

HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

23 FEBRUARY 2012 AT 6.30 PM

PRESENT: MR R MAYNE - MAYOR
MR MB CARTWRIGHT – DEPUTY MAYOR

Mr RG Allen, Mr JG Bannister, Mr PR Batty, Mr Bessant, Mr DC Bill,
Mr SL Bray, Mrs R Camamile, Mrs T Chastney, Mr DS Cope,
Mr WJ Crooks, Mr DM Gould, Mr PAS Hall, Mrs WA Hall,
Mrs L Hodgkins, Mr MS Hulbert, Mr DW Inman, Mr C Ladkin,
Mr MR Lay, Mr KWP Lynch, Mr JS Moore, Mr K Morrell,
Mr MT Mullaney, Mr LJP O'Shea, Mrs J Richards, Mrs H Smith,
Mrs S Sprason, Mr BE Sutton, Miss DM Taylor, Mr R Ward and
Ms BM Witherford

Officers in attendance: Steve Atkinson, Ilyas Bham, Adam Bottomley, Michael Brymer,
David Bunker, Bill Cullen, Sanjiv Kohli, David Potter and Julie Stay

387 PRESENTATION

The Mayor presented Irene Ashton with the Colin Smith Memorial Award in recognition of her outstanding contribution to her community.

388 APOLOGIES

Apologies were submitted on behalf of Councillors Boothby and Nichols.

389 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 DECEMBER 2011

On the motion of Mr Bray, seconded by Ms Witherford, it was

RESOLVED – the minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2011 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

390 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Smith and Sprason declared a personal interest in the budget items as council tenants.

Councillor Allen declared a personal interest in the same items as the lessee of a garage from the council.

391 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor paid tribute to past Mayor Brian Edwards who had recently passed away and provided details of the funeral arrangements for those who wished to attend.

He congratulated Councillor Bill on his MBE and Councillor Bessant and his wife on the birth of their son.

The Mayor listed his forthcoming charity events including the fashion show on 13 March, indoor bowls evening and carvery on 29 March, curry night on 24 April and civic service on 29 April.

392 QUESTIONS RECEIVED UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.1

- a) Question asked by Councillor MR Lay and addressed to the Executive Member for Finance

“What progress has been made in awarding the lowest paid staff at HBBC (those earning below £21k) a cost of living increase as sanctioned by the government? I raised this issue last year at a Finance and Audit Committee meeting following a report to the committee indicating a large revenue underspend. No report back has been given. Thank you”

Response from Councillor KWP Lynch

“Whilst central government recommended a payment of £250 for those earning under £21,000 the National Joint Council (NJC), who represents local authorities and is the employers negotiating body, had not agreed this as part of the pay deal. However the NJC in preparation for the pay negotiations for 2012/13 has consulted employers and a discussion has again taken place to consider paying £250 to those staff whose earnings are below £21,000. We are still waiting to here from NJC.

Outside of this, and following Cllr Lay raising this at Finance and Audit Services Select Committee, the Council implemented a local arrangement whereby all staff who earned under £21,000 were paid a one off amount for 2011/12 of £125 in December 2011. 245 employees received this payment with the total cost being £37,883 (including on costs).”

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Lynch confirmed that should a similar revenue underspend be repeated the same action would be taken.

- b) Question asked by Councillor MR Lay and addressed to the Executive Member for Finance

“From 2001 to 2010 HBBC received significant sums of additional finance to support capital projects from the government and regional development bodies. Could he indicate all the projects with grants of over £50,000 that the Council were awarded during this period and the projects the money was assigned to”

Response from Councillor KWP Lynch

“The total amount of capital funding received between 2001 and 2010 by this Council is £13,899,469 as follows:

2000/01	104,992
2001/02	239,171
2002/03	376,333
2003/04	758,774
2004/05	653,079
2005/06	465,999
2006/07	1,727,113
2007/08	1,051,370
2008/09	1,575,958
2009/10	4,016,755
2010/11	2,929,925
Total	13,899,469

