

MINUTES OF ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on Monday 30 September 2013 at 7.00pm in the Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds.

PRESENT:

The Mayor (Councillor T L Buckle) (in the Chair)

Councillors:

Ager	Griffiths	Mrs Richardson
Beckwith	Mrs Hind	Mrs Rushbrook
Mrs Broughton	P J Hopfensperger	Mrs Rushen
Ms Byrne	Mrs R V Hopfensperger	Springett
Chung	Houlder	Mrs Stamp
Clements	Levack	Stevens
Clifton-Brown	Marks	Thorndyke
Cockle	McManus	Mrs Wakelam
Mr Cox	Mrs Mildmay-White	F J Warby
Everitt	Nettleton	Mrs P A Warby
Farmer	Oliver	Mrs D A Whittaker
Farthing	Pugh	A Whittaker
French	Ray	
Gower	Redhead	

32. Prayers

The Mayor's Chaplain, Reverend Nigel Corwin of Christ Church, Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds, opened the meeting with prayers.

33. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 18 June 2013 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Mayor.

34. Mayor's Communications

The Mayor reported on the 74 civic engagements which he and the Mayoress had attended since the Meeting of the Council on 18 June 2013. A further 13 civic engagements had been attended by Deputy Mayor Councillor Marks; two engagements had been attended by Past Mayors Councillor F J Warby and Councillor Mrs P A Warby and one engagement had been attended by Past Mayor Councillor Spicer. Details of all the engagements attended had been circulated with the Members' Bulletin on Friday 20 September 2013.

35. Announcements from the Leader of the Council

Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council, made the following announcements. He reported that St Edmundsbury Borough Council could expect a cut of 47% in government funding over the next two years and this would pose a very serious challenge.

He then informed Members that the staffing restructure was nearing the end and he was aware that staff had been under a lot of pressure. However, he was confident that the Council was on track to deliver improved services.

Finally he wished to thank all those who had submitted comments and proposals as part of the Vision 2031 consultation and that all submissions would be forwarded to the Secretary of State.

36. **Announcements from the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Simner, Spicer and Mrs Wade.

Under this item the Head of Legal and Democratic Services also introduced the new Democratic Services Manager, Fiona Osman.

37. **Declarations of Interest**

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

38. **Public Question Time**

Mr Ian Johnson of Haverhill stated that Haverhill would have 85 hectares deficit of parkland and nature reserve when its population reached that of Bury St Edmunds in 2001. He therefore asked why the potential parkland between Calford Green and the Wilsey Estate in Haverhill was restricted to 20 hectares, when the formal request to St Edmundsbury was for a designated green area of just over 30 hectares? And why has this area been called a "green buffer zone" and not "country parkland"?

In reply, **Councillor Clements, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation**, confirmed that an Open Space Assessment carried out in 2005 noted that Haverhill had a "reasonably generous" amount of accessible open space with nowhere in the town more than half a mile from either designated Amenity Open Space or Recreational Open Space. He went on to inform Mr Johnson that the next stage for North-East Haverhill would be the preparation of the masterplan and that this would provide a further opportunity for local residents to work up a bit more detail on how the development would look and what form the various areas of open space, including the buffer, would take. Those residents that have concerns about the open space provision were urged to get involved in this process.

County Councillor Tony Brown asked why St Edmundsbury were persisting in including a North East Haverhill tertiary road in its plan, when the road would smash through a woodland belt, and go down a golf driving range which is designated a nature reserve? It would also cut through the link with East Town Park.

In reply, **Councillor Clements, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation**, confirmed that the tertiary road had been included as a result of advice from Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority. The concept statement was clear that the route was only an option that could be achieved, but that more detailed traffic analysis would be required before a final decision was made. He concluded that he remained hopeful that the County Council would not require the road.

Haverhill Town Councillor, Roger André, asked for the Council to explain what their view was of the Haverhill Town Council's submission

in respect of Haverhill Vision 2031 submission draft, and in particular if it agreed that the document does not give sufficient weight to the need for major improvements to Haverhill's infrastructure to cater for the current population of 27,000 and for an estimated rise of 10,000 over the period to 2031?

In reply, **Councillor Clements, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation**, stated that the ten page submission made by the Town Council could not be responded to in full as the question time procedures limit the response to three minutes. However, he confirmed that, should the Council decide to submit the Vision document to the Secretary of State then the Planning Inspector would need to consider the submission and that the Council would prepare responses which would be submitted at the time of the Examination of the Vision documents. He went on to state that some of the infrastructure requirements in the Town Council's submission were outside St Edmundsbury and that the Planning Inspector would not be able to impose these requirements on other councils.

