

CITY COUNCIL

TUESDAY 20 JULY 2021

PRESENT: The Mayor (Councillor Birks), Councillors Alcroft, Allison, Bainbridge, Betton (until 8:06pm), Bomford, Mrs Bowman, Brown (until 10:18pm), Christian, Collier, Dr Davison, Ellis, Ms Ellis-Williams, Mrs Finlayson, Mrs Glendinning, Glover, Higgs, Lishman, Mrs McKerrell, Mrs Mallinson, Mallinson (J), Meller, Mrs Mitchell, Mitchelson, Morton, Nedved, Paton (until 8:40pm), Patrick, Robson, Shepherd, Miss Sherriff, Sunter, Mrs Tarbitt, Dr Tickner, Tinnion and Miss Whalen.

ALSO

PRESENT: Deputy Chief Executive
Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services

C.102/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Atkinson, Denholm and Southward.

C.103/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct the following declarations of interest were submitted:

Councillor Mitchelson declared a Registrable Interest in respect of agenda item 14(iii) – Notice of Motions – RVA Surveyors. The interest related to his ownership of a small business.

C.104/21 MINUTES

The Mayor moved the receipt and adoption of the Minutes of the Meetings of the City Council held on 27 April; 24 May and 15 June 2021.

In relation to the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May, a Member noted that under minute reference C. 91/21 (v)(a) it was stated that Councillor Mrs Bowman had been appointed as Chair of the Standards Committee for the 2019/20 Municipal Year; the minute should read for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Minutes of the meetings of the City Council held on 27 April; 24 May and 15 June 2021 be received; and would be signed as a true record of the meetings at the first practical opportunity.

2) That Minute reference C. 91/21 (v)(a) be amended to read: for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

C.105/21 PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED – That the Agenda be agreed as circulated.

C.106/21 ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) The Mayor

There were no announcements from the Mayor.

(ii) The Leader of the Council

The Leader announced that the outcome of the government's local government review in Cumbria was expected in the coming week

The Leader announced that the competition for the UK's City of Culture 2025 was now open, the theme for the year was to be 'Transitioning to Carbon Zero'. The Borderlands Partnership was to submit an Expression of Interest on behalf of the region.

(iii) Members of the Executive

There were no announcements from Members of the Executive.

(iv) Town Clerk and Chief Executive

There were no announcements from the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.

C.107/21 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 10.1, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services reported that the following questions had been submitted on notice by a member of the public:

Children's Plan Area on New Estates

The Mayor advised the meeting that the member of the public who had submitted the question was not able to be present at the meeting. Accordingly, Members received the question as printed on the Summons.

Question 1

"Persimmon Homes are the Parent Company of the House Builder Charles Church who have been responsible for the development of the Cloverfields and Fairybeck Gardens Housing complexes at Cummersdale Road end on Dalston Road, Carlisle. Cloverfields, built first, comprises more than 100 private dwellings yet when completed there was no facility on the site for children to play. Apparently this item was for consideration upon the completion of the 2nd phase of Build at Fairybeck Gardens. That phase now being complete, there remains no Play Area for Children in an area covered by some 200 family homes, yet according to an email I received over 2 years ago from the Managing Director of Persimmon Homes, handed money over to and at the request of Carlisle City Council for the future erection of such a facility.

As there is still no play areas on either of these sites, the nearest is a small park in Cummersdale. In order to get to this play park from these Estates, children have to cross over a very busy Dalston Road and then walk up another busy narrow access roadway with limited, narrow pavements. Given these dangers, parents are having to either accompany their children to this park or transport them to larger, better facilities in other parts of the city thereby increasing the already congested, heavy traffic flow.

Given that we constantly hear from Government Ministers that "children are the future" and that there are big N.H.S. concerns about obesity, physical and mental health well being of the young, when will Carlisle City Council do the right thing and provide a suitable Play Area for the children of these two Estates with the monies they have already received from Persimmon and if they have no intention of doing such, what are they intending to do with those monies that they themselves requested from Persimmon in lieu of such facility?"

The Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder responded that the Cloverfield and Fairybeck developments formed part of the Morton Masterplan development which comprised over 850 new dwellings. In order to provide meaningful areas for play and recreation for all ages each development would contribute financially to the larger facilities. When complete the whole development, which these estates formed part of, would be provided with a new central green space with play and leisure facilities which will link to all parts of the development with cycling and walking routes that do not cross main roads.

