

ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

THURSDAY 25 OCTOBER 2012 AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor Layden (Chairman), Councillors Bainbridge (until 11.35am), Bowditch, Graham, McDevitt, Nedved (until 12.55pm), Watson and Whalen.

ALSO

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs Martlew - Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder
Councillor Glover – Economy and Enterprise Portfolio Holder
Councillor Betton - Observer
Councillor Lishman - Observer
Councillor Mallinson - Observer
Councillor Mitchelson - Observer

EEOSP.57/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence submitted.

EEOSP.58/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bainbridge declared an interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item A3 – Business Improvement District. The interest related to the fact that if there was a second ballot he would vote on behalf of his employer.

Councillor McDevitt declared a registrable interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item A.6 – Car Parking. The interest related to the fact that he was a Member of Cumbria County Council.

Councillor Watson declared a registrable interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item A.6 – Car Parking. The interest related to the fact that he was a Member of Cumbria County Council.

Councillor Whalen declared a registrable interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of agenda item A.6 – Car Parking. The interest related to the fact that he was a Member of Cumbria County Council.

EEOSP.59/12 AGENDA

RESOLVED – That Agenda items 4a and 4b – Transformation Savings be considered at the end of the agenda to allow for discussions to be moved into private if required.

EEOSP.60/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RESOLVED – (1) That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2012 be noted.

EEOSP.61/12 CALL IN OF DECISIONS

There were no matters which had been the subject of call in.

EEOSP.62/12 OVERVIEW REPORT INCORPORATING THE WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD PLAN ITEMS

The Overview and Scrutiny Officer (Mrs Edwards) presented report OS.24/12 which provided an overview of matters related to the Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Panel's work. Details of the latest version of the work programme were also included.

Mrs Edwards reported that:

- The Notice of Key Executive Decisions had been published on 1 October 2012. The items that related to the work of this Panel were:
 - KD.027/12 – Highways Claimed Rights Review – the matter had been considered by the Panel at their meeting on 13 September 2012. Comments were to be presented to the Executive at their meeting on 29 October 2012.
 - KD.033/12 – Budget Process 2012/13 – the item was on the agenda for the meeting of the Panel on 29 November 2012
 - KD.35/12 – Higher Level Stewardship Grant Offer – to be considered later in the meeting
 - KD.034/12 – Future Management of Allotments – Councillors Layden and Nedved attended the Joint Task Group meeting with the Portfolio Holder and Neighbourhood and Green Spaces Manager on 16 October 2012.
- Task and Finish Groups
 - Tourist Information Centre Task and Finish Group - Mrs Edwards informed Members that a visit by the Task and Finish Group to Tourist Information Centres in Skipton and Leeds had taken place on 24 September 2012. The Task Group were making arrangements to meet with the Portfolio Holder and would report their findings to the next meeting of the Panel on 22 November 2012.
 - Enterprise Centre – a visit to the Enterprise Centre had taken place on 2 October 2012 and was well attended. The Chairman, Vice Chairman, Scrutiny Officer and Director of Economic Development would undertake further work and report back to the Panel if necessary.
- Work Programme – Mrs Edwards presented the current work programme. She highlighted the number of items that were scheduled for the next agenda and suggested that the Waste Services and Use of Green Infrastructure items be moved to the January meeting.

RESOLVED –1) That, subject to the issues raised above, the Overview Report incorporating the Work Programme and Forward Plan items relevant to this Panel be noted.

2) That the Waste Services and Use of Green Infrastructure reports be considered by the Panel at their meeting on 17 January 2013.

EEOSP.63/12 SMALL SCALE COMMUNITY PROJECTS

The report of the Small Scale Community Projects Task and Finish Group had been circulated. The Lead Member, Councillor Bainbridge, thanked Councillor C Bowman, the Director of Local Environment and the Scrutiny Officer for their input and support in the work of the Task Group.

He commented that the Group had undertaken an open, honest and frank discussion regarding the Small Scale Community Projects and had recommended some slight amendments that would give Members more clarity regarding the scheme and assist in the administration of the awards. He added that the Task Group wanted to retain the Scheme and had made a recommendation to the Executive to include a non-recurring budget for 2013/14 of £40,000 for Members Small Scale Community Projects.