The breakdown is :-

year	cap scheme	funding body	Amount
2000/01	renovation grants	Cent Govt	104,992
2000/01	Total		104,992
2001/02	cctv car parks	Cent Govt	27,939
2001/02	cctv Earl Shilton / Barwell	Cent Govt	65,831
2001/02	renovation grants	Cent Govt	100,233
2001/02	Historic Towns	Cent Govt (SRB6)	25,168
2001/02	Hill Hole Quarry	EMDA	20,000
2001/02	Total		239,171
2002/03	Implementing E Government	Cent Govt	200,000
2002/03	renovation grants	Cent Govt	123,433
2002/03	Hill Hole Quarry	EMDA	52,900
2002/03	Total		376,333
2003/04	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	105,001
2003/04	Implementing E Government	Cent Govt	200,000
2003/04	Community Park Barwell	Countryside Agcy	63,000
2003/04	Hill Hole Quarry	EMDA	17,112
2003/04	Druid Quarter	HERS	25,217
2003/04	Historic Buildings Hinck.	HERS	21,219
2003/04	Dodwells Bridge Ind Plot	LSEP	327,225
2003/04	Total		758,774
2004/05	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	105,000
2004/05	Implementing E Government	Cent Govt	400,000
2004/05	Planning Delivery Grant	Cent Govt	44,000
2004/05	Hill Hole Quarry	EMDA	23,965
2004/05	Druid Quarter	HERS	40,340
2004/05	Dodwells Bridge Ind Plot	LSEP	39,775
2004/05	Total		653,079
2005/06	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	105,000
2005/06	Implementing E Government	Cent Govt	234,611
2005/06	Public Realm	EMDA	43,602
2005/06	Druid Quarter - Factories	Eng Heritage	61,179
2005/06	Boston Way Play Area	Groundwork UK	21,607
2005/06	Total		465,999
2006/07	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	105,000
2006/07	Implementing E Government	Cent Govt	65,389
2006/07	Atkins Site Purchase	EMDA	1,365,450
2006/07	Druid Quarter - Factories	Eng Heritage	71,914
2006/07	Public Realm	LCC	119,360
2006/07	Total		1,727,113
2007/08	Decent Homes	Cent Govt	28,189
2007/08	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	150,000
2007/08	Atkins Site Purchase	EMDA	761,000
2007/08	Druid Quarter - Factories	Eng Heritage	50,000
2007/08	Recycling Containers	LCC	32,180
2007/08	CCTV	LPU	30,000
2007/08	Total		1,051,370
2008/09	Decent Homes	Cent Govt	116,003
2008/09	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	150,000
2008/09	Atkins Site Purchase	EMDA	309,056
2008/09	Atkins Building	Eng Heritage	27,537
2008/09	cctv	LAA capital	17,800
2008/09	Langdale Rec	Lottery	41,945
2008/09	Wykin Park	Lottery	39,050
2008/09	Atkins Building	LSEP	834,567
2008/09	general capital	psa award	20,000
2008/09	cctv	psa award 07/08	20,000
2008/09	Total		1,575,958
2009/10	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	150,000

2009/10	Renovation grants Decent	Cent Govt	557,267
2009/10	Atkins Building	College Conts	130,333
2009/10	Waste Vehicle	LCC	70,000
2009/10	Clarendon Park / Langdale	Lottery	9,536
2009/10	Atkins Building	LSEP	2,851,972
2009/10	Greenfields	LSEP	247,647
2009/10	Total		4,016,755
2010/11	Decent Homes	Cent Govt	277,886
2010/11	Disabled Facilities grants	Cent Govt	150,000
2010/11	Atkins Building	College Conts	87,992
2010/11	Earl Shilton Masterplan	Growth Point	300,000
2010/11	Queens Park	Lottery	50,000
2010/11	Greenfields	LSEP	1,838,387
2010/11	Shared Revenues and Benefits	RIEP	225,659
2010/11	Total		2,929,925
	Grand Total		13,899,469

In his supplementary question, Councillor Lay asked if similar grants were anticipated in future. In response it was stated that this was extremely unlikely.

c) Questions asked by Councillor S Sprason and addressed to the Leader of Council

“With the changes in the Welfare Reform Bill that devolves funding to this authority. Will the leader resist putting this funding into the general fund and agree that:

- a) The Community Care Grant will be ring fenced to support vulnerable people as intended
- b) That pensioners continue to receive the same level of assistance that they currently receive under Council Tax benefit
- c) That the extra £35,600 Disabled Facilities Grant will be used to reduce the DFG waiting list?”