In a supplementary question, **Roger André** asked whether the Council would commit to meeting with Haverhill Town Council to discuss these issues.

Councillor Clements agreed to commit to a meeting.

Will Austin, Clerk to Haverhill Town Council, asked the council to justify the claim in report E115 (as amended) "that the proposed reopening of the railway line between the two towns [Cambridge and Haverhill] is not considered feasible in view of the extensive practical problems in reopening the route and the major investment involved". He went on to ask what evidence was used in arriving at this conclusion and did this include the outline feasibility research undertaken by the Cambridge to Colchester Railway Project, and was European funding included in the examination of possible funding sources?

In reply, **Councillor Clements, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation**, stated that, with the exception of a short length in Haverhill, any rail route to Cambridge would be constructed in Cambridgeshire and that clearly the Borough Council would not be the local authority delivering such a project. He went on to explain that two recently published reports (the New Anglia LEP Rail Prospectus and Network Rail Anglia Route Business Plan) did not support such a rail line. In addition, much of the route had been lost and could not easily be reinstated so that new bridges and stations would be required. The draft Transport Strategy had been prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council and it was for them to consider the potential delivery of the project, should they decide to support the construction of a new railway line in their county.

Clive Morris of Bury St Edmunds asked the Leader whether he supported the proposal for a large food retailer to occupy part of the Tayfen Road site which would supply approximately 500 jobs?

In reply, **Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council**, responded that any decision to support, or otherwise, the construction of a large supermarket on this site would be down to the Development Control Committee to determine. Such a proposal would be contrary to the

policy in the adopted Local Plan, the final draft of the Bury Vision 2031 document, the adopted Concept Statement and adopted Masterplan.

David Wetton of Haverhill stated that it would appear that many coincidences have surfaced during this consultation. Firstly the area being called a green buffer zone instead of parkland, and secondly that Haverhill Golf Club have not raised any objections to a road going through their driving range. And surprisingly enough the developer has produced a brochure showing what looks remarkably like a golf course in the middle of the area called a green buffer zone.

Do you not understand why the people of Haverhill are questioning the integrity of the consultation process and with so many coincidences, do you think it will stand up to legal scrutiny?

In reply, **Councillor Clements** responded that residents had wanted to see a separation between certain areas, hence the green buffer zone. The next stage is to prepare the Masterplan which would give further opportunities for local residents to review how the development would look and what form the various areas of open space, including the buffer zone, would take. He urged residents to take the opportunity to make statements to the Planning Inspector.

In a supplementary question, **David Wetton** then asked whether it would confuse the Inspector that policy HV 19 for Haverhill green infrastructure had not been updated under project E5. This referred to a parkland area suggested by consultations, however it is outside the development area and is not the country parkland in the triangle between Calford Green and Haverhill which was requested at Stage 1 of the consultation with the developer and also at Stage 2 by over 350 people and is supported by Haverhill Town Council and Suffolk County Council.

Councillor Clements replied that it was now for the Inspector to take a view. There had been plenty of opportunities for residents to forward their views, and many of them had done so. He confirmed that many of these comments had been taken on board but that there was still an opportunity for residents to put their views to the planning Inspector.

39. **Schedule of Referrals from Cabinet, West Suffolk Joint Standards Committee and Development Control Committee**

The Council considered the Schedule of Referrals contained within Report E126 (previously circulated).

(A) Referrals from Cabinet: 9 July 2013

(A) 1. Level of Council Tax Support Grant to Town/Parish Councils, and SEBC Revenue Grant Scheme for Parish Councils for 2014/2015 onwards

Councillor Ray introduced this item and drew relevant issues to the attention of Council.

Concern was raised by some councillors that consultation had not taken place with parish and town councils and Councillor Ms Byrne moved an amendment to defer this item to allow consultation to take place. This was seconded and the

amendment was debated at length with councillors expressing views for and against. In response Councillor Ray informed the Council that all parish and town clerks had been contacted; that all borough councillors had received details and should have been raising the issue at Parish/Town Council meetings; and that the subject had been raised at the last Parish Conference. In conclusion he urged members to reject the amendment. Following a vote, the amendment was lost.

