

ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

**Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday 20 October 2010 at 5.00 pm
in the Conference Room West (F1R09), West Suffolk House,
Western Way, Bury St Edmunds**

PRESENT: Councillor J H M Griffiths (Leader of the Council) (in the Chair)
Councillors Mrs Alexander, Clements, Mrs Gower,
Mrs Mildmay-White, Ray and Stevens.

BY INVITATION: Councillor Spicer (Vice-Chairman of the Performance and Audit
Scrutiny Committee) and Councillor Thorndyke (Chairman of the
Central Safety and Joint Staff Consultative Panels) and
Councillors Beckwith, Cox and Mrs Rushbrook and Mick Pearce,
Chairman of Suffolk County Football Association for minute 72.

60. Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Everitt.

61. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62. Declarations of Interests

Members' declarations of interests are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

63. Petition

Mr Martin Ingram, owner of Dudley Mason, Abbeygate Street, Bury St Edmunds and also a resident of Bury St Edmunds presented a petition containing 336 signatures. The petitioners were against the use of the Corn Exchange, Bury St Edmunds as a drinking establishment and as a result requested the refusal of planning and licensing permissions for the building.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Ingram addressed the Cabinet for a total of three minutes. Mr Ingram stated that he and his wife had been residents of Bury St Edmunds for six years and owners of an independent business which retailed in the town for two years. Whilst they were not averse to Wetherspoons trading within the town there were concerns about the use of the Corn Exchange as licensed premises, in particular because of its scale, a view which Mr Ingram stated was shared by the Member of Parliament, David Ruffley MP. This opinion was also shared by many others located in the town according to the consultation on the proposed use of the Corn Exchange and reports and letters presented to the Bury Free Press. As a result Mr Ingram had received 336 signatures for his petition against the use of the Corn Exchange as a drinking establishment and asked that the Council refuse planning and licensing permissions for the building. He then stated that the Facebook group in favour of Wetherspoons in Bury St Edmunds was supporting just that, not the end use of a historical building in the historical core. He added that by the very nature of social networking sites supporters of a cause may have no connection with the town at all and were in the majority of cases not resident in the area. There was no way of establishing from this group the number of persons directly affected by the choices of the Council. He concluded by stating that the Council was elected by the people to

represent the people and that the petition provided evidence of the local view against the use of the Corn Exchange as a drinking establishment.

In response, Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White, Portfolio Holder for Economy and Asset Management, said she understood the sentiments expressed by Mr Ingram. She stated that the Corn Exchange needed to be used and no other viable application for its use had been received. She emphasised that any planning and licensing applications would go through the normal procedures, including full public consultation. She also reminded Mr Ingram that a previous planning application submitted by the Borough Council for the use of the Corn Exchange as a drinking establishment had been refused by the Council's Development Control Committee.

64. Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 27 September 2010

Forward Plan Reference: N/A Cabinet Members: All Portfolio Holders

The Cabinet received and noted Report B250 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following item discussed by the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee on 27 September 2010:-

Audit Commission presentation of 2009/2010 ISA 260 Annual Governance Report to those charged with governance.

Councillor Spicer, Vice-Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He explained that the Committee's September meeting was held each year to enable the Audit Commission to formally present its Annual Governance Report to the Committee and that Neil Harris, District Auditor, presented this year's report to the Committee. A number of non-trivial errors and one non-trivial error had not been adjusted for as the Audit Commission was satisfied with the explanation. The Commission had issued an unqualified opinion on the Council's Financial Statements. The District Auditor had congratulated the Council on another good performance and the Committee acknowledged that this was down to the performance of the Finance Team, and had congratulated the Chief Finance Officer and her colleagues.

The Chief Executive informed the Cabinet that the Audit Commission would no longer be producing its Use of Resources scores but that there was an indication that for the four categories that would have been scored the Borough Council would have achieved top marks of 4 out of 4 for two of the categories and 3 out of 4 for the remaining two. This provided a clear indication that the Borough Council had provided another excellent performance in its financial management.

(Councillor Spicer left the meeting at the conclusion of this item.)