Unfortunately, the landowner had not proceeded with the development at the speed originally intended which meant that the park and play areas had not yet been built. Persimmon Homes are now bringing forward the rest of the site which includes the remainder of the housing and the open space/recreation areas. Contributions from earlier developments were to be co-ordinated so that one individual developer didn't pay all and it was not clear who the developer would be at the start of this development. The current planning application shows the areas for recreation and the rest of the development and this now needs to go through the planning stages before the provision of the open space can continue. Two hundred homes was one of the triggers for provision of space but at the moment the area cannot be accessed safely due to ongoing construction and this needs to be phased into the continuing development. As Persimmon had the original developments and now have the additional land they will be providing the facilities before handing over the green space, play and recreation areas to the City Council to maintain. Carlisle City Council is totally committed to the provision of facilities for children and young people and will ensure that the developer delivers on their obligations with the Morton Masterplan.

Provision of good quality play areas are one of the ways the Council delivers on its priorities of improving the local environment and green spaces, and developing sports facilities and encouraging physical activity. It also links in with our aspirations for improving health and wellbeing through our status as a WHO Healthy City. Carlisle City Council has secured around £642,000 for play areas and other "active spaces" e.g. bike tracks, Multi-use games areas between 2016 and 2021.

Question 2

"Specklewood, is a new housing complex at the southern fringe of the city, it was erected at the same time as Cloverfield and by the same Housing Development Company (Persimmon). It has been provided with a 'Children's Play Area' when there are already several similar facilities within that vicinity (Pennine View, Waterman's Walk and London Road).

Considering the physical, psychological, educational and social developmental advantages we are told there are in children's play, the desire for play outside in fresh air, in a child friendly safe environment rather than on the streets with their parked cars as well as moving traffic and all the dangers they create, to be away from their TV's, Tablets & X Boxes and of course the current National trend to eradicate childhood obesity, can you tell me and the citizens of this city, what criteria are Carlisle City Council adhering to in order to make their decision as to who gets and who does not get a 'Children's Play Area' ?"

In response, the Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder advised that in relation to the Speckled Wood development (189 units) this was part of a larger housing allocation U5 in the Local Plan and the developer provided a play area on the central open space on a later revision to planning documents. Whilst this is of a similar size to the Cloverfield and Fairybeck Gardens development the provision of play is at different stages of the development. Speckled Wood will not have the benefit of larger areas for play and recreation and therefore accommodates a smaller provision on site. This only includes Junior provision and contributions are still being sought towards improvements to infant play off-site.

The way that play areas are provided through the planning system is consistent, however they always relate to the wider provision in each of the local areas and the circumstances between the two developments varies, as one relates to a sole housing allocation (Speckled Wood) and the other (Cloverfields/Fairy Beck) to a wider masterplan area (The Morton Masterplan). As with all developments the speed of construction is not controlled by the City Council and although triggers are put in for provision it is reliant on the housing market and demand for the houses as to when the play areas will be provided on-site.

The Communities, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder advised that a written copy of the responses provided would be sent to the member of the public who had submitted the questions.

C.108/21 PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 10.11, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services reported that no petitions or deputations had been submitted by members of the public.

C.109/21 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

(i) Carlisle Fire Show

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 11.2, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following question submitted on notice by Councillor Bomford:

“Can the Leader or Portfolio Holder tell me if there will be Fireworks or a Bonfire this year and if it will be a future event? I would like to see this Council take the opportunity to change this type of event in light of the Climate Change Policy and also create a new trend or event that can be enjoyed by everyone.”

The Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder advised that it had been decided that a Fireshow would not take place in 2021. Whilst the Fireshow would not take place until November, several months of planning and preparation work were required in advance of the event. Given the continued uncertainty of delivering large public events as a result of Covid 19 and the need to make upfront payments, which may be lost if the event were not able to proceed, the risk of going ahead with the event had been deemed too great. Therefore, the Council now had a full year to consider the nature of the event it wished to stage in 2022; the Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder invited Members to pass on to him suggestions from residents and themselves about what type of event they wish to see.