Councillor Ray proposed the original motion, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the Council Tax Support Grant for Parish/Town Councils be phased out over a four year period at a 25% reduction each year starting in 2014/2015 (year one being 2013/2014);
- (2) the basis for the parish revenue support grant calculation for 2014/2015 onwards be calculated on the previous year's precept level, rather than the forthcoming year's estimated precepts, as outlined in Section 4.24 of Report E52;
- (3) the Parish Revenue Grant Scheme be phased out over a four year period with a 25% reduction in the funding 'pot' each year starting in 2014/2015 (year one being 2013/2014);
- (4) the first two years' reduction amounts arising from the Parish Revenue Grant Scheme, as outlined in (3) above, be retained and for Cabinet to determine its use within the rural areas, possibly through a further amount for the established Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme; and
- (5) delegated authority be given to the Head of Resources and Performance in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance to finalise the designs for both the Council Tax Support Grant Scheme and the Parish Revenue Grant Scheme following the Parish Conference in Autumn 2013, subject to there being no detrimental impact on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy beyond that allowed for in recommendations (1) and (3) above.

(A) 2. Joint Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

On the motion of Councillor Clements, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Joint Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, as contained in Appendix B to Report E46, as amended to include the list of minor amendments tabled at the meeting of the Sustainable Development Working Party on 27 June 2013, be adopted.

(B) Referrals from Cabinet: 10 September 2013

(B) 1. Annual Treasury Management Report 2012/2013

Councillor Ray introduced this item and informed the Council that the report had previously been presented at Treasury Management, Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet. Councillor Ray explained that interest earned as at 31 March 2013 was £92,000 higher than budgeted but that this trend was unlikely to continue as investments were already under-performing; the Treasury Management Sub-Committee would be reviewing investments to see if any improvements could be achieved.

On the motion of Councillor Ray, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Annual Treasury Management Report 2012/2013, attached as Appendix 1 to Report E61, be approved.

(B) 2. Policy for Granting Loans to External Organisations

Councillor Ray introduced this item and informed the Council that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had previously resolved that the draft Policy should be subject to external validation which had now been completed. The revised Policy had been supported by Cabinet but had stipulated an additional statement which would enable the Council to recoup any costs associated with the setting up on any proposed loan.

Some Councillors raised concerns about the concept of loaning money to external organisations whilst at the same time cutting grants. Councillor Ray confirmed that loans would only be approved in exceptional circumstances. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had brought this item forward to ensure that the criteria were adequate.

On the motion of Councillor Ray, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Policy for Granting Loans to External Organisations, as set out in Appendix 1 to Report E102, be adopted, subject to the following addition as Item (f) to Section 3.1 of the Policy:

'Provision for recovery of any fees incurred for items including, but not limited to, validation of financials, legal advice on loan security arrangements etc.'

(B) 3. Amendment to the Grants Policy

On the motion of Councillor Everitt, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the St Edmundsbury Grants Policy be amended to extend the use of the e-mail system for determining all Rural Initiatives Grants is used for all project funding applications.

(B) 4. West Suffolk Empty Homes Strategy 2013/2015

Councillor Mrs Gower introduced this item and in response to a question, confirmed that the strategy would be monitored and officers would report back to members.

On the motion of Councillor Mrs Gower, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the West Suffolk Empty Homes Strategy 2013/2015, as contained in Appendix A to Report E104, be adopted to ensure that the council has a robust and transparent strategy for bringing empty properties back into use.

(B) 5. West Suffolk Contaminated Land Strategy

On the motion of Councillor Clements, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the proposed West Suffolk Contaminated Land Strategy, as amended by the wording contained in Appendix A and as set out in Appendix C to Report E91, be formally adopted.

(C) Referrals from Special Cabinet: 24 September 2013

(C) 1. Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031, Haverhill Vision 2031 and Rural Vision 2031: Submission

(Councillor Mrs Broughton declared a Pecuniary Interest in this item as her husband had a beneficial interest in land referred to in the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2013 document. She left the room during the consideration of this item.)

Councillor Clements introduced this item and expressed his thanks for the excellent work done by officers in producing these documents.

Some councillors acknowledged that they and their residents may not necessarily support all of the aspects within the documents but that it was important that St Edmundsbury had a local plan. Concern was raised over the lack of consideration of infrastructure and transport and that some residents had experienced difficulties in submitting comments online and requesting paper copies. Although not all comments and concerns made had been incorporated into the plans any that had been submitted by 9 August 2013 would be forwarded to the Secretary of State including the ten page document submitted by Haverhill Town Council. It was acknowledged that the Vision 2031 documents provided an overall framework but did not include any detailed planning permissions.