Response from Councillor KWP Lynch

“I thank Cllr Mrs Sprason for her question sent to the Leader of the Council. I am however uncertain as to which parts of the Welfare Bill she is referring to. The second part of her question regarding Council Tax benefit support for pensioners is part of the Finance Bill on the Localisation of Council Tax Support and the third part of her question regarding the extra Disability Facilities Grant has nothing to do with any Bill as this is simply a further allocation to the ring fenced grant already received by this Council in the current financial year. I will however answer Cllr Mrs Sprason’s specific questions as follows:

a)& b) The Council will administer Community Care Grants and Council Tax Benefit for low income pensioners as required by legislation and treat any resulting grant or reimbursement in the way required or intended. The proposal contained in the Finance Bill regarding localising support for Council Tax benefit protects pensioners.

c) Yes the additional DFG will be used to reduce the waiting list.”

Councillor Sprason, by way of supplementary question, asked whether a line could be included in the budget so it could be monitored. Councillor Lynch

provided a response then later corrected himself, stating that this was already included.

- d) Question asked by Councillor K Morrell and addressed to the Executive Member for Rural Affairs

“Could the Executive Member for Rural Affairs please inform me how much the Parish & Community Initiative Fund spends on plaques for successful bids?”

Response from Councillor WJ Crooks

“The plaques now cost £25 each. The total cost of the provision of plaques for successful applications for 2011/12, therefore, will be £525 for the 21 grants, compared with the total of grants awarded of £104,130. Whilst costs could be reduced by issuing laminated paper certificates, these would not have the longevity of the metal plaques and have limited value in promoting the fund or in recognising the support the Borough Council offers to rural areas.”

In a supplementary question, Councillor Morrell asked whether consideration could be given to ceasing provision of plaques and putting that money back into the scheme. In response Councillor Crooks expressed his view that HBBC should get recognition for the provision of the grants, and he explained that the costs had reduced since moving from metal to plastic plaques. However he did commit to asking the Executive to re-consider the matter.

393 LEADER OF THE COUNCIL'S POSITION STATEMENT

In his position statement, the Leader of the Council congratulated Irene Ashton on being awarded the Colin Smith award, Councillor Bill on his MBE, Councillor Bessant on the birth of his son, and Mike Brymer and his team for their excellent services and increased customer satisfaction. The Leader thanked Sanjiv Kohli and Councillor Lynch for their work on the budget and highlighted the intention to freeze Council Tax again this year. He also made reference to the suggested contribution to rural broadband and the recent arrest of three people for theft of lead from church roofs in Hinckley.

Councillor Bessant responded by supporting the freeze in Council tax, echoing the congratulations offered to Councillor Bill and thanking everyone for their good wishes.

Councillor Lay supported the congratulatory comments already made, and spoke in support of all employees in Business, Contract and Street Scene Services who had contributed to the high achievement in the service and were a credit to the authority.

394 MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission introduced the minutes of the meetings held on 8 December 2011 and 5 & 19 January 2012. He highlighted the ongoing reviews into fuel poverty, care for people with dementia and the newly convened Barwell and Earl Shilton Scrutiny Group which would provide valuable input into the development of the SUEs.

395 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Members received a report which presented the proposed HBBC Pay Policy Statement for 2012/13 in line with Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 which required the statement

to be prepared in order to be transparent and accountable with regard to how local authorities pay and reward their workforce.

On the motion of Ms Witherford, seconded by Mr Bray, it was

RESOLVED – the HBBC Pay Policy Statement for 2012/13 be approved.

396 FINANCE ISSUES INCLUDING BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX

The Executive Member for Finance gave his budget speech, stating that whilst separate reports, the following seven items all related to the same budget and as such they would be discussed and voted on together. For the purpose of these minutes the discussion and voting are recorded as one, but the resolutions are set out under each separate item.

The Executive Member reminded Council that an amendment to the HRA subsidy buyout recommendation (c) had been tabled which provided for consultation with the Scrutiny Commission / Finance, Audit & Performance Committee before a decision being made by the Executive with the (non-voting) involvement of the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Group and Chair of Scrutiny Commission.