(ii) New Council House Provision in Carlisle and its Districts

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 11.2, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following question submitted on notice by Councillor Brown:

“On the 5th of November 2019 a motion was passed and resolved that Carlisle City Councils Executive look into the benefits, social value and business case for new council house provision in Carlisle and its districts and report back its conclusions to Full Council. Minutes from the Executive on the 16th of December 2019 state:

“The Leader moved that Officers be requested to prepare a paper on the matter for submission to a future meeting of the Executive; which course of action was agreed.

DECISION

That Officers be requested to report back to a future meeting of the Executive.”

Can the Portfolio holder update us on how this report has progressed over the last 18 months?”

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder responded confirming the details of the resolved Motion at Council in November 2019 and the subsequent Executive Decision at its meeting of 16 December 2019. An Officer report had been prepared and was due to be considered in May 2020. The impact of the Covid 19 pandemic restrictions had meant that only important business was transacted through the Council’s Committees, thus the item had been delayed; a report on the matter would be presented at the Executive meeting on 31 August 2021.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 10.8, Councillor Brown asked the following supplementary question:

In relation to the Officer report, it had been indicated that the document required further scrutiny to determine whether it remained relevant, could that report be made available to Members as well as that which was to be presented to the Executive at its 31 August 2021 meeting.

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder undertook to consider the matter.

(iii) **Hawker Festival**

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 11.2, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following question submitted on notice by Councillor Brown:

“The recently held Hawker Festival, in Carlisle City Centre was claimed a success by the Council. What was the exact criteria a local business had to meet in order to be allowed a free stall at the event and how many expressions of interest were received.”

The Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder noted that it was some time since the event had taken place and that it had been a great success. He gave an overview of the criteria for stallholders at the event.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 10.8, Councillor Brown asked the following supplementary question:

Councillor Brown read from a statement submitted to her by a local business owner which expressed concerns in relation to the criteria used to assess applications for a stall at the event.

The Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder expressed disappointment that local businesses with concerns regarding the provision of stalls had not contacted the Council prior to the event. He undertook to look into the matter.

The Culture, Heritage and Leisure Portfolio Holder thanked the Officers involved in preparing the event.

C.110/21 EXECUTIVE

Councillor Mallinson (J) moved and Councillor Ellis seconded that the Minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 2 June and 5 July 2021 be received and adopted.

RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 2 June and 5 July 2021 be received and adopted.

C.111/21 PORTFOLIO HOLDER REPORTS

Copies of reports from the following Portfolio Holders had been circulated prior to the meeting:

Culture, Heritage and Leisure
Communities, Health and Wellbeing
Environment and Transport
Economy, Enterprise and Housing
Finance, Governance and Resources
Leader's Portfolio

The Portfolio Holders moved their individual reports.

Whilst moving her report, the Communities Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder advised that the Expression Of Interest to the Connecting Healthy Communities 2021 – 2022 programme had been unsuccessful due to the programme being over subscribed

In presenting his report, the Economy, Enterprising and Housing Portfolio Holder, stated that a detailed report on the St Cuthbert's Garden Village project would be submitted to the next meeting of the Executive. He further congratulated the team for its successful funding applications to the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government Capacity Fund and the Development Corporation.

The Economy, Enterprising and Housing Portfolio Holder further advised that the John Street Accommodation was expected to re-open in September 2021.

Members questioned individual Portfolio Holders on details of their reports and it was:

RESOLVED – (1) That the reports of the Portfolio Holders be received.

(2) That the Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder provide a written response to Councillor Miss Whalen regarding the inclusion of Registered Social Landlords in the Green Homes and Sustainable Warmth Grants – Local Authority Delivery (LAD2).

C.112/21 MINUTES

The Mayor moved and the Deputy Mayor seconded the receipt and adoption of the Minutes of the meetings as detailed within Minute Book Volume 48(1):

Committee	Meeting Date
Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel	8 April and 10 June 2021
Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel	1 April and 3 June 2021
Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel	12 April and 17 June 2021
Regulatory Panel	28 April and 4 May 2021
Licensing Committee	28 April 2021
Development Control Committee	24 March; 26 March; 28 April; 30 April; 9 June; 9 June and 11 June 2021
Audit Committee	20 May 2021
Appeals Panel	21 April 2021

In relation to the meeting of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel on 17 June 2021, Councillor Mrs Bowman noted that her attendance had not been recorded.