The Panel agreed that the budget was an exceptionally valuable resource and made a big impact on local communities.

RESOLVED - That the Executive be requested to include a non-recurring budget for 2013/14 for £40,000 for the Members' Small Scale Projects

EEOSP.64/12 CARLISLE CITY CENTRE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT UPDATE

The Economy and Enterprise Portfolio Holder introduced report ED.34/12 which reviewed the options regarding the establishment of a Business Improvement District (BID) following the result of the ballot on Friday 28 September 2012 which voted against the formation of a BID. He reminded the Panel that there had been Cross Party support for the BID and the Council had been disappointed with the turnout and with the overall result.

The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the good relationship that the Council had with local businesses and felt it was important to keep building on the relationship to ensure the limited resources available for the City Centre were used in a way that had maximum impact.

The Director of Economic Development (Mrs Meek) reported that the majority of business ratepayers in the proposed BID area who voted, voted against the proposal, although the majority (67%) of rateable value voted in favour. The turnout for the ballot was 37.3%. To achieve a "Yes" vote in the ballot 8 additional votes would have been required. As a result of the BID process the relationship between the City Council and the retailers had improved, particularly with regards to communication and it was important that that relationship was built upon.

Mrs Meek advised that there were three options now available:

- To continue to work with City Centre businesses without the establishment of a formal Business Improvement District
- Based on the current area defined within the BID, re-ballot the existing businesses once a period of consultation had taken place with the Steering Group and other stakeholders
- Review the proposed BID area and eligible business categories in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- Members were disappointed with the ballot result for the BID had not been agreed and agreed that it was important that the relationships with retailers continued to grow.
- Members wanted a re-ballot to go ahead but agreed that the City Council should take a step back from the process. They also agreed that it was extremely important to engage more with small business holders.
- A Member hoped that any resources available could be used to improve the look of the outside of businesses.
- There was concern that a re-ballot may have the same outcome as the first ballot.
- A Member of the Panel, who was also a BID voter, gave the Panel the following feedback on the process:
 - Contact with the Council regarding the website had been difficult;
 - The ballot papers which were posted to the businesses did not go directly to the Managers and communication had been poor;
 - Meetings regarding the BID had been held at business opening or closing times when Managers had to be on their premises;
 - There had been no interaction with Head Offices of businesses and they were the ones who made the decision on the voting;
 - There had been no information regarding the officer who had been based at the Tourist Information Centre;
 - There were at least three City Councillors who had a lot of retail experience. This was a valuable resource that had not been used during the process.
 - There had been no one canvassing businesses in the last month up to the vote, this was a crucial time to encourage voters.

The Member suggested that the re-ballot be delayed to allow for a longer period of consultation and for more information to be prepared.

The Portfolio Holder thanked the Member for his valuable feedback and agreed that further conversations needed to take place with businesses to gain as much feedback on the process as possible.

- Had the result of the BID vote impacted the City Council's budget?

The Portfolio Holder explained that the BID money had not been included in the Council's Base Budget. The use of the money would have been a decision for the BID Board and the City Council may not have been invited a Member of the Board.

RESOLVED – That the Panel recommend that the Executive continue to support all efforts being made to establish a Business Improvement District.

EEOSP.65/12 HIGHER LEVEL OF STEWARDSHIP GRANT OFFER

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder presented report LE.36/12 regarding the Higher Level Scheme (HLS) for Countryside Stewardship. The HLS covered various areas of agricultural land within the District. The annual payment for the HLS would be £22,800pa for the ten year period for both revenue and capital items. She highlighted the

main issue regarding the agreement was the restriction of heavy machinery on any area within the agreement.

The Director of Local Environment (Ms Culleton) explained that the Council's successful performance at the Entry Level for Countryside Stewardship led to the qualification for the Higher Level Scheme under which potential payments were increased. That was an excellent outcome for Carlisle's parks and open spaces and offered the opportunity to continue to maintain and improve public access to the land within the scheme. Ms Culleton explained the background to the scheme and provided a full list of sites for which the Higher Level Scheme had been offered.