65. Recommendations from Shared Services Steering Group: 16 September 2010

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/06 Cabinet Member: Cllr John Griffiths

The Cabinet considered Report B251 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Shared Services Steering Group on 16 September 2010:-

- (1) Project Update;
- (2) Shared Services Communications Strategy;
- (3) ICT Business Case;
- (4) Anglia Revenues Partnership; and
- (5) Customer Services Direct (CSD).

Councillor Ray, Vice-Chairman of the Shared Services Steering Group, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He explained that as part of the 'way forward' in producing a full Information and Communication Technology (ICT) business case the Steering Group had concluded that it may not be appropriate to appoint a single ICT Manager for both the Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council before the production of the full business case and that this would be the subject of further discussion.

RESOLVED:- That

(a) Shared Services Communications Strategy

The Shared Services Communications Strategy, as detailed in Appendix A to Report B212, be approved, subject to the inclusion of the following amendments:-

- (a) the Property, Markets and Car Parks service cluster be added to the priority list of shared services identified for delivery in Phase 1; and
- (b) additional media stakeholders be added to the list in Appendix I.

(b) Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Outline Business Case

- (1) The ICT Outline Business Case, as detailed in Appendix 1 to Report B213, be approved; and
- (2) taking into consideration that it may not be appropriate to recruit a single ICT Manager before the production of the full ICT Business Case, the 'Way Forward', as set out in paragraph 4.1 of Report B213, be approved.

66. Recommendations from Central Safety Panel: 11 October 2010

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/04 Cabinet Member: Cllr David Ray

The Cabinet considered Report B252 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Central Safety Panel on 11 October 2010:-

- (1) Minutes: Combined Area Safety Committee (CASC);
- (2) Incidents involving Employees and Incidents involving Members of the Public;
- (3) Healthy Ambitions Suffolk: Business Award Scheme;
- (4) Fire Log Book;
- (5) Health and Safety News; and
- (6) Any Urgent Business.

Councillor Thorndyke, Chairman of the Central Safety Panel, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He stated that the Borough Council was already working actively to improve the health of its employees through its wellbeing initiatives but considered that applying for this Healthy Ambitions Suffolk Business Award would further enhance this work. He added that there were no cost implications to the Borough Council apart from continuing the on costs of the wellbeing initiatives.

RESOLVED:- That

Healthy Ambitions Suffolk Business Award Scheme

The Council applies for a Healthy Ambitions Suffolk Business Award and continues to develop its Wellbeing Initiatives to further reduce ill health during the 2 year period of the grant of any award.

67. Recommendations from Joint Staff Consultative Panel: 12 October 2010

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/05 Cabinet Member: Cllr David Ray

The Cabinet considered Report B253 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Joint Staff Consultative Panel on 12 October 2010:-

- (1) Partnership Working and Shared Services: Update; and
- (2) Harmonisation of Key Human Resources Policies: Disciplinary and Capability and Sickness Absence and Ill-health Policies.

The Cabinet was asked to approve the adoption of single key policies for the management of human resources across St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and Forest Heath District Council (FHDC). The Partnership People Protocol agreed by the Councils encouraged the development of joint policies to ensure consistency with the Partnership Agenda. It was considered extremely enabling for the sharing of the Human Resources and the Learning and Development Services to use the same policies and procedures for dealing effectively with Human Resource issues, and it would also be useful for Service Managers and Team Leaders managing shared services to become competent and confident with one policy for each situation.

Councillor Mrs Alexander a member of the Joint Staff Consultative Panel, informed the Cabinet that during the discussions on this item at the meeting of the Panel the employees' representatives had indicated that they were being kept informed of developments and appropriate discussions were also being held with staff from the Human Resources Section.

RESOLVED:-

That the joint policies for St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council on Disciplinary and Capability, attached as Appendix A to Report B248, and Sickness Absence and Ill-Health, attached as Appendix B to Report B248 be approved.

68. Asset Management Plan: Beetons Cottages, Bury St Edmunds

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/07 Cabinet Member: Cllr Sara Mildmay-White

The Cabinet considered Report B254 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the sale of numbers 1 and 2 Beetons Cottages, Bury St Edmunds.