RESOLVED – 1) That the Minutes of the meetings as detailed above be received and adopted.

2) That the minutes of the Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel on 17 June 2021 be amended to record Councillor Mrs Bowman's attendance.

C.113/21 SCRUTINY

(a) Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Paton moved his Chair's Report.

A Member requested further information of the Council's signing of the Healthy Weight Declaration.

Councillor Paton undertook to provide a written response.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Report of the Chair be received and adopted.

2) That Councillor Paton provide a written response giving further information regarding the Council's signing of the Healthy Weight Declaration.

(b) Business and Transformation Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Bainbridge moved his Chair's Report.

RESOLVED – That the Report of the Chair be received and adopted.

(c) Economic Growth Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Brown moved her Chair's Report.

RESOLVED – That the Report of the Chair be received and adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10pm and reconvened at 8:18pm

C.114/21 NOTICE OF MOTIONS

(i) Special Event

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 12, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report that the receipt of the following motion submitted on notice by Councillor Bomford:

"I would like to propose that this Council create or have a special event in town at the most suitable time in regard to COVID-19 and lockdown.

I ask for this special event to allow the people of Carlisle an opportunity to grieve as one and celebrate the lives of those lost during the last year and a bit.

I would like this Council to create a Members Advisory Group, to help steer the event planning.

I feel that this event will help create solidarity and allow closure for those that have lost loved ones - friends or family members but were unable to attend any form of funeral or even a family gathering.

I would like to see, if possible an area within the event that would allow people to place photographs or a small item that reminds them of their loved one, that we may be able to collect together as a keepsake to remind us all of what was lost during COVID-19. It would be nice to be able to store these and maybe even show them as a part of Carlisle history within the likes of Tullie house.

The Members Advisory Group would scope the funding and to see if its viable to do. But I would like to see it funded by project funding with the chance of applying for further grants and partnerships.

Thank you for considering this proposal."

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 14.7, Councillor Bomford gave notice of an alteration to his Motion, copies of which were table and duly received the consent of the meeting:

1. - Paragraph 3:

Delete "Members Advisory" and **replace with** "Working".

Sentence to read: "I would like this Council to create a Working Group, to help steer the event planning."

2. Paragraph 6:

i) **Remove** "Members Advisory" and **replace with** "Working"

ii) **Add** after "Viable to do." "Representatives of charities and religious groups and others who might like to join would be invited to the Working Group."

Paragraph to read: "The Members Working Group would scope the funding and to see if it's viable to do. Representatives of charities and religious groups and others who might like to join would be invited to the Working Group. But I would like to see it funded by project funding with the chance of applying for further grants and partnerships."

Amended Motion to Read:

"I would like to propose that this Council create or have a special event in town at the most suitable time in regard to COVID-19 and lockdown.

I ask for this special event to allow the people of Carlisle an opportunity to grieve as one and celebrate the lives of those lost during the last year and a bit.

I would like this Council to create a Working Group, to help steer the event planning.

I feel that this event will help create solidarity and allow closure for those that have lost loved ones - friends or family members but were unable to attend any form of funeral or even a family gathering.

I would like to see, if possible an area within the event that would allow people to place photographs or a small item that reminds them of their loved one, that we may be able to collect together as a keepsake to remind us all of what was lost during COVID-19. It would be nice to

be able to store these and maybe even show them as a part of Carlisle history within the likes of Tullie house.

The Working Group would scope the funding and to see if it's viable to do. Representatives of charities and religious groups and others who might like to join would be invited to the Working Group. But I would like to see it funded by project funding with the chance of applying for further grants and partnerships.

Thank you for considering this proposal."

Councillor Bomford moved and Councillor Paton seconded the Motion.

Discussion arose, during which a number of Members of the City Council outlined their support for the Motion.

Councillor Bomford thanked Members for their support.

Following further voting, the substantive Motion, as set out below was CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY:

"I would like to propose that this Council create or have a special event in town at the most suitable time in regard to COVID-19 and lockdown.

I ask for this special event to allow the people of Carlisle an opportunity to grieve as one and celebrate the lives of those lost during the last year and a bit.

I would like this Council to create a Working Group, to help steer the event planning.

I feel that this event will help create solidarity and allow closure for those that have lost loved ones - friends or family members but were unable to attend any form of funeral or even a family gathering.