Ms Culleton explained that the grant was given specifically to keep the land in good agricultural condition and favoured environmentally friendly management. That was in keeping with the Council's own objectives for the qualifying sites so there would be no conflict of interest with the Council's own management plans.

She set out the general conditions of the grant and confirmed that with one exception the conditions did not create any conflict of interest and did not create any problems for site managers in achieving the Council's objectives for the sites in question. However, the Border Steam Fair at Rickerby Park would be incompatible with the grant conditions. The presence of heavy machinery and vehicles had already had a visible impact on the Park, with compaction of the soil leading to localised flooding and ponding. The presence of show followers camping on the site for 5-6 days, several hundred vehicles parked on the grass and the impact on public access were also problematic. The Steam Fair organiser had been advised of the issues.

Because the grant was calculated on a hectare basis, and the areas identified only by field registration numbers, it was not straightforward to say how much of the grant was for any specific site. Rickerby Park's share would be between £4,000 and £8,000 per annum. The money would be used to maintain fences, trees, hedgerows and footpaths. The Higher Level Stewardship Grant encouraged public access to the land, entirely in line with the Council's own objectives for a healthy, active population.

Ms Culleton outlined a number of options available to the Council and asked Members to consider the benefits of the scheme and any associated restrictions and make recommendations to the Executive on the acceptance of the Higher Level Stewardship grant.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Ward Member commented that he was concerned that, by accepting the whole grant, the Council would be tied into a ten year agreement that would prevent major events from taking part on Rickerby Park. He felt that although the Park had significant agricultural value, the restrictiveness of the agreement excluded a number of activities. The Ward Member raised the importance of the Steam Fair which was held annually in Rickerby Park and was a signal to residents, businesses and visitors that the Park was open to be used. The new agreement would prevent this event taking place in Rickerby Park in the future. The Steam Fair attracted several thousand visitors to the City and helped the local economy. He stated that there had not been a suitable alternative open space for the Steam Fair and the prevention of the use of Rickerby Park would mean that there was no large open green space available in the City for similar events.

He agreed that the Grant was important to the City and suggested that the terms of the agreement be altered so that Rickerby Park was not included in the agreement.

The Portfolio Holder informed the Panel that the land within Rickerby Park had not recovered from the previous Steam Fair and City Council staff had been unable to carry out the necessary remedial works. The issue with the Steam Fair was the heavy machinery that caused long term damage to the land and many other events would not cause this damage and would still be able to use Rickerby Park.

She reminded the Panel that the grant was for £228,000 over ten years and guaranteed public access to the land. She added that National England had also been concerned about the condition on the trees in Rickerby Park following the last Steam Fair as the land around them had become so compacted. She understood the concerns regarding the use of the Park and reminded the Panel that the Park was for the whole City and should be viewed that way. She added that there had been some dissent regarding the Steam Fair being allowed to use Rickerby Park which had resulted in a number of people leaving the Friends of Rickerby Park.

The Portfolio Holder explained that an alternative venue had been suggested for the Steam Fair and the Council would look to help facilitate the Fair where possible. If Rickerby Park was removed from the agreement it would significantly reduced the grant available to the Council.

- A Member felt that the use of the Park should be widened not restricted as events such as the Steam Fair attracted families to the Park and visitors to the City. He also felt that the Council should be able to decide who used the Park and agreed that Rickerby Park should not be included in the agreement.
- Three important anniversaries would take place during the ten year period and Members were concerned that events at the Cenotaph would not be able to go ahead due to the restrictions within the agreement.
- The Panel had been informed of the damage being done to the Park by the heavy machinery at the Steam fair and questioned if the Park was suitable for the Fair regardless of the new agreement.

A Member informed the Panel that the Fair had been held at Warwick Bridge but had become too large for the venue. A percentage of the Fair had moved to the Airport and a percentage had gone to Rickerby Park. He suggested that Devonshire Walk car park may be a suitable venue for the Fair.

Mr Gray explained that Rickerby Park was a recent venue for the Fair but in the short time it had been used the Fair organisers been unable to successfully repair the damage caused to the ground; there was a risk that the City Council would have to fund any remedial work. The Grant would allow the area to be maintained so everyone could use it. He confirmed that the Grant conditions would not affect the 2014 anniversary events.

