

Council



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Council** held on
Tuesday 22 September 2015 at **7.00 pm** at the **Conference Chamber,**
West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

Mayor Patrick Chung
Deputy Mayor Julia Wakelam

Sarah Broughton	Paul Hopfensperger	Barry Robbins
Simon Brown	Ian Houlder	Richard Rout
Tony Brown	Margaret Marks	Angela Rushen
Carol Bull	Tim Marks	Andrew Speed
John Burns	Betty Mclatchy	Clive Springett
Terry Clements	Ivor Mclatchy	Sarah Stamp
Jason Crooks	Jane Midwood	Peter Stevens
Robert Everitt	Sara Mildmay-White	Peter Thompson
Paula Fox	David Nettleton	Jim Thorndyke
Susan Glossop	Clive Pollington	Paula Wade
John Griffiths	Alaric Pugh	Frank Warby
Wayne Hailstone	Joanna Rayner	Patricia Warby
Diane Hind	Karen Richardson	
Beccy Hopfensperger	David Roach	

82. **Minutes**

Subject to amendments to the final paragraph of Minute 69 so that it read to the following, the public and exempt minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor:

*'In a response to a question from **Colin Hilder** of Fornham Ward about whether the Development Control Committee would be reviewing the current procedures for planning enforcement, Councillor Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth explained the plans to improve performance on planning enforcement, including the introduction of the quarterly monitoring reports.'*

83. **Mayor's announcements**

The Mayor reported on the civic engagements and charity activities which he, the Mayoress, Deputy Mayor and Consort had attended since 7 July 2015.

84. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Terry Buckle, Bob Cockle and Jeremy Farthing.

85. **Declarations of Interests**

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

86. **Leader's Statement**

Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, presented his statement as contained in Paper COU/SE/15/027.

He provided updates on the devolution agenda; the role of the Suffolk authorities in supporting nationwide plans for addressing the current refugee crisis in Europe; and that Suffolk councils had agreed to launch a call for potential short term Gypsy and Traveller sites across the county in an attempt to mitigate unauthorised encampments.

In response to a question regarding the allocation of feasibility funding to major projects without the guarantee that the project would be delivered, Councillor Griffiths stated that particularly in light of the expected future cut in the Government settlement grant, the Council must continue to make a combination of savings and income. Savings and income generated over the longer term often required significant investment in projects, which required the necessary expertise and forward funding to undertake feasibility studies to ensure the project was viable.

87. **Public Participation**

The following questions were put and answered during this item:

1. **Adrian Williams** of Bury St Edmunds, asked a question in connection with his objection to the recommendation of the Sustainable Development Working Party and Cabinet to reinstate the originally proposed site for potential Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the Masterplan for the South East Bury St Edmunds strategic development site, and how this appeared to go against the decision of the Development Control Committee which had refused permission for a planning application for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in this location.

In response, Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth stated that the decision to refuse planning permission had been taken into account during the Council's consideration of the Masterplan. The emergence and recommended adoption of this document would amount to a material change in circumstances which could affect and influence any outstanding appeal, particularly as upon adoption of the Masterplan, the first reason for refusal would fall away. Councillor Pugh continued with explaining that the importance of the community woodland site in the wider landscape would be changed given that the Masterplan development would subsequently provide many hectares of public open space, including new woodlands and therefore

the existing community woodland land had become more appropriate as a potential Gypsy and Traveller site.

2. **John Corrie** of Bury St Edmunds, asked a question in connection with the above topic, including the decision of the Development Control Committee to refuse permission for a planning application for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in this location. Mr Corrie also made reference to the current land ownership of the community woodland site and how alternative Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough should be sought.

In response, Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth reiterated his comments to Mr Williams to Mr Corrie, adding that the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation did not form part of the reasons for refusing the proposed development at the woodland site.

In his supplementary question, **Mr Corrie** referred to Suffolk County Council as landowner, not making the community woodland site available for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. In response, Councillor Pugh stated it was inappropriate to comment on the land ownership issue as full Council was considering the adoption of the Masterplan for the South East Bury St Edmunds strategic development site and not a planning application for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.

3. In response to a question from **Simon Harding** of Bury St Edmunds, which was in connection with the Council's support for more food self-sufficiency and the reduction in food imports and miles, Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, explained how the Council supported the policy, particularly in terms of promoting economic growth. He quoted Actions contained in the West Suffolk Six Point Plan for Jobs and Growth which indicated how the Council was committed to local businesses, provisions markets and the agricultural sector in helping to support national policy.