On the motion of Councillor Clements, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, the submission versions of the Bury St Edmunds Vision 2031, Haverhill Vision 2031 and Rural Vision 2031 documents and supporting documentation as contained in Reports D370, D368 and D367 respectively, as amended as minuted in Minute 15 (B) (3) and Appendix A of the minutes of full Council on 16 May 2013, and as consulted upon between 18 June and 9 August 2013, be approved for submission to the Secretary of State and subsequent examination by the Planning Inspectorate.

(Councillors Cockle, Farthing, Mrs Levack and A Whittaker left the meeting at the conclusion of this item.)

(D) Referrals from West Suffolk Joint Standards Committee: 17 June 2013

(D) 1. The New Standards Regime – Update and the Appointment of Independent Persons

On the motion of Councillor Redhead, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED: That

- (1) the position with regard to the implementation of the new Ethics regime be noted;
- (2) the need to align the arrangements for the appointment of Independent Persons at both authorities for the efficient working of the Joint Committee be acknowledged;
- (3) the extension of the appointment of the Independent Persons at Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) for a further year at most, pending the completion of any recruitment process be agreed; and
- (4) the appointment process for Independent Persons going forward be approved and agreed following a further report to the Joint Committee at its next meeting on 16 December 2013.

(E) Referrals from Development Control Committee: 5 September 2013

(E) 1. Framework for a Shared Planning Service

On the motion of Councillor Thorndyke, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the changes to the Constitution as contained in the following appendices to Report E97, be approved:

- (1) Appendix 5 – Part 2: Articles of the Constitution; Article 8: Regulatory and Other Committees and Part 3: Responsibility for Functions: Development Control Committee:

To allow for the creation of a Delegation Panel, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Paragraph 6.3(b) the addition at the end of 'or adjacent Ward Member with the approval of the Ward Member(s)'; and
- (ii) Paragraph 6.3(e) redrafted as follows 'The formal decision will be made by the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, in

consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairmen and any interested local Ward Members. In the absence of a consensus between the Members the application will be reported to the Development Control Committee.'

(2) Appendix 6 – Combined Scheme of Delegation, Head of Planning and Regulatory Services, subject to the following amendment: Paragraph 11: the addition at the end of the words in parenthesis 'and Ward Member(s); and

(3) Appendix 8 – Decision Making Protocol.

40. **Bury St Edmunds Seasonal Park and Ride: Use of Chief Executive's Urgency Powers**

The Council received and noted the use of Chief Executive's Urgency Powers in respect of Bury St Edmunds Seasonal Park and Ride, previously circulated as Report E127.

Concern was raised that the proposed route for the Seasonal Park and Ride entered the town from the East when the car park is located to the West of the town. An alternative route was suggested that entered the town from the West along Newmarket Road. In answer to a question, Councillor Mrs Stamp confirmed that the cost for using the Park and Ride would be £5.00 per car.

41. **Call-In Provisions for Development Control Committee: Use of Chief Executive's Urgency Powers**

The Council noted the use of Chief Executive's Urgency Powers in respect of call-in provisions for Development Control Committee.

42. **Appointment of Chairman of Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee**

Following the sad death of Councillor Hale, Councillor Griffiths expressed his thanks for the hard work that Councillor Hale had given as Chairman of Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee and also to the Vice Chairman, Councillor Spicer.

Councillor Griffiths proposed Councillor Mrs Broughton as Chairman of Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, seconded by Councillor Nettleton. Councillor P J Hopfensperger proposed Councillor Spicer as Chairman, seconded by Councillor Beckwith. Following a vote, Councillor Mrs Broughton was duly elected.

43. **Notice of Motion: Local Government Act 1972: Section 249
Honorary Freedom of the Borough**

Dr Ann Williams

On the motion of Councillor Griffiths, seconded and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That in recognition of the eminent services rendered to the Borough and its residents by Dr Ann Williams, former Principal of West Suffolk College, a special meeting of the Council be convened for the purpose of conferring upon the said Dr Ann Williams the Honorary Freedom of the Borough of St Edmundsbury.

44. **Motion on Notice**

Under Paragraph 12.1 of the Council Procedure Rules, as contained within the Council's Constitution, Councillor Nettleton had given notice of the following motion:-

'That the borough council introduces a Locality Budget scheme so that all 45 Members of the Council can make funding decisions in the wards they represent.'