With regard to Council tax, it was stated that this had again been frozen in line with Government recommendations in response to concerns about the public being under pressure in the current economic climate.

During discussion on the seven reports, the following points were made and questions raised:

- The importance of ensuring a large part of the income was not being spent to service debt;
- Support for the amended recommendation on the HRA subsidy buyout;
- The need to ensure residents were aware of the implications of options for use of the Argents Mead site;
- Whether the cost of demolition anticipated for the current council offices was still valid;
- The risk of eroding the Council tax base by maintaining 0% increases and risk that the public will have this expectation for future years;
- Concern whether the decrease in the budget for Disabled Facilities Grants would lead to increased waiting lists;
- Whether potential income from the Community Infrastructure Levy had been factored into the budget papers;
- The timing for a decision on future leisure centre provision bearing in mind the impending end of the current contract and how this would be financed given the lack of capital funding;
- Where funding for the sustainable urban extensions would come from particularly as the core strategy had identified the cost of development.

Mrs Richards left the meeting at 7.59pm.

In response, the Executive Member for Finance made the following points:

- In four to five years the leisure centre would require major work costing between £4m and £6m which had to be weighed up against the cost of a new leisure centre for approximately £10m. Initial appraisals would be completed within the next couple of months.

- The projected costs of demolishing the current council offices had been checked again and were still accurate.
- There would still be no waiting list for Disabled Facilities Grants.
- Income from the Community Infrastructure Levy had not been included in the projections as there was no CIL Charging Structure in place at the present time and would not be included until after 2014.
- Development in the sustainable urban extensions would be funded by the private sector, mostly by the developers. The core strategy had merely identified the infrastructure schedule and showed costs of development but did not indicate an intention for the authority to fund the development. It was agreed that this would be discussed and a response sent to all Members to clarify.

Mr Ladkin left the meeting at 8.29pm.

On reaching the end of discussion and a vote on all seven items, including the amended recommendation regarding the HRA subsidy buyout, Mr Bray along with a further seven Members requested that voting be recorded.

The vote was taken as follows:

Mr Bannister, Mr Bill, Mr Bray, Mr Cartwright, Mr Cope, Mr Crooks, Mr Gould, Mrs Hall, Mr Hall, Mrs Hodgkins, Mr Hulbert, Mr Inman, Mr Lynch, Mr Mullaney, Miss Taylor and Ms Witherford voted FOR the motion (16);

Mr Allen and Mrs Smith voted AGAINST the motion (2);

Mr Batty, Mr Bessant, Mrs Camamile, Mrs Chastney, Mr Lay, Mr Moore, Mr Morrell, Mr O'Shea, Mrs Sprason, Mr Sutton and Mr Ward abstained from voting.

The motions were therefore CARRIED and resolved as recorded under each separate minute below.

397 GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2012-2013

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED –

- (i) The General Fund Revenue Budgets be approved;
- (ii) The Special Expenses area expenditure be approved;
- (iii) The total General Fund service expenditure for the Council be approved;
- (iv) The proposed movement of General Fund Reserves as set out in appendix C to the report be approved.

398 CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012 TO 2014/15

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED -

- (i) the Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2014/15 be approved;

- (ii) the financial implications be noted.

399 HRA SUBSIDY BUYOUT

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED –

- (i) the authority buys itself out of the current Housing Revenue Account Subsidy system at a cost of £67.652m as per the Communities and Local Government (CLG) HRA Self Financing Determination on 28 March 2012;
- (ii) the authority borrows up to £67.652m from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) to finance the buy out payment on 26 March 2012 (the loan being advanced on 28 March 2012);
- (iii) the determination of the structure of the borrowing be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Direction), Deputy Chief Executive (Community Direction), Executive Member for Finance and Executive Member for Housing to make recommendations to a Joint Scrutiny Commission / Finance, Audit & Performance meeting to advise the Executive, who will make the final decision with the (non-voting) involvement of the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition Group and Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission;
- (iv) the debt be repaid over a maximum period of 25 years.

400 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED – the budgets presented in the annexes to the report be approved.

401 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2011/12 TO 2014/15

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED – the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved.