The Council bought numbers 1 and 2 Beetons Cottages in the late 1980's as service accommodation for two caretakers working at the former St Edmundsbury House and Depot. Following the tender of the Facilities Management Contract for services at West Suffolk House and subsequent resignation of a caretaker, number 2 Beetons Cottages was now vacant and surplus to requirements for service delivery. In accordance with Asset Management Plan (AMP) procedures the favoured option was to sell the property. Number 1 Beetons Cottages continued to be occupied by a caretaker employed by Ocean Cleaning Ltd and would be disposed of when the opportunity arose.

A detailed discussion was held on whether there was any advantage to the Borough Council in retaining number 2 Beetons Cottages until number 1 became vacant and also whether there were any possible developments in the immediate vicinity to the site. However, it was concluded that there would be no apparent development opportunities and there would be no advantage in waiting until Number 1 became vacant.

RESOLVED:- That

- (1) Number 2 Beetons Cottages be declared surplus and sold on the open market; and
- (2) Number 1 Beetons Cottages be declared surplus when it becomes vacant.

69. Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme and Section 106 Funds

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/09 Cabinet Member: Cllr Sara Mildmay-White

The Cabinet considered Report B255 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the reallocation of the available Section 106 funds and Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) Scheme for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012.

The Borough Council had received a total of £1,319,740 over five years in respect of LABGI funding from the Government. However, the new Government had announced that the funding for the scheme had been withdrawn and no more grants would be made. The Borough Council's allocation for 2010/2011 of £40,928 had been reclaimed, therefore, there was a need to review the Investment Programme. This funding was to be used to promote economic prosperity throughout St Edmundsbury. In addition the Borough Council had received a £750,000 from the Asda development as a Section 106 contribution, which was to be used for economic development initiatives within Bury St Edmunds and again a review of this Investment Programme was required.

A detailed discussion was held on the allocations listed in the tables attached to the report. During the discussion the Cabinet was informed that although the funding for the Haverhill Town Centre Management and Events ceased in June 2011 discussions were continuing on the options to continue the functionality but not the post. The proposal to allocate £79,000 for the Rural Action Plan was endorsed. The Cabinet was pleased to note the success of the Apprenticeship Support Initiative and welcomed the continued funding for this project.

Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White was concerned at reports within the press that the Borough Council had reallocated funding which had been earmarked for community initiatives within Bury St Edmunds to business initiatives elsewhere. It was agreed that a letter be sent to appropriate members of the community clearly stating that the Section 106 funding received from Asda had been made to contribute towards economic development initiatives within Bury St Edmunds only because the Asda petrol station had been located on industrial land. It was a contribution towards economic development initiatives and had never been intended for use for community initiatives.

RESOLVED:- That

- (1) The amended investment proposals for the available Section 106 funds and the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) scheme for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 as detailed in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 and section 4 of Report B255 be approved; and

- (2) the Corporate Director for Economy and Environment, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder responsible for economic development and the Chief Finance Officer, be authorised, if necessary, to update and amend the investment programme in (1) above in accordance with the Council's Economic Development Action Plan.

**70. Recommendations from Sustainable Development Panel:
5 October 2010**

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/01 Cabinet Member: Cllr Terry Clements

The Cabinet considered Report B256 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Sustainable Development Panel on 5 October 2010:-

St Edmundsbury Local Development Framework: Core Strategy Inspector's Report and Final Core Strategy Document.

The Cabinet was requested to note the contents of the Planning Inspector's Report on the St Edmundsbury Local Development Framework Core Strategy and to recommend to full Council the adoption of the Core Strategy document as amended.

Councillor Clements, Chairman of the Sustainable Development Panel, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He stated that the Council had been working on the preparation of the Core Strategy since 2008 and there had been three rounds of consultation. During the whole consultation period around 4,000 representations had been received. In December 2009, full Council had agreed to submit the Core Strategy to the Government for examination by a Planning Inspector. The examination of the Core Strategy took place between January and August 2010 and the Inspector's Report into the examination had now been received by the Council and a copy had been distributed to all Members. The Inspector had advised the Council that the Core Strategy, subject to mainly minor amendments, was sound and that it complied with the legislation for preparing Local Development Frameworks. The Panel had considered the Report and the amended Core Strategy and associate documents at its meeting of 5 October 2010.