This motion was duly seconded. The Mayor, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, considered that this motion, as a motion which, if carried, would involve the Council in expenditure not included in the approved budget, should be referred without discussion to the appropriate forum for consideration. He considered that the appropriate forum in this instance was Cabinet with a referral to full Council if required.

45. **Question on Notice**

In accordance with paragraph 11.2 of the Council Procedure Rules, as contained within the Council's Constitution, Councillor Nettleton has given notice of the following question to Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council:

'In which year does the Leader of the Council expect the derelict Tayfen site to be developed at this important gateway to Bury St Edmunds?'

Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council, reminded Members that a Concept Statement and Masterplan had been prepared and adopted for the site that complied with the local plan policy for seeking a mixed use redevelopment scheme. Officers had been meeting prospective developers over a number of years and it was acknowledged that there were a number of constraints on the site that limited the financial viability of delivering the proposals in the Masterplan. There had been recent discussions about possible amendments to the Masterplan put forward by the developers to include a large supermarket but these were not in accordance with the adopted Concept Statement or Policy in the draft Bury Vision 2031 document and would be unlikely to deliver the quality of development that was required.

Councillor Griffiths concluded that officers remained available to continue working with the landowners and developers to bring forward a scheme that would provide both a high quality and viable development that would be a positive enhancement to this gateway to the town.

Councillor Nettleton then stated that he could not find any justification financially to say that the Masterplan for Tayfen Road was viable. Therefore how would a developer deliver a scheme which would give them a return on their investment?

Councillor Griffiths concurred that the markets were not very robust currently and that this was probably why the supermarket had been proposed. However, officers were taking into account issues of viability.

46. **Quarterly Report on Special Urgency**

The Council received and noted a narrative item as required by the Council's Constitution in which the Leader of the Council reported that, the following executive decision was taken under the Special Urgency provisions of the Constitution, with the agreement of the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

The Memorandum of Co-operation for the Cambridge Sub-Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment was signed in order for it to be taken to Forest Heath District Council's next scheduled meeting of Cabinet on 3 September 2013.

47. **Reports and Questions**

- (i) Report from the Leader of the Council: Councillor Griffiths (Report E128)

The following topics were the subject of questions put to Councillor Griffiths, who duly responded:

- (1) Was St Edmundsbury going to object to the tolling of the A14 and would residents be expected to pay to use the toll road indefinitely?
- (2) When would the website improvements be fully operational?

- (ii)(a) Report from the Deputy Leader of the Council: Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White (Report E129)

(Councillor Clements declared that he was Chairman of the Shadow Board for the Bury St Edmunds Community Sports Association and left the meeting during this item to avoid the perception of bias.

Councillor Mr Cox declared a local non-pecuniary interest in this item as an affiliated member of both the Suffolk Football Association and the Cambridgeshire Football Association, and remained in the meeting during this item.

Councillor Mrs Gower declared a local non-pecuniary interest in this item as an owner of property in Chivers Road and remained in the meeting during this item.

The following Councillors declared a local non-pecuniary interest in this item as Bury Town Councillors: Chung, Cockle, Everitt, Farmer, Oliver, Springett, F J Warby, Mrs P A Warby. All remained in the meeting during this item.

The following councillors declared a local non-pecuniary interest in this item as Haverhill Town Councillors: Ms Byrne, French. All remained in the meeting during this item).

The following topics were the subject of questions put to Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White, who duly responded:

- (1) Further information regarding Bury Community Football Project was not yet available. Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White explained that discussions were taking place with Suffolk County Council as they were proposing to build a secondary school in the area and there may be opportunities for shared resources such as car parking.
- (2) Any suggestions for schemes to bid for funding from the £2m transformation fund is available from the West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) would be welcomed from members as well as officers?
- (3) Congratulations were given to all those who had achieved awards at the recent St Edmundsbury Sports Awards ceremony.

A written response would be forwarded to Members in due course to the question:

Will the new surface for the Haverhill All Weather Pitch be first generation astro turf?

(ii)(b) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Waste and Property Portfolio: Councillor Stevens (Report E130)

In the absence of Councillor Stevens, Councillor Clements confirmed that the Head of Waste Management is looking into numbering waste bins (both litter and dog waste) together with a telephone number so that overflowing bins can be easily identified and reported.

A written response would be forwarded to Members in due course to question:

Will the council promote the use of corn starch bags rather than plastic as these can be composted?