I would like to see, if possible an area within the event that would allow people to place photographs or a small item that reminds them of their loved one, that we may be able to collect together as a keepsake to remind us all of what was lost during COVID-19. It would be nice to be able to store these and maybe even show them as a part of Carlisle history within the likes of Tullie house.

The Working Group would scope the funding and to see if it's viable to do. Representatives of charities and religious groups and others who might like to join would be invited to the Working Group. But I would like to see it funded by project funding with the chance of applying for further grants and partnerships.

Thank you for considering this proposal."

(ii) Carlisle's Turkish Baths

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 12, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following motion submitted on notice by Councillor Ms Ellis-Williams:

"This council is proud of Carlisle's people and places both past and present and believes that every effort should be made to preserve, enhance and promote the city's living heritage, in particular the Victorian and Edwardian Baths on James Street.

Council notes that:

1. Carlisle's Turkish Baths are one of only 11 original Turkish Baths still in operation in the UK
2. That the original 1884 Public Baths building is to remain after demolition of the 1970s pool & reception, and houses two fully functioning pools, a gym and changing facilities
3. Carlisle's Turkish Baths provide the only publicly available steam, sauna & relaxation facilities in the city, and that the continued provision of these facilities will play an important role in the wellbeing and mental health of local residents as we emerge from the COVID pandemic.

This Council pledges that:

- Through the scrutiny process, it will examine and assess the findings of the Mott Macdonald feasibility study into the Victoria and Edwardian Baths.
- It will retain the building for the health and well-being purposes as it was originally intended and look at future potential and sustainability of the development."

Councillor Ms Ellis-Williams moved and Councillor Glover seconded the motion.

Councillor Ms Ellis-Williams then elaborated upon the reasons for submission of the motion, which she hoped would receive the backing of the Council.

Councillor Higgs gave notice of an amendment, copies of which were tabled:

1. At point 2: **Insert** "could be allowed to remain" in place of "is to remain." **Add** "; it" after "reception".
2. Final paragraph: **Insert** "Subject to a sustainable business plan that can show the viability of the Victorian/Edwardian health suite, the council will retain the building..." in place of "- It will retain the building...."

Amended motion to read:

"This council is proud of Carlisle's people and places both past and present and believes that every effort should be made to preserve, enhance and promote the city's living heritage, in particular the Victorian and Edwardian Baths on James Street.

Council notes that:

1. Carlisle's Turkish Baths are one of only 11 original Turkish Baths still in operation in the UK
2. The original 1884 Public Baths building could be allowed to remain after demolition of the 1970s pool & reception; it houses two fully-functioning pools, a gym and changing facilities
3. Carlisle's Turkish Baths provide the only publicly available steam, sauna & relaxation facilities in the city, and that the continued provision of these facilities will play an important role in the wellbeing and mental health of local residents as we emerge from the COVID pandemic.

This Council pledges that:

- Through the scrutiny process, it will examine and assess the findings of the Mott Macdonald feasibility study into the Victoria and Edwardian Baths.
- Subject to a sustainable business plan that can show the viability of the Victorian/Edwardian health suite, the council will retain the building for health and well-being purposes as it was originally intended."

The meeting adjourned at 8.40pm and reconvened at 8.50pm

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 14.6 Councillor Ellis-Williams sought clarification as to whether the tabled amendment negated the original Motion.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services advised that whilst the amendment did alter the focus of the original Motion, by virtue of its making provision for the retention of the Turkish Baths, it did not negate the original Motion.

Councillor Higgs moved the amendment, which was seconded by Mallinson (J).

Councillor Higgs further outlined, in some detail, the reasons for submission of the amendment.

Speaking at the invitation of The Mayor, the mover of the original motion declined to accept the amendment of Councillor Higgs.

Substantial debate ensued, during which various Members expressed their support for / opposition to the amendment; and during which points of order and personal explanation were raised in accordance with Procedure Rules 14.12 and 14.13.

Following voting, the amendment to the original Motion was CARRIED.

Discussion then took place on the substantive Motion, with input from a number of Members of the City Council.

Following further voting, the substantive Motion, as set out below was CARRIED

"This council is proud of Carlisle's people and places both past and present and believes that every effort should be made to preserve, enhance and promote the city's living heritage, in particular the Victorian and Edwardian Baths on James Street.

