

CABINET

THURSDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2020

PRESENT: Councillors David Cannon, Andrew Johnson (Chairman), David Coppinger, Samantha Rayner, Stuart Carroll (Vice-Chairman), David Hilton, Gerry Clark, Donna Stimson and Ross McWilliams

Also in attendance: Councillors Baldwin, Davey, Davies, Baskerville, Tisi, Del Campo, Price, Knowles, Singh, Bond, Jones, Werner, Taylor and Barbara Richardson (RBWM Property Company).

Officers: Duncan Sharkey, Adele Taylor, Kevin McDaniel, Hilary Hall, Ben Smith, Russell O'Keefe, Andrew Vallance, Louisa Dean and David Cook.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies received. (Cllr Carroll later gave apologies for the Part II meeting)

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Part I minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2020 were approved.

APPOINTMENTS

None

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes made since last published, including:

- Siena Court moving from December to January 2021 Cabinet.
- St Clouds Way, Maidenhead, Site Proposals was proposed to go to December 2020 Cabinet.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

c) FINANCE UPDATE: NOVEMBER 2020

Cabinet considered the report that set out the latest financial position of the Council in respect of the 2020/21 financial year at the end of Month 6.

The Chairman informed Cabinet that Mr Andrew Hill had registered to speak on this item and asked him to address the meeting.

Mr Hill mentioned the projected increase in general reserves and asked the Lead Member for Finance what the projection was for the following financial year.

The Lead Member for Finance and Ascot informed Cabinet that the finance update provided a narrative of financial activity in the Council. He proposed to present the highlights of the report as further detail could be found within the report if required.

Cabinet were informed that paragraph 4.2 of the report informed that, excluding the impact of COVID-19, we would be reporting a favourable variance of £4.5 million, an increase of £1.66M from last month. This supported the statement made in the revised MTFS published in October which states, The Council approved a robust budget in February 2020, which would have stabilised the Council's financial position.

The Lead Member asked what had changed to get such a turnaround and informed that about a year ago this administration changed, the new leader had acted upon all the recommendations in the CIPFA Finance and Governance report He recruited a Director of Resources and Head of Finance to increase the capacity and capability of the finance team and re-established the administration's financial competence.

The report forecasts the Council's financial outturn based upon assumptions that are changed as we move through the year and circumstances change. He highlight two services; forecasts on parking income had proven to be optimistic and in the light of income to date and the current lockdown, additional losses of £2.348M were forecast. For homelessness, unfortunately the number of residents requiring support continued to rise and the projected outturn was nearly 3 times the approved budget. He mentioning that the emerging homelessness strategy offered some solutions to this social problem that was so harmful to the families affected.

Cabinet were also informed that the first Sales / Fees and Charges compensation return had been made to the MCHLG. This amounted to just over £2.4M for the period from April to July 2020 and a further £3.4M was included in the report for the period July to March 2021. Under the rules the council could claim just over 71% of losses but nothing for income from commercial properties. However, when these sums were included in the non -service expenditure, at the end of month 6 we report a positive variance of £3.125M. This would be transferred to general reserves which increased to £9.138 million, nearly £2.8M above the minimum.

The Lead Member went on to say that a revised MTFS was presented to Council in October 2020. Based on the assumptions made the paper indicates a that for 2021/22 there would be a £8.4m gap between income and expenditure, 10% of current service expenditure. This was driven by Covid-19 and our low level of reserves was an unhelpful but historic issue.

The administrations obligation was to present a balance budget for 2021/22, work was ongoing and however challenging, the gap would be closed. However, we cannot know with certainty what Government will include for Local Authorities in the CSR, when the impact of COVID-19 would finally abate, what a new normal might be and the effect of this on the 2021/22 budget.

In paragraph 4.13 of the report the S151 officer is considering establishing a COVID-19 mitigation reserve and seeks approval to transfer any underspends into this reserve. The proposal is to use funds in the COVID-19 mitigation reserve as one-off funding to manage any future volatility in budgets. I am very supportive of what is a financially sound recommendation.