402 THE PRUDENTIAL CODE FOR CAPITAL FINANCE IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES - SETTING OF PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2011/12 - 2014/15 AND TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2012/13 - 2014/15

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED – the key elements of the report be noted:

- (i) the prudential indicators and limits for 2011/12 to 2014/15 contained within section 3 part A of the report, including authorised limit prudential indicator;
- (ii) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement contained within section 3 part A of the report which sets out the Council's policy on MRP;
- (iii) the Treasury Management Strategy 2011/12 to 2014/15 and the treasury prudential indicators contained within section 3 part B of the report;
- (iv) the investment strategy contained in the treasury management strategy part 3 section B of the report and the detailed strategy at appendix 1.

403 COUNCIL TAX SETTING

Following discussion on all budget-related reports as one and a recorded vote as recorded above, it was

RESOLVED – in accordance with sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended):

- (i) the Council's budget requirement as set out in the General Fund Revenue Budget 2012/13, excluding Special Expenses and Parish Councils be £9,825,274;
- (ii) the Council's budget requirement as set out in the General Fund Revenue Budget 2012/13, including Special Expenses, be £10,435,734;
- (iii) the Council's total net budget requirement including Special Expenses and Parish Councils be £11,940,670;
- (iv) the contribution from Revenue Support Grant and Non Domestic Rates be £5,372,446;
- (v) a surplus of £20,000 on the Collection Fund be transferred to an earmarked reserve in accordance with Council policy in 2012/13;
- (vi) the Council Tax for Borough wide services, excluding Special Expenses and Parish Council precepts, for Band D be £95.96;
- (vii) the Council Tax for Borough wide services and an average of Special Expenses services for Band D be £112.17;
- (viii) the basic amount of Council Tax, being the tax relating to Borough wide services and an average of Special Expenses and Parish Council services for Band D be £152.12;
- (ix) the total Council Tax, including amounts for the County Council, Police Authority and Fire Authority and for each area and valuation band be approved as contained within appendix A to the report;
- (x) the calculation of the estimated surplus on the Collection Fund be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Direction) and

the surplus be transferred to the Pension Reserve in accordance with the Council's policy.

404 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2012/2013

Members were presented with the draft calendar of meetings 2012/13. It was moved by Ms Witherford and seconded by Mr Bray that the meeting of Council in July be amended and brought forward to 19 June. This amendment was accepted. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission requested that the dates of the July and August Commission meetings be changed, and it was agreed that this would be discussed outside of the meeting. It was therefore

RESOLVED – the calendar of meetings for 2012/13 be agreed with the abovementioned amendment to the date of Council in July 2012 and subject to the change in dates of the Scrutiny Commission in July and August 2012.

405 MOTIONS RECEIVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES 13.1 AND 13.2

Motion from Councillors MR Lay and S Sprason

“Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council is alarmed at the decision of Leicestershire County Council (LCC), who in removing the assisted home to school bus service which takes children from Field Head to Groby Community College is now seeking to charge £400 a year for a safe travel to school option which for many years had been provided by the County Council as a right.

This decision was taken midway through the school year causing hardship for parents and yet in a similar case the free bus from Kirby Muxloe to Groby has been allowed to continue until the end of the school year. At a minimum the route should qualify for assistance as other historic exception routes do and continue as stated in the final report of the LCC scrutiny review panel on home to school transport. We believe that the qualifying criteria are met by this route and the failure not to acknowledge this falls foul of the Equalities Act 2010.

The County Council has claimed the route from Field Head to Groby is “suitable” and available for children to walk almost 3 miles to school but do not regard safety to be an issue while many reasoned neutral observers would totally disagree with the assessment that the route is either “suitable” or safe for children to walk.

The route leads children to walk right alongside the A50 one the busiest stretches of road in the County carrying over 24,000 vehicles per day, many travelling along a good part of the route in excess of the speed limit and with the footpath running right alongside. A section of the route on the steep gradient of Bradgate Hill is a recognised accident hot-spot known by locals as “Accident Alley” which claimed another fatality as recently as Tuesday 7th February 2012. The aftermath caused the route to be closed to vehicles and pedestrians for over 7 hours.