In a supplementary question, **Mr Harding** asked how the Council classified the quality of the arable farmland at Hollow Road Farm and whether brownfield land should be firstly considered for the siting of the proposed West Suffolk Operational Hub (WSOH). In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council stated that the Hollow Road Farm site was not the preferred option for the WSOH and further consultation was proposed to be undertaken on this issue (as detailed later in the minutes). The most suitable location for a WSOH would not necessarily be on brownfield land as many other factors needed to be considered (as detailed later in the minutes).

4. In response to a question from **Valerie Legg** of Bury St Edmunds, which was in connection with other sites being considered for the possible location of the West Suffolk Operational Hub and whether sites were being examined to the same depth as the Hollow Road Farm site, Councillor Peter Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations stated the following:

Subject to Council approval for funding (as detailed later in the minutes), a further six-week pre-planning application consultation process would be undertaken to provide an opportunity for suggestions for alternative sites and to provide information for public scrutiny, which would include the four

matters detailed in the resolution of Cabinet in respect of this item on 8 September 2015 (Report No: CAB/SE/15/050 refers).

The outcomes of the consultation would be discussed with a Focus Group, who would be asked to comment on its content, including any preferred site and subsequently, a planning application would be submitted. Once the outcomes of the consultation and any preferred site had been with discussed with the Focus Group, the results of the consultation would be published.

In response to a supplementary question of **Ms Legg**, Councillor Stevens explained that a specific date had not yet been determined to commence the proposed new six-week pre-application consultation.

5. **Nathan Loader**, of Kedington Parish Council asked a question in connection with what he considered to be a flawed North East Haverhill Masterplan and how Haverhill needed to be more economically sustainable before it could be considered for additional housing, including whether the Council had worked with Cambridgeshire County [and District] Councils to ensure it was not 'doubling up' on its delivery of houses to match the assumed jobs growth in Cambridgeshire.

In response, Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, explained that Haverhill and area had excellent potential for housing development and economic growth and by working closely with neighbouring authorities, developers, businesses etc, both this and the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplans had been produced to support that vision.

6. **Justin Waite**, of Kedington asked a question in connection with the consultation process for the North East Haverhill Masterplan and whether it had been undertaken with sufficient community engagement and in accordance with legislation and policy.

In response, Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, stated that the consultation process had been extremely thorough and was in accordance with the Council's adopted protocol for the production of masterplans and its own Statement of Community Involvement. He referred to documentation that indicated the level of consultation undertaken and offered this information to Mr Waite upon request.

In response to a supplementary question of **Mr Waite** where he wished to highlight that a significant part of the North East Haverhill development was proposed for Kedington parish, Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council explained how in addition to the significant investment in last ten years, the Council sought to enhance the future prospects of Haverhill and its surrounding area and both this and the Town Centre Masterplan assisted in bringing that vision to fruition.

7. **Michael Collier**, Chairman of Fornham St Martin cum St Genevieve Parish Council, asked a question in connection with the proposed new pre-application consultation process for the proposed location for the West Suffolk Operational Hub (WSOH) and sought assurance that the Council was not undertaking the new consultation to justify the previously preferred location of Hollow Road Farm.

In response, Councillor Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations, reiterated his comments that he had made to Valerie Legg above, and offered his assurance that this was a new consultation and following due consideration, a preferred site for the WSOH would be identified in conjunction with a Focus Group in an open and transparent manner.

(As the total time allocation of 30 minutes for this item had now exceeded and in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1 (o), a motion to suspend Council Procedure Rule 6.1 was put to the vote and carried, to enable the remaining members of the public in attendance to have their questions put and answered within the designated time limit of five minutes each.)

8. **Adrian Graves**, of Great Barton asked a question in connection with the proposed new pre-application consultation process for the proposed location for the West Suffolk Operational Hub (WSOH) and how he felt the recommendation for Council's consideration under Agenda Item 8 (B) (1), Report No: COU/SE/15/028, was misleading.

In response, Councillor Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations, explained that the recommendation sought sufficient funding to underwrite the project (with partners), which included the new pre-application consultation process. While Cabinet had approved the recommendation to undertake a further six-week consultation as an executive matter, it could only proceed with the approval of funding, as detailed in the recommendation to Council. The approval of funding would not limit a review of any potential sites that may come forward as part of the new consultation.

9. In response to a question from **Howard Quayle**, Chairman of Fornham All Saints Parish Council, in connection with funding previously allocated to the West Suffolk Operational Hub project and that now recommended for approval, Councillor Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations explained that a breakdown of costs had been outlined in the report, some of which would be used to facilitate the new consultation.