He added that if the Council turned down the whole grant it would create additional financial pressure on the Council as resources for maintenance work at the Park would have to be found.

- A Member had concerns regarding the overall cost to the Council of the remedial works at the Park and felt through negotiations the organisers of the Fair and the City Council could find an alternative and more suitable venue. He was also concerned about the future of the Park if the Council did not take the Grant and did not have the money for the remedial work.
- A Member commented that the general conditions that would be applied to the HLS agreement stated that the land could not be infilled or used for games or sports, this was considered too restrictive and would prevent holes being repaired and events such as the Cumbrian Run being able to take place.

Mr Gray clarified that repairs to holes etc were allowed; the agreement meant the impact of large land fills. He added that events such as the Cumbrian Run would still be allowed as they would not cause excessive or unreasonable disturbance to the wildlife and land.

Ms Culleton informed the Panel that, regardless of the agreement, the Council would have to give serious consideration to further requests for events such as the Steam Fair due to the damage caused. The Council wanted the land to be in good condition so everyone could use it. She added that the Council's new Events Policy required any event users to pay a substantial bond to carry out remedial works.

During the course of the discussion Members of the Panel expressed differing opinions, as a result:

Option B of the report was proposed and seconded as the Panel's recommendation to the Executive.

Option C of the report was proposed and seconded as the Panel's recommendation to the Executive.

Voting thereon took place and the results were :

Those in favour of Option B – 5
Those opposed to Option B – 2

Those in favour of Option C – 3
Those opposed to Option C - 4

RESOLVED – 1) That report LE.36/12 on the Higher Level of Stewardship grant offer be noted.

2) That the Panel was supportive of acceptance of the grant in part (Option B) and the views of the Panel be conveyed to the Executive.

EEOSP.66/12 CAR PARKING

The Director of Local Environment (Ms Culleton) presented report LE.23/12 on car parking. The report provided an update for Members on car park use and income since the implementation of a new charging structure in February 2012.

Ms Culleton explained that the consultant's review made a number of recommendations on how to increase car park usage and income. Officers had attempted, with the

resources available, to implement those recommendations. Little progress had been made in respect of the upgrade to car park surfaces and white lining, the upgrade of car park access routes and lighting, and the suggested increase in car park maintenance due to budget limitations.

Following a tendering exercise, a Pay by Phone service had been introduced in May 2012. Ms Culleton explained that there had been a regular monthly increase in users and there were currently 763 users. The service was expected to grow as it provided a convenient way of parking for those using mobile and smart phones.

However, Ms Culleton advised that there was still a downward trend in usage and income but that did provide some encouragement that the decline in usage was slowing considerably particularly in category 1 and 2 car parks.

In considering the update Members raised the following comments and questions:

- The Panel were pleased to see that the use of the pay by phone service was increasing and requested better marketing for the scheme and the car parks.
- Members felt that more work was required when dealing with those who abused the on street parking.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that there were problems in some areas where people parking their cars gave no thought to the residents in the area; those 'hot spots' were regularly targeted.

- It was suggested that Devonshire Walk car park be renamed Castle car park to encourage its use by visitors to the City.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that the renaming of Devonshire Walk car park should be investigated further.

- Members asked that issues with car park signage be addressed. The digital signs within the City were no longer in use and should either be removed or switched back on. The Panel agreed that the signage needed to be improved.

The Deputy Chief Executive (Mr Crossley) informed the Panel that the digital signage belonged to the County Council. The City Council and city centre retailers felt that the loss of the signage had had a detrimental effect on the city centre.

- Had the working group of City and County Members and officers been established?

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the working group had met and had agreed for a review of various parking zones to go ahead. The outcome of the review was expected towards the end of 2012 or the beginning of 2013.

- Other Cities had car parking machines that took credit or debits cards, would that be an option for Carlisle?

Ms Culleton explained that the option had been considered but had been superseded by the pay by phone option.

- Members highlighted the excellent work undertaken by Enforcement Officers especially as they were often subjected to anti social behaviour which should not be tolerated.