Councillor Clements continued by stating that the Panel was informed that the changes proposed by the Inspector were binding upon the Council should they wish to adopt the Core Strategy. Furthermore, the changes could not be 'cherry picked'. The Panel had been asked to consider two options:-

- (1) whether to adopt the Core Strategy as amended; or
- (2) not to adopt the Core Strategy.

In considering the options, the Panel was asked to consider whether the Core Strategy represented the appropriate planning strategy for St Edmundsbury, and was reminded that the Council had already considered the implications of the revocation of the East of England Plan on the Core Strategy and, in particular the planned housing numbers. The Panel agreed that the evidence presented demonstrated that the housing numbers planned in the Core Strategy were appropriate for the Borough. The Inspector was aware of this consideration and was also reminded that locations for strategic growth in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill were derived locally. The Inspector had confirmed that an appropriate approach had been taken to identify these directions of growth. In terms of the Strategy for the Rural Area, the Inspector was satisfied that the hierarchy of settlements provided a sound basis for the detailed planning of these settlements.

Councillor Clements then continued by stating that Members would be aware that a Localism Bill planned by the Coalition Government may propose a greater role in the decision making for local communities. However, it was likely that the Bill would not be enacted until late in 2011 and until that time the Council would need to continue to determine planning applications. The Panel had given consideration to the option not to adopt the Core Strategy. The Panel was reminded that the current local plan made provision for development in 2016 and that there remained a requirement to identify sufficient land that could deliver the housing requirements of the Borough for the next five years. This would start to be an issue from mid 2011. In addition, the lack of a clear planning framework would put the Council at risk from speculative development proposals and take away any certainty about the extent and location of growth and the infrastructure planning to service it. Planning would potentially be through the appeal process rather than controlled locally. Councillor Clements concluded that having given careful consideration to the report the Sustainable Development Panel recommend that Cabinet recommends to full Council that the Local Development Framework Core Strategy be adopted.

Councillor Beckwith considered that urban extension of Moreton Hall was nearing completion. The housing settlement boundary was clear and everywhere inside it was filled. The Core Strategy contained proposals for a brand new development in Moreton Hall that was unacceptable. He added that the reporting of the consultation feedback to Members was inadequate. For example, he had submitted representations on behalf of 'hundreds of people'. This, plus other representations from residents of Moreton Hall merited just two lines in the report to the Sustainable Development Panel. He had challenged the Council to explain how it would mitigate the effects of so much development and the whole concept hung on the provision of the eastern relief road. He had told the Council on numerous occasions of the problems that already existed but these had been ignored. However, the community had shown by attending public meetings in very large numbers, and now by forming a residents' association, that the anger and frustration and sense of betrayal was widespread. Throughout the process it has been stressed that it was the Government's fault because the Rural Spatial Strategy laid down the number of houses to be built. However, that had absolutely no bearing on where they should be built. That decision came from the Council and the Council alone. He was most concerned that the Council had disregarded public opinion and agreed proposals that would adversely impact on a community of over 6,000 people who had already taken significantly more development than originally proposed.



RECOMMENDED:- That

St Edmundsbury Local Development Framework: Core Strategy – Inspector's Report and Final Core Strategy document

That the Core Strategy document as amended, (Appendix B); Proposals Map (Appendix C), Habitat Regulations Assessment (Screening), (Appendix D), and the Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix E) to Report B239 be recommended for adoption by full Council.

71. Recommendations from Rural Area Working Party: 30 September 2010

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/03 Cabinet Member: Cllr John Griffiths

(Councillor Stevens declared a personal interest as the Borough Council's representative on the Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Advisory Committee and remained within the meeting for consideration of this item.)

The Cabinet considered Report B257 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Rural Area Working Party held on 30 September 2010:-

- (1) Introduction to the 'Village Hub' Concept;
- (2) Participation of our Rural Communities in the future stages of the delivery of the Local Development Framework;
- (3) Targeting of campaigns to promote the take up of benefits in Rural Areas;
- (4) Review of Rural Area Funding: Final Report;
- (5) The Council's approach to the new neighbourhoods agenda in the rural area; and
- (6) Rural Area Working Party Work Programme.