Council notes that:

1. Carlisle's Turkish Baths are one of only 11 original Turkish Baths still in operation in the UK
2. That the original 1884 Public Baths building is to remain after demolition of the 1970s pool & reception; it, houses two fully functioning pools, a gym and changing facilities
3. Carlisle's Turkish Baths provide the only publicly available steam, sauna & relaxation facilities in the city, and that the continued provision of these facilities will play an important role in the wellbeing and mental health of local residents as we emerge from the COVID pandemic.

This Council pledges that:

- Through the scrutiny process, it will examine and assess the findings of the Mott Macdonald feasibility study into the Victoria and Edwardian Baths.
- Subject to a sustainable business plan that can show the viability of the Victorian/Edwardian health suite, the council will retain the building for the health and well-being purposes as it was originally intended."

(iii) RVA Surveyors

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 12, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following motion submitted on notice by Councillor Bainbridge:

"This Council notes the recent publicity surrounding the actions of RVA Surveyors with concern. The Council firmly believes that Small Business Rates Relief (SBRR) provided by Government, should in its entirety be received solely by the Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) for whom it is intended. In support of efforts to close this practice, the Council agrees to:-

1. Write to The Insolvency Service outlining our concern that practices by RVA Surveyors potentially prevent some SME's in Carlisle from receiving their full entitlement of Small Business Rates Relief and that the Insolvency Service should use their powers to close down this practice. The Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy will also be copied into the correspondence.

2. Given that RVA Surveyors obtain much of their information from Freedom of Information (FOI's) requests to Local Authorities, Carlisle City Council will write to the Information Commissioner to request clarification as to whether FOI's from RVA Surveyors can be denied given their behaviour.

3. Carlisle City Council will seek to include a sufficient warning on our webpage relating to SBRR over this practice, highlighting that the process can be undertaken for free without the need for agents requiring an annual commission or fee.

<https://www.carlisle.gov.uk/Business/Business-Rates-Information/Small-Business-Relief>

Councillor Bainbridge moved and Councillor Mrs Bowman seconded the motion.

Councillor Bainbridge then elaborated upon the reasons for submission of the motion, which he hoped would receive the backing of the Council.

Discussion arose, during which a number of Members of the City Council outlined their support for / opposition to the Motion.

A Member commented that he supported the principle of the Motion. In relation to point 3, he questioned whether it was lawful that an individual company be named.

The Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services responded that, upon receipt of the Motion, he had carefully considered the matter. In the event of the Motion was carried, the warning text published on the Council's website about the practice would not include reference to any individual company.

Following voting, the Motion, as set out below was CARRIED

"This Council notes the recent publicity surrounding the actions of RVA Surveyors with concern. The Council firmly believes that Small Business Rates Relief (SBRR) provided by Government, should in its entirety be received solely by the Small and Medium Enterprises (SME's) for whom it is intended. In support of efforts to close this practice, the Council agrees to:-

1. Write to The Insolvency Service outlining our concern that practices by RVA Surveyors potentially prevent some SME's in Carlisle from receiving their full entitlement of Small Business Rates Relief and that the Insolvency Service should use their powers to close down this practice. The Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy will also be copied into the correspondence.

2. Given that RVA Surveyors obtain much of their information from Freedom of Information (FOI's) requests to Local Authorities, Carlisle City Council will write to the Information Commissioner to request clarification as to whether FOI's from RVA Surveyors can be denied given their behaviour.

3. Carlisle City Council will seek to include a sufficient warning on our webpage relating to SBRR over this practice, highlighting that the process can be undertaken for free without the need for agents requiring an annual commission or fee.

<https://www.carlisle.gov.uk/Business/Business-Rates-Information/Small-Business-Relief>

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

The Mayor noted that the meeting had been in progress for 3 hours; and moved that Council Procedure Rule 9, in relation to the duration of meetings be suspended in order that the meeting could continue to enable the remaining items of business to be transacted, and it was:

AGREED that the meeting should continue beyond three hours in duration to enable the remaining items of business to be transacted.

(iv) Planning

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 12, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services to report the receipt of the following motion submitted on notice by Councillor Mrs Glendinning:

"That this Council believes planning works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes; therefore this Council calls on the Government to protect the right of communities to object to individual planning applications."