In response the Mr Hill's earlier question the Lead Member informed that he was currently unable to say what the next financial years level of reserves would be as the budget build process was still in process.

The Chairman mentioned that they had approved a difficult budget and established a sound financial path that would have been better if not for C-19.

Cllr Jones mentioned that it was an excellent report to monitor the budget. She was concerned about the situation regarding parking income especial post C-19 and thus she supported the recommendations. She also raised concern about the decrease in demand effecting some capital projects and recommended business cases should be reviewed. With regards to the favourable variance some of this came from an underspend from services and she said that care needed to be taken that service delivery was not compromised.

The Chairman informed that business cases were reviewed looking at affordability and economic cases. He was pleased that Cllr Jones approved of the new report format as she had previously raised concerns. The financial position was being re built.

Cllr Werner mentioned that the current financial position was in part due to support provided by Government; he asked how confident was the administration that the budget was sound.

The Director of Resources informed that C-19 had effected the budget and there were loses. With regards to the robustness of estimates she said that she had confidence in the services budget management. There had been support from central Government to all authorities but we still needed to manage the rest of our finances. Corporately there was better governance of the finances.

The Chairman said that without C-19 the finances would be in a better place and the report was testament to the soundness of the budget that unfortunately not all members had supported.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet:

- i) Notes the Council's projected revenue & capital position for 2020/21;**
- ii) Notes the budget movements;**
- iii) Agrees the capital variances and notes the slippage which will be recommended to Council for formal approval;**
- iv) Approves the setting up of a Covid-19 Mitigation Reserve from any underspends during the 2020/21 financial year.**

A) PARKING STRATEGY (2020 - 2025)

Cabinet considered the report regarding the adoption of a new parking strategy which would replace the previous strategy and supporting policies.

The Chairman informed Cabinet that Mr Andrew Hill had registered to speak on this item and asked him to address the meeting.

Mr Hill mentioned that he had participated in the BLP meetings and in the meeting about parking he got the impression that RBWM had said that there was an imminent revision of the 2004 parking standards, however this report at paragraph 2.4 stated that there would only be a review at an appropriate point. When is this appropriate point. He also mentioned that the latest Nicolson's Broadway car park proposals included a viability report that stated that the land value did not include the car park, why was this asset not included. He also questioned the cost of the proposed increase of 98 parking spaces across the borough to alleviate the loss of spaces, referring to the proposed cost of the Vicus way car park.

Mr Hill was informed that as Nicholson's was a live planning application there would not be any comment on this. With regards to his other points the Director of Place said he would provide a written response.

The Lead Member for Public Protection and Parking informed Cabinet that before he introduces the report he wished to say that during this current climate it was important to assist businesses and residents so there would be free Christmas parking on certain days in most of our town centre council run car parks in the run-up to Christmas, to help support local businesses and rejuvenate the high street.

Free parking would be on Wednesdays from 3pm in both Windsor and Maidenhead Royal Borough town centre council car parks on 9, 16 and 23 December. It would also be free on Sundays in Windsor on 6, 13 and 20 December. Maidenhead was already free on Sundays.

The Lead Member informed that the report was about the adoption of a new parking strategy which replaces the previous strategy and supporting policies, for example: enforcement strategy, which have been refreshed. In addition, it brought together a number of existing policies and practices into one document.

The strategy recognised and sought to balance the impact and influence of parking in terms of 'Place' making; commerciality and supporting the Climate Change strategy. With regards to the Climate Strategy it was noted that there had been a typing error and the target year was 2050 and not 2040. It was also noted that in the recommendation it should say policy and not police.

The strategy was designed to provide a framework for decision making; policy making; guide financial decisions and help to prioritise and deliver activity in a co-ordinated manner which brings improvements to customers.

During 2021, the council would be developing a strategy focussed on opportunity and innovation. The parking strategy promotes the future use of innovative technology (for example: wireless charging and 'Green' projects) and seeks to support economic opportunity by creating infrastructure to promote and support regeneration and development.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor welcomed the report and thanked the Lead Member for the free parking in Windsor during the run up to Christmas.