88. **Service by Former Members of the Council**

(During the consideration of the motions for the Long Service Awards, Councillor Julia Wakelam, Deputy Mayor, duly took the Chair to enable the Mayor to present framed copies of their specific resolutions to each former Councillor in attendance.)

On 16 July 1991 and in addition to the statutory provision for the creation of Honorary Freeman and Honorary Alderman, the Council created a third award option, namely formal acknowledgement of 12 years or more cumulative service by former Members of the Council. Accordingly, the following motions in respect of those who were eligible for the award were duly carried.

(1) Paul Farmer MBE

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twelve years of dedicated public service by Paul Stephen Farmer MBE as an elected Member of the Council for Abbeygate Ward, Bury St Edmunds and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(2) Phillip French

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Frank Warby, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twelve years of dedicated cumulative public service by Phillip Morton French as an elected Member of the Council for the Cangle, Haverhill North and Haverhill South Wards, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(3) Christopher Spicer

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Peter Stevens, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twelve years of dedicated public service by Christopher James Evan Spicer as an elected Member of the Council for the Pakenham Ward, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, including his term of office as Mayor for 2011/2012, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(4) Adam Whittaker

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Terry Clements, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twelve years of dedicated public service by Adam Whittaker as an elected Member of the Council for Haverhill West Ward, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(5) Stefan Oliver

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Sarah Stamp, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of thirteen years of dedicated public service by Stefan Robert Morgan Oliver as an elected Member of the Council for the Westgate Ward, Bury St Edmunds and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, including his term of office as Mayor for 2005/2006, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(6) Helen Levack

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Patsy Warby, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of sixteen years of dedicated public service by Helen Mary Levack as an elected Member of the Council for the Risby Ward, and in acknowledgement of her contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and her service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(7) Trevor Beckwith

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Peter Thompson, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twenty years of dedicated public service by Trevor Beckwith as an elected Member of the Council for the Eastgate and Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds Wards, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(8) Derek Redhead

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Sarah Broughton, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twenty years of dedicated public service by Derek Redhead as an elected Member of the Council for Wickhambrook Ward, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, and

his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

(9) Robert Clifton-Brown

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Peter Stevens, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in recognition of twenty-six years of dedicated public service by Robert Lawrence Clifton-Brown as an elected Member of the Council for Withersfield Ward, and in acknowledgement of his contribution to the work of the Borough Council, including his term of office as Mayor for 2002/2003, and his service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, the Council hereby record its thanks and deep appreciation.

On the individual approval of each resolution, the Mayor separately presented former Councillors Farmer, Spicer, Whittaker, Oliver and Clifton-Brown with a framed copy of their specific resolution. As former Councillors French, Levack, Beckwith and Redhead were not in attendance, framed copies of their resolutions would be forwarded to each of them accordingly.

(Councillor Patrick Chung, Mayor, duly re-took the Chair at the conclusion of this item.)

89. Service by Former Members of the Council: Vote of Thanks to Other Immediate Past Members

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Council records a vote of thanks in respect of the former Councillors who had not been re-elected or had not stood for re-election, namely, former Councillors Maureen Byrne, Anne Gower, the late Paul McManus, David Ray, Marion Rushbrook, Paul Simner and Dorothy Whittaker.

90. Recognition of Former Cabinet Members not Eligible for Long Service Awards

It had been proposed by the Cabinet that former Cabinet Members that were not eligible for Long Service Awards should also receive separate formal acknowledgement by the Council for their contribution to the work of the Borough Council's executive through their roles as Portfolio Holders. In relation to such councillors not re-elected in May 2015, the Cabinet would pass such a resolution of thanks at its own meeting on 20 October 2015, but Council considered that in future, it would be appropriate for it to make such an acknowledgement directly alongside other votes of thanks.

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Robert Everitt, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, in future, the Council in acknowledgement of their contributions to the work of the Borough Council through their roles as Portfolio Holders, and for their service to the community and fulfilment of the duties and responsibilities of a Councillor, shall record its thanks and deep appreciation to former Cabinet Members not eligible for Long Service Awards.

91. Referrals report of recommendations from Cabinet

The Council considered the Referrals report of Recommendations from Cabinet, as contained with Report No: COU/SE/15/028.

(A) Referrals from Cabinet: 1 September 2015

1. West Suffolk Strategic Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020

Approval was sought for the West Suffolk Strategic Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020.