Councillor Mrs Glendinning moved and Councillor Miss Whalen seconded the motion.

Councillor Mrs Glendinning then elaborated upon the reasons for submission of the motion, which he hoped would receive the backing of the Council.

Councillor Dr Davison gave notice of an amendment, copies of which were tabled:

"That this Council believes planning a) works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes; therefore this Council calls on the Government to protect the right of communities to object to individual planning applications."

b) should play a vital part in responding to the climate and biodiversity emergencies; by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and ensuring meaningful biodiversity gain in development, ensuring homes and other buildings can function as "net zero" and creating communities where travel needs are reduced by making active and public transport easy options for people.

Council asks that the Council Leader writes to the Housing Minister, Robert Jenrick and our local MPs, John Stevenson and Neil Hudson, to this effect."

Councillor Ellis gave notice of an amendment, copies of which were tabled:

1. **Add** after "applications."

"This Council also believes the current planning system is both failing residents and failing developers. It takes seven years from start to finish to complete a local plan for an area which results in minimal public engagement. It is when local areas are assessed for housing allocations that local communities need to be actively engaged. Once entered into the local plan the eventual fate of a site has been sealed.

Residents object to an individual planning applications and are angry when they find out that the Development Control committee have little grounds to refuse except on technical details, which can be either overcome or appealed against.

This Council therefore believes:

- The local plan process taking seven years is too long. It is cumbersome, bureaucratic and fails to engage with residents.
- The best time to consult residents as to whether they support development in their area is when sites are considered for allocation, not when an individual application has been submitted, which is often too late, when objections are about compliance with planning policies rather than principle of development."

The meeting adjourned at 9.50pm and reconvened at 10.00pm

Speaking at the invitation of The Mayor, the mover of the original motion indicated that they found the proposed amendments to be acceptable and sought the consent of the Meeting to alter the Motion accordingly. Such consent was given in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.7

The altered motion to read:

“That this Council believes planning a) works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes; therefore this Council calls on the Government to protect the right of communities to object to individual planning applications.

b) should play a vital part in responding to the climate and biodiversity emergencies; by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and ensuring meaningful biodiversity gain in development, ensuring homes and other buildings can function as “net zero” and creating communities where travel needs are reduced by making active and public transport easy options for people.

This Council also believes the current planning system is both failing residents and failing developers. It takes seven years from start to finish to complete a local plan for an area which results in minimal public engagement. It is when local areas are assessed for housing allocations that local communities need to be actively engaged. Once entered into the local plan the eventual fate of a site has been sealed.

Residents object to an individual planning applications and are angry when they find out that the Development Control committee have little grounds to refuse except on technical details, which can be either overcome or appealed against.

This Council therefore believes:

- The local plan process taking seven years is too long. It is cumbersome, bureaucratic and fails to engage with residents.
- The best time to consult residents as to whether they support development in their area is when sites are considered for allocation, not when an individual application has been submitted, which is often too late, when objections are about compliance with planning policies rather than principle of development.”

Council asks that the Council Leader writes to the Housing Minister, Robert Jenrick and our local MPs, John Stevenson and Neil Hudson, to this effect.”

Councillors Ellis and Dr Davison outlined, in some detail, the reasons for submission of their individual alterations.

Following voting, the Motion, as set out below was CARRIED

“That this Council believes planning works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes; therefore this Council calls on the Government to protect the right of communities to object to individual planning applications.

b) should play a vital part in responding to the climate and biodiversity emergencies; by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and ensuring meaningful biodiversity gain in development, ensuring homes and other buildings can function as “net zero” and creating communities where travel needs are reduced by making active and public transport easy options for people.

This Council also believes the current planning system is both failing residents and failing developers. It takes seven years from start to finish to complete a local plan for an area which

results in minimal public engagement. It is when local areas are assessed for housing allocations that local communities need to be actively engaged. Once entered into the local plan the eventual fate of a site has been sealed.

Residents object to an individual planning applications and are angry when they find out that the Development Control committee have little grounds to refuse except on technical details, which can be either overcome or appealed against.

This Council therefore believes:

- The local plan process taking seven years is too long. It is cumbersome, bureaucratic and fails to engage with residents.
- The best time to consult residents as to whether they support development in their area is when sites are considered for allocation, not when an individual application has been submitted, which is often too late, when objections are about compliance with planning policies rather than principle of development.”