The Lead Member for Planning, Environmental Services and Maidenhead thanked the Lead Member for continuing the free parking as it was essential at the moment and showed our continued support to residents and businesses. He also thanked the Lead Member for the continued support for the regeneration of Maidenhead as parking was a critical part of this. It was mentioned that Shopmobility had been given a site in Maidenhead so they could continue to operate whilst work was ongoing.

Cllr Tissi said she welcomed the document although it did not solve all problems overnight. She mentioned the standardising of parking tariffs across the borough and that Windsor provided 60% of income with 40% of spaces, she asked if Windsor would no longer have to pay more for parking. With regards to controlled parking zones (Residential Parking) she was concerned about the introduction of shared use parking between 8am to 6pm as this would put increased pressure on parking for residents returning from work.

Cllr Tissi also mentioned that it had been said there would be a review of residential parking zones introduced by previous councillors and asked if this would be undertaken. She also suggested the introduction of season tickets for residents.

The Lead Member responded by saying that there would be a review of standardising parking charges, they would be looking at short stay and long stay tariffs. With regards to shared use in controlled parking zones he mentioned that this was already in use in some areas of Windsor to use up daytime capacity. Due to C-19 this would not currently be extended. Shared use will be looked at in the future. He agreed parking zones were being reviewed and for all new one they would look at the impact on surrounding streets, there would be a

retrospective review. With regards to season tickets for residents this would be taken under consideration.

Cllr Davey mentioned autonomous vehicles and automated enforcement as this required 5G technology for fast transfer of data. Automated enforcement should also include enforcement of works on the highways. He was concerned about the number of electric points as only 10% of new car purchases were electric, he questioned the cost of introducing these points. He also said that there was no mention of pavement parking especially as Government consultation on this had just finished. If this says that no one can park on the pavement what will residents do. The Lead Member mentioned that the electric charging points was an aspirational figure that we will work towards when appropriate.

Cllr Baldwin mentioned that on page 59 of the report there was a table that showed the post 2023 public capacity of the proposed Nicholson's car park of 1035 spaces that's up from 734 which was a gain of 301. However other plans show that this figure is reduced to 885 of which only 700 will be public, that makes the document out by 335 spaces just in one car park. He was also concerned about previous mention of shopmobility as this did not mention Windsor that would be reviewed, would this exclude retention.

The Lead Member replied that the numbers had to be fluid due to planning applications being submitted and a written response could be provided. With regards to Shopmobility it had been worded that way as current provision was not appropriate and it was to be reviewed to provide a better solution not to remove.

Cllr Larcombe mentioned that the report said that a new residents discount scheme would not be implemented at this time due to the financial position does this mean the end of the advantage card. He was concerned about pricing and if price elasticity graph was used. He also raised concern about parking on verges that was not being dealt with. The Lead Member replied that the Advantage Card was still there and the discount was removed in the budget, however we remained committed to bring back a discount scheme when finances allowed.

Cllr Bowden said that he was pleased to see the discounts for Windsor but also mentioned that there was no more capacity for parking in Windsor and visitors should consider alternative methods of transport when visiting.

Cllr Taylor asked if the short stay parking in Maidenhead could be extended from 30 minutes to 1 hour and if the times the lifts in the car park could remain in operation longer than the 6pm cut off time. She also asked if park and ride could be considered again. The Lead Member said he would consider the suggestions.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Adopts the Parking Strategy 2020-2025 shown in Appendix 1, including the revised enforcement policy.**
- ii) Delegates authority to the Director of Adults, Health and Commissioning in consultation with the Lead Member for Public Protection (including Parking) to make reasonable minor amendments to the Parking Strategy after consideration by the Infrastructure Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Maidenhead and Windsor Town Forums and the Disability and Inclusion Forum**

B) 0-19 INTEGRATED FAMILY HUB SERVICE PROPOSAL FOR NEW MODEL AND SECOND PUBLIC CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Cabinet considered the report regarding the approval for the implementation of the preferred early help model of the integrated Family Hub Service.