(ii)(c) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Housing Portfolio: Councillor Mrs Gower (Report E131)

Councillor Mrs Gower advised that she would take any questions on this report. She confirmed that the Public Art in the Town Centre of Haverhill (PATCH) would be located in the Market Square. The map/directory showing local information and to be

located at the Bus Station would now be incorporated with the proposed clock.

In response to a question, Councillor Mrs Gower confirmed the Housing Team had not been able to contact a group of homeless persons but if Councillor Ms Byrne could confirm details of how and when to contact them she would pass this on to the Housing Team to follow up.

Written responses would be forward to Members in due course to the following questions:

- (1) How many people are St Edmundsbury currently housing in bed and breakfast – what is the breakdown between families, couples and single people?
- (2) How does this compare with the same period last year?
- (3) How much has St Edmundsbury paid for bed and breakfast this year?
- (4) Compared to last year?
- (5) How many people on the waiting list are registered disabled?
- (6) How many people are currently being supported with transition payments (or whatever they are called)?
- (7) How many people have asked to be re-housed as a result of the bedroom tax?
- (8) And how many have been?

(Councillors Beckwith, Mrs Mildmay-White and Redhead left during the discussion of this report.)

(ii)(d) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Resources and Performance Portfolio: Councillor Ray (Report E132)

In response to a question Councillor Ray advised that the issue of whether a freephone telephone number should be provided would be part of the Customer Access business case and that any such provision would incur a cost to the borough council.

(ii)(e) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Economic Growth Portfolio: Councillor Pugh (Report E133)

Councillor Pugh congratulated officers on the recent success of the Business Festival and said that they had worked 'beyond the call of duty'. In response to questions, Councillor Pugh advised that:

- (1) The software and hardware issues with the VIM Signs should be resolved by the end of October.
- (2) Free parking on Christmas Eve did not fit within the strategy of offering incentives to encourage parking at quiet periods.

Two questions were raised to which written responses would be forwarded in due course, as follows:

(1) What is the actual number of fines issued during this financial year (i.e. not as a percentage of transactions) and how much actual income has been generated from the fines?

(2) The car park in School Yard West is currently being used by a developer who is paying the council £11,500 plus VAT. Why was there no consultation with the Risbygate Traders Association regarding this?

(ii)(f) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Planning and Regulation Portfolio: Councillor Clements (Report E134)

Councillor Clements confirmed that he would take any questions on his report.

A question was raised regarding a specific application to vary a premises licence which was governed by the Licensing Act 2003 and therefore it was not considered appropriate to discuss in detail the specifics of this case at council as to do so would expose the authority and others to legal challenge.

In response to a question on any financial investment made by the council towards the restoration of Cupola House following the fire, Councillor Clements confirmed that although there had not been any financial support, conservation and planning support had been given.

Two questions were raised to which written responses would be forwarded in due course, as follows:

(1) Why did Cabinet not accept the recommendation from the Haverhill Area Working Party to not revoke the Article 4 Direction in the two Conservation Areas?

(2) How far forward is the proposal to rename Ehringshausen Way in Haverhill to Jubilee Way?

(ii)(g) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Communities Portfolio: Councillor Everitt (Report E135)

Councillor Everitt confirmed that he would take any questions on his report. He explained that there would be an improvement to the current arrangements in St Andrews Street South to make it a safe shared space.

(ii)(h) Report from the Cabinet Member for the Heritage, Arts and Culture Portfolio: Councillor Mrs Stamp (Report E136)

Councillor Mrs Stamp confirmed that there would continue to be private security guards employed to control entrances and exists at Abbey Fest.

Three questions were raised to which written responses would be forwarded in due course, as follows:

(1) Are other caterers allowed to operate at the Apex under the new catering contract?

(2) Will fencing be provided around the football pitches on Motts Field as they are at Hardwick Heath?

(3) Will there be funding to install a sundial with the CB9 logo for East Town Park?

(iii) Report from the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Councillor Houlder (Report E137)

No questions were raised.

(iv) Report from the Vice Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: Councillor Spicer (Report E138)

No questions were raised.

(v) Questions to the Chairmen of other Committees

No questions were raised.

48. Exclusion of the Public

On the motion of the Mayor, seconded by Councillor Griffiths and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

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 paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

49. Exempt Minutes of the Council: 18 June 2013

The exempt minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18 June 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

50. Conclusion of Business

The meeting concluded at 10.40 pm.

MAYOR