The Portfolio Holder agreed that there should be a zero tolerance policy for any abusive behaviour directed at enforcement officers and confirmed that the Council had protocols in place to safeguard officers.

RESOLVED – (1) That report LE.32/12 on car parking be noted.

(2) That the renaming of Devonshire Walk Car Park be investigated further.

EEOSP.67/12 CLEANING UP CARLISLE

The Director of Local Environment (Ms Culleton) presented report LE.33/12 on the Cleaner Carlisle project. The report updated Members on the progress of the Enforcement and Education Team in the cleaning up of Carlisle since the Panel meeting held on 2 August 2012.

Ms Culleton explained the background to the project and advised that the Enforcement and Education Team had been in place since 15 October 2012. The team included an Enforcement and Education Team Leader, 2 Enforcement and Education Officers and 2 Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Officers. The team were already implementing the delivery of educational messages and were following that up with robust enforcement.

The Education and Enforcement Team Leader (Ms Anson) outlined the “Love Where You Live” campaign which was scheduled to be launched in mid November. She showed the Panel four sets of artwork which had been developed and featured people who were making a difference to Carlisle and the surrounding areas. A number of educational and promotional materials had also been produced. Leaflets and posters were ready for distribution across Carlisle and the surrounding areas by Christmas. Council web pages were being re-branded to include the campaign and there was now one telephone number and e-mail address. That should assist those who wished to report an incident and would enable the Council to track the effectiveness of the campaign in relation to the reporting of events.

The Team had carried out their first primary school visit and more would take place in the high priority surveillance areas. A lesson plan was currently being formulated for secondary classes and should be ready for the New Year. A dog micro-chipping event had also been arranged that would allow dog owners on means tested benefits would be able to have their dogs micro-chipped for free.

In September the team had issued a total of 14 Fixed Penalty Notices for a wide range of offences including dog fouling, dogs off leads, littering and waste receptacles. There had also been 24 Fixed Penalty Notices issued for environmental crime so far in 2012/13 compared to 18 for the whole of 2011/12. There had also been 2 successful fly tipping prosecutions that had been widely publicised and further cases had been referred to the council’s Legal Services for consideration.

Ms Culleton advised that the Team were working closely with the Waste Services Team regarding the ongoing problem of waste being placed out for collection too early or inappropriately.

Ms Culleton informed Members that 20 high priority surveillance signs had been purchased and would be placed in key areas across the City and surrounding areas. To avoid the signage becoming part of the street furniture the signs would be moved every two months. Currently Old Harraby and Currock have 10 signs each and they will then be moved to St Aidans and Botcherby. An additional 200 smaller new aluminium signs had been ordered for permanent location and it had been identified that a number of lampposts still had faded signs attached. They would be re-utilised with the purchase of new stickers.

With regard to seagulls, Ms Culleton explained that the most effective control was for occupiers and landowners to proof their buildings to discourage birds from nesting and producing eggs.

The Team had taken delivery of three of the four sweeping machines that the Council had funded with delivery of the remaining vehicle being due before Christmas. Three additional vehicles had been ordered two of which would be fitted with dog excrement cleaning attachments. The new fleet of vehicles would improve the quality of street cleaning and there would also be improvements in the cleanliness of footpaths and pavements.

There had been a marked improvement in street cleaning since March 2012 and that would continue until all areas had been cleaned to an acceptable standard. Brampton and Longtown would be included as well as rural roads. Programmes of work had been developed for the mechanical sweepers which would come fully on line when the fourth sweeper was delivered and for the three street cleansing machines. Programmes of work were also being developed for the barrow and mobile teams.

A response team had been established as part of the Cleaner Carlisle project that could provide a more reactive service to requests from the public for cleansing between scheduled sweeps. Priority would be given to high risk incidents and asbestos reports would be dealt with by Environment Health in the first instance and removal was usually be specialist contractors.