The Chairman informed Cabinet that Mr Andrew Hill had registered to speak on this item and asked him to address the meeting.

Mr Hill said that the paper mentioned the Maidenhead Community Centre and the Marlow Road Youth Centre whose futures were linked. The report said that legal advice had been sought on the Child Care Act but he was concerned if this advice had been taken before or after the decision was made to move the youth centre. Lots of people valued the youth centre as shown in the report. He said in the consultation question 25 was to retain the centre as a family hub, you consulted to retain but are now proposing to remove it. He felt that would require a separate consultation. He also questioned what were the limitations of both being on the same site.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed Cabinet that the Family Hub Service would bring together a range of services that would focus provision on targeted support to our most vulnerable children, young people and families. The aim of the remodelling was to strengthen support for those families that most need it and in doing so reduce the demand for statutory intervention. It was designed to give better outcomes to those that need support.

As part of the approval we were seeking a decision about the retention or closure of specific children's centres and youth centres and the resulting lease arrangements for those spaces. The decision will result in a significant restructure of the roles required to deliver the new service. The final proposals were based on an initial 12 week public consultation that took place January to March 2020 and a further eight week public consultation from July to September 2020. The feedback received is summarised in this report and has shaped the final proposed model. He thanked everyone who took part in the consultation.

The preferred model is to bring together services being run by children's centres, youth centres, the parenting service, health visitors, school nurses and the family resilience service so that residents can get all the help they need from one Family Hub. The preferred model was to establish two main Family Hubs, one in Windsor and one in Maidenhead. In addition, there would be a number of sub-venues across both Windsor and Maidenhead. Children's centre services and youth services will be delivered from these venues, other community venues, in people's homes and via other outreach in the community. The model was based on best practice from the Government. It was important to have flexibility to meet demands and requirements of young people.

The Director for Children's Services informed that the rationale for the proposals had been through Cabinet previously. With regards to the planned sites when looking at them it became clear that each site had some benefits to some users, so we had chosen a set that offered the best value for access and support. During the consultation the opportunity to work with the Maidenhead Community Centre became clear and there was also the opportunity to move the office element of the youth service from Marlow Road to Reform Road and free up space for the community service. It was proposed to remove Marlow Road as the designation of the service and legal advice was appropriate after the report was delayed for one month before coming to Cabinet. It was proposed to move resources from the maintenance of buildings to providing targeted support to residents. Coming out of this process was the opportunity to repurpose the Pinckney's Green centre to create a smaller more comfortable space to meet with vulnerable children.

The Lead Member for Housing, Communications and Youth Engagement focused on Pinckneys Green as it was a good news story and had key benefits, the enhancements of services, releasing property for social housing by moving services to this site and provide targeted support. He thanked Mr Gilmore for his positive engagement on the use of this site. It showed how constructed engagement benefited the community.

The Chairman said that this was an excellent strategy that had a lot of work put into it. It was about services and not buildings. He also thanked Mr Gilmore for his role.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor said that she thought that this was an excellent paper that yielded many dividends. She was delighted that Windsor was retaining a strong hub support and especially the poppies nursery that was important to our armed forces. In Eton Wick some residents have come forward with suggestions of running their own youth club.

Cllr Tisi said that the transformation was a huge undertaking and will have an impact on our residents so she stood by the decision to call the paper in earlier on in the year. Because of this there was the second consultation that gave residents a chance to say what they felt about potential closures. Despite reservation it was accepted that the hub system would be introduced and she hoped the transformation succeeds. There was a role for voluntary organisations and she asked how secure the council was that these groups had the capacity especially with C-19.

The Lead Member said the second wave of consultation had already been planned but he welcomed the scrutiny of the proposals. The Director also said it is hard work for volunteers to run groups but there would be capacity from the youth service to work with groups and also sign post services.