Councillor Thorndyke, Chairman of the Rural Area Working Party, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He stated that the Working Party had received a very interesting presentation from Steve Cook, former Chief Executive of the Havebury Housing Partnership, concerning the 'Village Hub' Concept. Mr Cook had advocated the establishment of a community partnership which, through the use of existing assets such as the Village Hall and Playing Field, could enable income streams to be generated and thus allowed local services to be sustained or developed. However, Councillor Thorndyke had reservations about whether there were actually many rural communities that would be in a position to utilise assets in this way.

Councillor Thorndyke then explained that as part of its review of rural funding the Working Party had considered that it did not have enough information to determine whether there should be continued contributions towards funding for the Brecks Partnership and Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project, and, therefore that this was a matter for the Cabinet to take forward. He concluded by stating that the Working Party considered it appropriate that the Cabinet consider the level of subsidy for Parish and Town Councillor elections.

A discussion was held in which the Cabinet agreed that it was appropriate for the Grant Panel to consider future funding for the Brecks Partnership and Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project. A discussion was then held on the level of subsidy for Parish and Town Councillor elections. The Cabinet was informed that a letter had been sent to all Parish and Town Councils informing them that the Borough Council was considering making no provision to fund Parish or Town Council elections and that they may wish to take this into consideration when setting their precepts. It was emphasised that this was not a consultation letter but one of information. The Cabinet concluded that regrettably it was no longer appropriate for the Borough Council to continue to provide funds to finance Parish and Town Council Elections and that the Councils be notified as soon as possible in order that they could take this decision into consideration when setting their precepts.

RESOLVED:- That

Review of Rural Area Funding: Final Report (Report B235)

- (1) Subject to the clarification outlined in paragraphs 3.2 (vii) and (viii) of Report B235 ie. funding for In Bloom and Christmas lights being included in the Rural Area Community Initiatives Fund (RACIF) all current rural funding streams be retained;
- (2) the Rural Action Plan and the Rural Area Community Initiatives Fund funding streams due to end in 2011 continue;
- (3) no new rural funding streams should be introduced;
- (4) funding for the Brecks Partnership and Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Project should be examined in more detail as part of the budget setting process for 2011/2012; and

- (5) to assist the Parish and Town Councils in precept planning, no provision be made by the Borough Council for the cost of Parish and Town Council elections.

72. Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/02 Cabinet Member: Cllr Lynsey Alexander

(Councillor Cox declared a personal interest as an affiliated member of the Suffolk and Cambridge Football Association and remained in the meeting for the consideration of the item.)

The Cabinet considered Reports B258 (previously circulated) which sought confirmation of the Borough Councils commitment to the Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project.

In 2008, the Borough Council set aside capital funding of up to £1m to further its aspiration to set up a community football project in Bury St Edmunds, including the relocation of Bury Town Football Club from Ram Meadow to a site set aside for recreational use at Moreton Hall. This report provided a means to deliver a Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project in partnership with Suffolk Football Association and Bury Town Football Club and a range of other external funding contributors. It also provided the opportunity for the Council to improve local community facilities to the east of Moreton Hall. The land on which the Project would be developed was owned by the Borough Council and would be leased to and managed by Suffolk County Football Association. Suffolk County Football Association would then sub-let part of the site to Bury Town FC for their new football ground. There was no requirement for revenue funding to be contributed by the Borough Council for the Project.

Councillor Mrs Alexander emphasised that there was a strict timeframe for this project to proceed due to limited availability of national funding, which was endorsed by Mick Pearce, Chairman of Suffolk County Football Association. Councillor Mrs Alexander then informed the Cabinet that during the consultation concerns had been raised about car parking. She considered that the 250 spaces allocated for car parking should be enough spaces for community use of the facility but that there would be occasional Bury Town Football Club matches, due to their importance, where additional parking may be required. She stated that this issue was being addressed and it was anticipated that a Travel Management Plan would be produced in respect of 'big' matches.

