaney; Cllr LJP O'Shea; Cllr J Richards; Cllr H Smith; Cllr S Sprason.

(6) Ethical Governance & Personnel Committee (9 Members) (change in membership)

Cllr DW Inman (Chairman); Cllr R Camamile; Cllr WA Hall; Cllr KWP Lynch; Cllr JS Moore (replacing Cllr Bill); Cllr LJP O'Shea; Cllr J Richards (filling vacancy), Cllr R Ward; Cllr BM Witherford.

(7) Finance, Audit & Performance Committee (7 Members) (change in membership)

Cllr DM Taylor (Chairman); Cllr R Mayne (Vice-Chairman); Cllr PR Batty (filling vacancy); Cllr R Camamile; Cllr P Hall; Cllr JS Moore (replacing Cllr Bannister); Cllr K Morrell.

23a Outside Bodies

To appoint representatives for the Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Board, as part of the new Voluntary and Community Sector arrangements established for Hinckley and Bosworth, and to amend membership of the Hinckley Highways Forum to maintain political balance.

(a) Voluntary and Community Sector Commissioning Board

The Executive has recommended that Councillors Keith Lynch and Bron Witherford be appointed as the Council's representatives.

(b) Hinckley Highways Forum (9)

Cllr RG Allen, Cllr WJ Crooks, Cllr DM Gould, Cllr PAS Hall, Cllr DW Inman, Cllr MR Lay, Cllr K Morrell, Cllr BE Sutton and Cllr BM Witherford.

Substitutes (9):

Cllr PS Bessant (for Cllr Allen), Cllr MB Cartwright (for Cllr Crooks), Cllr MS Hulbert (for Cllr Gould), Cllr K Nichols (for Cllr PAS Hall), Cllr R Mayne (for Cllr Inman), Cllr PR Batty (for Cllr Morrell), Cllr R Ward (for Cllr Sutton), Cllr DS Cope (for Cllr Witherford).

(Cllr Batty replacing Cllr Moore as substitute for Cllr Morrell).

This page is intentionally left blank