Councillor Ian Houlder, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that the draft documents had both been updated through a 'light touch' review, which focussed on updating the projects and actions within the existing frameworks and making minor changes to reflect developments in legislation or local government financing arrangements.

A discussion was held on investing in affordable housing and encouraging developers to build high energy efficient homes.

On the motion of Councillor Ian Houlder, seconded by Councillor Clive Springett, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That subject to updates and amendments by the Leaders, as detailed in paragraphs 13 and 14 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/048, the:

- (1) West Suffolk Strategic Plan 2016-2020; and
- (2) West Suffolk Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020, be adopted.

2. West Suffolk Investment Framework

Approval was sought for the West Suffolk Investment Framework.

Councillor Ian Houlder, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that the Investment Framework supported staff and Members throughout the initial development stages to the decision making process for the Councils' key strategic projects,

particularly those that required the Councils to invest. It also supported the Councils' compliance with the 'The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities'.

In addition, a number of West Suffolk's key strategic projects had the potential to commit significant capital sums, as well as officer and Member resources. It was important therefore that feasibility funding was made available at the early stages of these business case developments, so as to unlock these projects and their investment potential and to enable the necessary progress to a full business case and the identification of a preferred way forward for Member scrutiny and approval.

On the motion of Councillor Ian Houlder, seconded by Councillor Patsy Warby, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the West Suffolk Investment Framework attached at Attachment A to Report No: CAB/SE/15/049, be approved.

(B) Referrals from Cabinet: 8 September 2015

1. West Suffolk Operational Hub

Approval was sought for the Borough Council's contribution of £108,000 funding to enable the West Suffolk Operational Hub project to progress.

Councillor Peter Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that on 8 September 2015, the Cabinet resolved that:

- (1) *the contents of Report No: CAB/SE/15/050, be noted;*
- (2) *approval is given for a further six-week period of public pre-application consultation that will give an opportunity for suggestions for alternative sites and provide information for public scrutiny including the:*
 - (i) *case for a shared waste hub;*
 - (ii) *site selection criteria;*
 - (iii) *process of site selection; and*
 - (iv) *sustainability appraisal.*

While Cabinet had approved (2) above as an executive matter, this could only proceed with the approval of funding, as detailed in the recommendation to Council. Members noted from Report COU/SE/15/028 the initial funding allocated during the feasibility and deliverability phases of the West Suffolk Operational Hub (WSOH) project, and an outline of the estimated elements of further costs required to progress the project. This summary included the estimated costs to undertake the new six-week pre-application consultation approved by Cabinet on 8 September 2015.

Councillor Stevens reiterated his comments from earlier in the meeting regarding the outcomes of the new consultation being considered by a Focus

Group. Having taken all documentation into account as outlined in the Cabinet resolution above, which would be made publicly available, and the results of the consultation, the Group would be asked to consider a preferred option to site the WSOH and a planning application would be subsequently submitted.

A detailed discussion was held and Councillor Sarah Broughton, Ward Member for Great Barton Ward, which was adjacent to the previously preferred WSOH location of Hollow Road Farm (HRF), welcomed the new consultation but expressed some concern that reference to HRF remained in Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/15/050 as the preferred site, and whether the impact of the new proposals for the future of the organic waste service had been taken into account in the development of this project (see Minute 91 (B) (2) below.)

Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger, Ward Member for Fornham Ward, which was the ward in which HRF was located, supported Councillor Broughton's concerns and sought assurance that the new consultation would genuinely consider alternative suggestions for sites and how no further funding should be allocated to progress the proposed business case until this new consultation had been completed and analysed.

Some Members also expressed concern regarding:

- (a) references to HRF as the preferred option in Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/15/050;
- (b) the proposed increase in funding required since the matter was last considered in July 2015; and
- (c) the proposed new consultation process and how other credible, available, alternative sites to HRF (including those with rail links) should genuinely be considered in an open and transparent manner.

Other Members acknowledged however, that:

- (a) the references to HRF as the perceived preferred option in Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/15/050, had been taken out of context;
- (b) the documentation that would be publicly available to assist interested parties with suggesting alternative sites, as detailed in the Cabinet resolution above, was a positive step in promoting democracy and transparency and provided further reassurance that a genuine consultation would be undertaken; and
- (c) a solution to identifying a preferred optimum location for siting the WSOH for the delivery of cost and efficiency savings was the ultimate goal; however that in order to fund the new consultation process, the request for further funding had increased since last presented to Council.