Cllr Werner welcomed the change in direction but remained concerned about the loss of universal services. He was glad that Pincknys Green centre was to be retained. He was concerned about the loss of the large hall and way it was used and asked for certainty if there would remain a hall after the changes to make it a youth centre.

The Lead Member replied that he was pleased the proposals had been well received. The design of the building was currently being undertaken. The Director also said that changes to the centre was required for service delivery for smaller groups. All opportunities to maximise the space for public use would be considered.

Cllr Price said that with regards to the Lawns Children's Centre were on page 196 it said that it was the only user of the site. Family Friends also used the site. She was informed that they would remain on the site the reference in the report was to space used for the children's centre.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- I. Agrees to the proposed model of an integrated Family Hub Service as set out in the consultation documents in appendix 2.**
- II. Agrees to the proposals de-designating a number of children's centres, along with a number of changes to leases and rental agreements at a number of sites as set out in section 3.3.**
- III. Confirms that Achieving for Children should commence implementation including staff consultation for the proposed new model.**

D) MID-YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT

Cabinet considered the report regarding the mid-year performance report.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor informed Cabinet that the Council Plan 2017-21 remained current up to 30 July 2020 when Cabinet approved an Interim Council Strategy 2020/21 for immediate adoption on the basis that the Covid-19 pandemic had significantly altered the context in which the council was currently operating.

Table 2 of the report showed that 9 reported targets were showing as one target, 6 near target and 4 off target. There has also been other successes such as the completion of the Braywick LC, the Climate Change Strategy, keeping our residents safe, the library service and the modern workforce project.

There had been issues with the new waste contract that was now stabilising and due to the pandemic there had been on temporary accommodation and care leavers finding employment.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- I. Notes the Mid-Year Performance Report in Appendix A.**
- II. Requests relevant Lead Members, Directors and Heads of Service to maintain focus on performance.**

E) RBWM PROPERTY COMPANY LTD – ANNUAL REPORT & AUDITED ACCOUNTS 2019-2020

Cabinet considered the report regarding the Annual Report and Audited Accounts for 2019-2020 (for the year ended 31 March 2020) for RBWM Property Company

The Chairman informed Cabinet that Mr Andrew Hill had registered to speak on this item and asked him to address the meeting.

Mr Hill said that the company had evolved over time from when it had first been established. When set up it was given properties in York Road and had to return interest payments. He asked why the minutes of the company were not public as they used to be. Could the company be more transparent. Could we see minutes or hold public meetings due to how close it is to the council and represents the council on major development schemes. He asked what the process of transferring properties to the company. As it grows the public need to Know what it is doing.

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property informed Cabinet that the company had had an excellent year in its growth and the quality of services provided to the council. The company has support the transformation programme.

Barbara Richardson, Executive Director RBWM Property Company, informed Cabinet that the only assets that transfer into the company are residential assets. The council's commercial portfolio remained within the council. The York Road flats were transferred for private rented units with a loan on them as a profit making process, the loan is still on the accounts. Since then assets have been transferred for repurposing and used for affordable housing. There was currently only 13 assets. With regards to minutes and Board meeting the company was independent and a private registered company so we do not have the same rules that the council has. However nearly all items discussed come to Cabinet.

The Chairman mentioned that the Council was not in a position that Croydon found itself in. Every investment made was based on sound financial planning.

Cllr Baldwin raised a question of one of the Non-Executive Directors by name asking about his connections with the Shanley property company and if this had been declared. He asked if the Leader was aware of this as many of the residents would see this as a conflict of interest. The Managing Director informed that if Cabinet were going to discuss an individual this needed to be in Part II.

Cllr Baldwin mentioned that this information was in the public domain but the Chairman said that he was questioning an individual who was not at the meeting and thus had no right of reply about a perceived conflict of interest.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and the Annual Report and Financial Statements for RBWM Property Company for 2019-2020 (the year ended 31 March 2020).

F) **SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS AND COORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME 2022/23**

Cabinet considered the report regarding school admission arrangements and co-ordinated admissions scheme for 2022/23.