The irony is that the school transport that is provided for eligible children by LCC school bus that children at Field Head used is the same bus that picks up children from Markfield and this assisted service will continue. However this bus will now pass Field Head children being exposed to having to walk along this dangerous route, with obviously visible empty seats as most parents in these difficult times cannot afford the £400 extra now being demanded from them, in some cases for 2 children. A ridiculous situation from which there is no gain for the County Council who will not achieve any additional revenue while no additional cost is incurred by having to continue to provide

the assisted bus service, which has existed since Markfield and Field Head children began attending Groby Community College many years ago. The only negative impact with potentially serious consequences are the children who are being encouraged to walk to and from school along what is potentially a very dangerous route as borne out by an independent Risk Assessment and recent fatalities.

The County Council should therefore reflect on the comments made in Parliament on the 10th of January 2012 by Andrew Bridgen MP (North West Leicestershire) who said that “under current guidelines common sense sometimes appears to go out the window” and Nicky Morgan MP (Loughborough) who said “Common sense has been lost as part of the debate in the County Council reviewing these routes”

The motion calls on the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council to

1. Make the strongest representations to the County Council asking them to revisit their decision on home to school transport removing the assisted transport service from Field Head to Groby CC, to put child welfare and safety at the top of its priorities, remind the County of the pressing nature of this issue, and reports back to this Council on its response as soon as possible.
2. To ask the County Council to comply in full to the statutory guidance in particular sections 82, 84, 85 & 86 provided on these matters by the Department for Education.
3. To ask the County Council to take into full consideration the data on the number of road traffic accidents on the route, the ever increasing volume and speed of the traffic travelling along the route and the percentage of it which is HGV traffic.
4. To ask if the 3 miles + safe walking route criteria apply to the Kirby Muxloe and Field Head route
5. To ask for copies of relevant equality impact assessments in regard to the County Council’s home to school transport policy + EIA for the above routes.”

Attention was drawn to an amendment to the motion contained within the late items which was proposed by Mr Cartwright and seconded by Mr Bray. The proposal was that the first paragraph be amended as follows:

“Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council ~~is alarmed at~~ **condemns** the decision of the **Conservative administration at** Leicestershire County Council (LCC), who in removing the assisted home to school bus service which takes children from Field Head to Groby Community College is now seeking to charge £400 a year for a safe travel to school option which for many years had been provided by the County Council as a right. **The Council further condemns the Conservative administration, including all the Conservative County Councillors representing electoral divisions in Hinckley & Bosworth, for failing to back an amendment to the 2012/13 budget which would have restored some of the cuts to school transport.**”

As the proposers of the original motion were not in support of the amendment it was put to the vote. Mr Bessant and five further Members requested that voting be recorded. The vote on the AMENDMENT was therefore recorded as follows:

Mr Bannister, Mr Bill, Mr Bray, Mr Cartwright, Mr Cope, Mr Crooks, Mr Gould, Mrs Hall, Mrs Hodgkins, Mr Hulbert, Mr Inman, Mr Lynch, Mr Mullaney, Miss Taylor and Ms Witherford voted FOR the amendment (15);

Mr Allen, Mr Batty, Mr Bessant, Mrs Camamile, Mrs Chastney, Mr Hall, Mr Lay, Mr Moore, Mr Morrell, Mr O'Shea, Mrs Smith, Mrs Sprason, Mr Sutton and Mr Ward voted AGAINST the amendment (14).

The AMENDMENT was therefore declared CARRIED and became the substantive motion.

The vote on the substantive motion was taken as follows:

Mr Bannister, Mr Bill, Mr Bray, Mr Cartwright, Mr Cope, Mr Crooks, Mr Gould, Mrs Hall, Mrs Hodgkins, Mr Hulbert, Mr Inman, Mr Lynch, Mr Mullaney, Miss Taylor and Ms Witherford voted FOR the motion (15);

Mr Allen, Mr Batty, Mr Bessant, Mrs Camamile, Mrs Chastney, Mr Hall, Mr Moore, Mr Morrell, Mr O'Shea, Mrs Smith, Mrs Sprason, Mr Sutton and Mr Ward voted AGAINST the motion (13);

Mr Lay abstained from voting.

It was therefore

RESOLVED – the motion as amended be agreed.

(The Meeting closed at 9.19 pm)

MAYOR