Councillor Beckwith, one of the local Ward Members for Moreton Hall, stated that parking was an important issue for the residents of Moreton Hall and that concerns had already been expressed about car parking along Skyliner Way. He considered that there was scope to build a bigger car park and it would be more cost effective to build it whilst the scheme was being built rather than at a later date. He concluded by stating that he supported the scheme but it was important that potential parking problems be addressed at this stage of the process.

Councillor Cox stated that he fully supported the project and, having attended the consultation, understood that parking issues were a concern of residents. Having discussed the facilities with the Architect he also considered that there was a need for additional toilet facilities in close proximity to the main entrance to the site. In response, Mick Pearce stated that as part of the design process consideration had been given to the toilet facilities and it had been concluded that these were acceptable for the proposed use of the site.

A discussion was held regarding funding, and it was noted that the Suffolk County Football Association Capital Funding contribution had yet to be determined. It was agreed that Members would be notified in writing when this was known. In addition, it was stated that the report did not list all the partners who may be making a

contribution towards the scheme and it was the intention that Bury St Edmunds Town Council would be approached.

Mick Pearce stated that Suffolk County Football Association was fully committed to the project, provided that appropriate business and football development plans were produced to make sure it was a sustainable scheme. He emphasised that there were time pressures for the delivery of this scheme.

RESOLVED:- That

- (1) the Borough Council confirms its existing commitment to the Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project, subject to the receipt of planning permission and external match-funding;
- (2) external funding bids be submitted to the Football Foundation, Football Stadia Improvement Fund and other external funders for the Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project;
- (3) subject to the approval of their Board of Directors, Suffolk County Football Association be approved to lead the Project, in partnership with the Borough Council and Bury Town Football Club;
- (4) subject to successful funding bids, planning permission, funding and tenders being in place, that the project land be leased to Suffolk County Football Association for the purpose of developing and operating the Bury St Edmunds Community Football Project, with a sub-lease to Bury Town Football Club for their new football ground; and
- (5) that a further report be submitted to Cabinet for final authorisation, following the planning process, funding bid approval and, if successful, building tenders in 2011.

(Councillors Beckwith, Cox and Thorndyke left the meeting at the conclusion of the discussion on this item.)

73. Heritage Service: Acquisition and Disposal Policy

Forward Plan Reference: Nov10/08 Cabinet Member: Cllr Lynsey Alexander

The Cabinet considered a narrative item which sought approval to a revised Acquisition and Disposal Policy which was detailed in Paper B259 (previously circulated).

The Acquisition and Disposal Policy was first approved by the Council on 27 June 2006. As part of the West Stow accreditation through the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council it had now been further updated to reflect the latest technical changes concerning collection and disposal criteria and procedures which were detailed in Section 14 of Paper B259. The Acquisition and Disposal Policy was based on a Model Policy provided by the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council.



RECOMMENDED:- That

- (1) ***the revised Acquisition and Disposal Policy, detailed in Paper B259, be approved; and***

- (2) *the Corporate Director for Community, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture and Sport, be authorised to make minor typographic, grammatical and/or factual changes.*

**EXEMPT INFORMATION – EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC
TERMS OF FORMAL RESOLUTION**

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

74. Revenues Collection Performance and Write Offs

Forward Plan Reference: N/A Cabinet Member: Cllr John Griffiths

(Councillor Clements declared a prejudicial interest as he was an acquaintance of a debtor and left the meeting for the consideration of this item.)

The Cabinet considered Report B260 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the Write Off of two accounts for Council Tax and 36 accounts in respect of Business Rates.

The Revenues Section collects outstanding debts in accordance with either statutory guidelines or Council agreed procedures. When all these procedures had been exhausted the outstanding debt was written off using the delegated authority of the Chief Finance Officer for debts up to £1500 or by Cabinet for debts over £1500. The reasons for recommending the write offs were included in the Exempt Appendices attached to the report.

The Collection Data in respect of Council Tax and National Non Domestic Rates was shown in Section 8 of the report.

RESOLVED:-

That the write off of two Council Tax accounts totalling £5,912.74, detailed in Exempt Appendix 1 of Report B260, and 36 Business Rates accounts totalling £177,948.92, detailed in Exempt Appendix 2 of Report B260 be approved.

The meeting concluded at 6.55 pm

**J H M GRIFFITHS
CHAIRMAN**