Council asks that the Council Leader writes to the Housing Minister, Robert Jenrick and our local MPs, John Stevenson and Neil Hudson, to this effect.

C.115/21 PROPOSALS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN RELATION TO THE COUNCIL'S BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

(i) Provisional General Fund Revenue Outturn 2021/21 – Carry Forwards

Pursuant to Minute EX.46/21 and EX.49/21, consideration was given to the 2020/21 provisional outturn for the General Fund Revenue budgets (including Council Tax and Business Rates outturn) and requests for carry forward of budgets). Extracts from the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 2 June and 5 July 2021 were also submitted.

Councillor Ellis moved the Report, which was seconded by Councillor Mallinson (J).

RESOLVED – That the Council:

- (i) Approved the carry forward requests totalling £971,400 to be incurred in 2021/22 and the release of £971,400 in 2021/22 from the General Fund Reserve as set out in report RD.15/21 and Appendix 1;
- (ii) Approved the creation of new reserves and transfers into the new and existing reserves of £14,446,071, in addition to the transfer from the building control reserve of £66,374, as detailed in paragraphs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 and Appendix 2 of report RD.15/21.

(ii) Provisional Capital Outturn 2020/21 – Carry Forwards

Pursuant to Minute EX.47/21, consideration was given to the provisional outturn for the Council's Capital Programme and provides details of the revised Capital Programme for 2021/22. An extract from the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 2 June 2021 was also submitted.

Councillor Ellis moved the Report, which was seconded by Councillor Mallinson (J).

RESOLVED – That the Council:

- (i) Approved the carry forward requests totalling £4,454,600 to be met in 2021/22 as set out in report RD.16/21;
- (ii) Approved the revised programme for 2021/22, together with the proposed methods of financing and virement request, as detailed at paragraph 3 of report RD.16/21.

(iii) Treasury Management Outturn 2020/21

Pursuant to Minutes EX.48/21, consideration was given to a report on Treasury Management, as required under both the Financial Procedure rules and the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management. An extract from the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 2 June 2021 was also submitted.

Councillor Ellis moved the Report, which was seconded by Councillor Mallinson (J).

RESOLVED – That the Treasury Management Outturn 2020/21 report (RD.07/21) be approved.

(iv) Regeneration Programme Update and Economic Development Programme Management Office

Pursuant to Minute EX.58/21, consideration was given to an update on the key regeneration projects and the work programme and activities to be undertaken. Approval was sought for an additional revenue budget to enable the creation of an Economic Development Programme Management Office (PMO) and increase the capacity of the Regeneration team to support the development and delivery of these regeneration projects. Additionally, approval was sought to add the Future High Streets Fund projects, for which funding had been secured, to the capital programme. An extract from the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 5 July 2021 was also submitted

Councillor Nedved moved the Report, which was seconded by Councillor Mallinson (J).

The Economy, Enterprise and Housing Portfolio Holder responded to questions from Members on the report.

RESOLVED – That the Council:

1. Note the progress on the development and delivery of the key regeneration projects led by the City Council – Future High Streets Fund, Town Deal and Caldew Riverside.
2. Approved an additional revenue budget of £91,545 for this financial year 2021/22 to fund the Programme Management Office and the regeneration team and an additional £82,560 for the following two years 2022-23 and 2023-24, as set out in Table 3 of report ED.22/21 and funded from Revenue Reserves.
3. Approved a budget of £6,742,839 (in addition to the Greenmarket scheme already included in the Council's capital programme) be added to the Council's Capital Programme, in accordance with the financial profile for the Future High Street Fund programme for the years 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24 as set out in Table 2 of report ED.22/21.

C.116/21 OPERATION OF THE PROVISIONS RELATING TO CALL-IN AND URGENCY

Pursuant to Procedure Rule 15(j) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, the Corporate Director of Governance and Regulatory Services reported (GD.41/21) on the Operation of Call-in and Urgency Procedures over the past year.

RESOLVED – That report GD.41/21 be noted.

C.117/21 COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications or items of business brought forward by the Mayor as a matter of urgency to be dealt with at the meeting.

[The meeting ended at 10:23pm]