In conclusion Ms Culleton advised that with the improved mechanisation, programmes of street cleansing, the new Enforcement and Education Team and many of the planned processes coming into fruition it was anticipated that the second quarter would see a significant improvement in the cleanliness of Carlisle.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member requested that consideration be given to signs being placed in high priority areas that informed the public how much it cost to keep the street clean.
- It was suggested that street stencils be used to remind people to clean up after their dog or to encourage them not to drop litter.
- A Member suggested that each Councillor gave out some of the dog fouling leaflets in their wards.

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder urged Members to pass on any information about offences in their wards so that the enforcement team could target their time to be more productive. She asked that all Members support the Love Where You Live Campaign.

- A Member highlighted some clean up work that had been undertaken by the local community in his Ward and urged the Council to support local communities in cleaning up their streets.

RESOLVED – That report LE.33/12 on Cleaning Up Carlisle be welcomed.

EEOSP.68/12 TRANSFORMATION SAVINGS

Economic Development

The Director of Economic Development (Mrs Meek) presented report ED.33/12 that updated members on the draft proposals to deliver the transformation savings as agreed by the Executive at their meeting on 3 September 2012. The Economic Development directorate had a target of £150,000 savings to find. However, Mrs Meek had worked closely with the Portfolio Holder to ensure that any re-structure would continue to address the administration priority to support the issues around economic growth.

Mrs Meek outlined the proposed changes to the structure of the Economic Development Directorate and explained that the savings proposals had taken into account a number of key issues and influences that were taking place at a national and local level. In particular the changes to the planning system, the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework and the need to have an up to date Local Plan in order to deliver growth and address Localism.

She explained that the consultation would end on 16 November 2012 and any feedback would be included in the amended proposals by 3 December. The implementation of the proposals would take place between January and April 2013.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- The Panel felt that it was important to ensure that all statutory services were looked at to ensure that they were achieving value for money.

Mrs Meek informed the Panel that the Directorate was also undergoing Lean Systems Reviews on services to ensure that they all achieved good value for money and were fit for purpose.

- Had the proposed changes undergone an impact assessment?

The Economy and Enterprise Portfolio Holder confirmed that consideration was given to where the Council hoped to be in the future and what its priorities were before any proposals were put together.

Local Environment

The Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder presented report LE.35/12 which provided a summary of the latest savings proposal within the Local Environment directorate.

The Director of Local Environment (Ms Culleton) advised that all teams across the directorate had worked hard to achieve savings over the previous few years and there had been many changes to how services were delivered.

Ms Culleton explained the Executive wished to minimise the number of redundancies and to that end wished to make housekeeping savings of almost £280,000 in 2012/13 from non staffing budgets. Within the Local Environment directorate work was underway to continue with the forensic review of budgets to identify any areas of non-staffing spend that could be reduced. Ms Culleton outlined a number of approaches that were proposed to meet savings targets which included Highways Claimed Rights and reductions in CCTV services. Proposals were also under discussion in respect of an allotment mutual, Talkin Tarn and non-staffing savings and overtime.

Ms Culleton explained that formal consultation would commence with any affected staff before Christmas and if the decision was made to transfer Highways Maintenance back to the County Council staff would be affected through a transfer of undertaking. Where there were cuts in CCTV services, which could lead to a reduction in staff. Any such reduction would be delivered through a range of options designed to reduce the need for compulsory redundancies. Subject to the consultation about the proposals it was anticipated that the savings would be implemented as early as possible in the new financial year.

In considering the report Members raised the following comments and questions:

- A Member raised the allotments mutual and asked for reassurance that allotments were awarded fairly.

The Panel were reminded that the allotments fell within the remit of the Community Overview and Scrutiny Panel. The Panel had carried out a Task and Finish Group on the allotments proposals and Members of this Panel had been invited to attend.

- The Panel hoped that the smaller details of the Highways Claimed Rights were included in the current discussions.

RESOLVED – 1) That report ED.33/12 on the Economic Development Directorate Transformation Savings be noted.

2) That Report LE.35/12 on the transformation Savings within Local Environment be noted.

EEOSP.68/12 SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE

It was noted that, during consideration of the above item of business, the meeting had been in progress for three hours and it was moved and seconded, and

RESOLVED – That Council Procedure Rule 9 in relation to the duration of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue over the time of three hours.

(The meeting ended at 1.10pm)