The Deputy Chairman of Cabinet, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, Health and Mental Health informed Cabinet that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead was the admissions authority for community and voluntary controlled schools in the borough and set out the admissions arrangements for these schools.

The Local Authority also had a statutory duty to formulate a scheme to coordinate admission arrangements for all publicly funded schools within their area for phase transfer, e.g. primary to secondary school, and publish it on the website by 1 January 2021. This report recommended a revision to the co-ordinated admissions scheme to introduce a deadline by which a late application must be received for consideration in the second round of allocations.

The report sought approval to consult with other admission authorities and local authorities on the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Co-ordinated Admissions Scheme including the proposed change. Following the consultation, it seeks delegation to the Director of Children's Services, in consultation with the Lead Member, to approve the revised arrangements, having taken into account any views arising from the consultation.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves, and thereby determines, the RBWM Admission Arrangements for 2022/23 as set out at Appendix A.**
- ii) Approves consultation on the RBWM Co-ordinated Admissions scheme for 2022/23 as set out at Appendix B.**
- iii) Delegates authority to the Director of Children's Services in consultation with the Lead Member for Adult Social Care, Children Services, Health and Mental Health to approve, and thereby determine, the RBWM Co-ordinated Admissions scheme for 2022/23 set out at Appendix B.**

G) **MUFC - REQUEST FOR RELOCATION**

Cabinet considered the report regarding the request for relocation of Maidenhead United Football Club

The Chairman informed Cabinet that Mr Andrew Hill had registered to speak on this item and asked him to address the meeting.

Mr Hill mentioned that the BLP meetings did discuss Braywick Park and the issue of Forest Bridge School and the football club was raised. He felt that the location was still not known to the public and asked why we had not been told.

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property informed Cabinet that any move was still subject to the planning process. The report had been discussed at the Corporate O&S Panel and he thanked Member of the Panel for their input. The paper was an approval in principal subject to subject to an s.123 report,

planning consent and a detail consultation exercise. This is driven by the football club and when they are ready to proceed all the relevant details will be made available.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Resident and Leisure Services, HR, IT, Legal, Performance Management and Windsor said she supported the paper and the club moving would complement the Braywick LC and create a wonderful sport hub.

Cllr Singh said that this had been in his ward for 150 years but they had been looking for a new home. This will help the club, however he was concerned about the number of facilities being put into the park and on busy days the impact on transport.

Cllr Price mentioned that on page 542 under sustainability that consideration should be made about the existing nature reserve and any noise from the club and any associated activities. The Chairman mentioned that this would be considered in the planning process that the club would have to address. This paper was to progress to the next stage they still had a lot of hard work to do.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- I. Approves the release of land identified at appendix B, subject to planning for £460,000 as recommended in the s.123 report.**
- II. Delegates authority to Executive Director of Place, to undertake the statutory procedure required under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 as required and negotiate draft agreement for lease, for 999 years at a peppercorn rent.**

H) ASSET DISPOSAL & REDEVELOPMENT

Cabinet considered the report regarding the properties known as 18-20 Ray Mill Road East, Maidenhead.

The Leader of the Council and Chairman of Cabinet, Business, Economic Development and Property informed that this was a good example how the RBWM Property Company and operational services have worked closely together to identify an underutilised asset which could either been disposed of for a capital receipt or be used differently for in this instance helping with affordable housing.

Resolved unanimously: that Cabinet notes the report and:

- I. Approves the investment report at appendix A.**
- II. Recommends the relocation of Family Centre to Pinkneys Green Community Centre, in line with the family hub consultation process.**
- III. Recommends that Council approves a capital budget of £272,500 for the project.**
- IV. Approves the transfer of 20 Ray Mill Road East, once completed to RBWM Property Co Ltd, for use as affordable housing.**
- V. Approves the disposal of 18 Ray Mill Road East, by way of an open market bidding process.**
- VI. Delegate's authority to the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Lead Member for Business, Economic Development and Property to progress the project.**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public were excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion

took place on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 3 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 6.15 pm, finished at 8.50 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....