Councillor Stevens proposed the motion, which was duly seconded by Councillor Robert Everitt. Councillor David Nettleton requested that the vote be recorded and this was supported by more than five other Members, as

required by the Constitution. The votes recorded were 30 votes for the motion, 12 against and no abstentions, namely:

For the motion:

Councillors Simon Brown, Bull, Chung, Everitt, Glossop, Griffiths, Hailstone, Houlder, Margaret Marks, Tim Marks, Betty McLatchy, Ivor McLatchy, Midwood, Mildmay-White, Pollington, Pugh, Rayner, Richardson, Roach, Rout, Rushen, Speed, Springett, Stamp, Stevens, Thompson, Thorndyke, Wakelam, Frank Warby and Patsy Warby.

Against the motion:

Councillors Broughton, Tony Brown, Burns, Clements, Crooks, Fox, Hind, Beccy Hopfensperger, Paul Hopfensperger, Nettleton, Robbins and Wade.

Abstentions:

None

The motion was duly carried and

RESOLVED:

That funding of £220,000 (£112,000 FHDC and £108,000 SEBC), as detailed in Section 3 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/050, be approved, and for this to be allocated from the respective Council's Strategic Priorities and Medium Term Financial Strategy reserve to enable the project to progress.

(At this point, a motion to adjourn the meeting for a short comfort break was moved, seconded and upon being put to the vote was duly carried. The meeting resumed at 9.39 pm.)

2. The Future of the Organic Waste Service in West Suffolk

Following the recent Suffolk Waste Partnership review of organic waste management, approval was sought for revisions to the organic waste service in West Suffolk.

Councillor Peter Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that specific options for the future of West Suffolk's brown bin scheme and the implications relating to each had been considered in detail. Option 3 was the preferred option of officers and Cabinet, which would be to introduce an annual subscription charge and exclude food/kitchen waste, which would potentially generate an income to ensure that the service was cost neutral. The justification for the proposal was provided in Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/15/051.

The service would be provided on an opt-in basis at a cost of approximately £1.35 per collection, which was value for money when compared to the cost of a bulky goods collection at £35 a time. VAT was not believed to be charged within this charge; however this would be confirmed to the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee in November 2015.

The majority of Members acknowledged that this was difficult decision to make; however if the scheme was to continue in its current format, West Suffolk would be faced with an estimated budget increase of approximately half a million pounds per year in comparison to current costs. If not implemented, savings would therefore need to be found from elsewhere with potential impacts on services across the two West Suffolk councils.

Members also recognised that it was not conducive to potentially increase Council Tax by approximately 6% to continue the existing service. Such an increase would command a referendum and consideration would therefore need to be given to the potential cost implications of that.

Some clarification was sought on the new collection service and possible ramifications of the change; and whether there were possibilities for providing support to communities to introduce their own community composting facilities.

On the motion of Councillor Peter Stevens, seconded by Councillor Ian Houlder, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That

- (1) the exclusion of food/kitchen waste from the brown bin scheme - to commence following procurement of the new treatment contract, be agreed;
- (2) a subscription charge of between £35 and £50 per year for the brown bin service, as detailed in Section 1.4.3 to 1.4.8 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/051, be introduced; and
- (3) a future report be received outlining the results of the procurement exercise and the Suffolk Waste Partnership's agreed actions to deliver recommendations 1 and 2 above.

3. Annual Treasury Management Report 2014/2015

Approval was sought for the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2014-2015.

Councillor Ian Houlder, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council.

On the motion of Councillor Houlder, seconded by Councillor Clive Springett, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2014-2015, attached as Appendix 1 to Report No: TMS/SE/15/004, be approved.

4. Haverhill Town Centre: Masterplan

(Councillors Tony Brown and Tim Marks declared local non-pecuniary interests as members of ONE Haverhill's Town Centre Masterplanning Core Group and both remained in the meeting for the consideration of this item.)

Approval was sought for the adoption of the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan.

Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that he wished to place on record his thanks to ONE Haverhill and other partners during the development of this Masterplan. Emphasis was also placed on the excellent response to the consultation.

Other Haverhill Councillors supported Councillor Pugh's comments and Councillor Tony Brown offered his personal thanks to Councillor Pugh for his leadership on this project and also to David Lock Associates (consultants appointed to produce the Masterplan).

In response to a question in connection with car parking and the potential for an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) survey of the entire town to extract data to assess the effect of traffic flow and volume in and around the town centre, including the impact the proposed new developments may have, Councillor Pugh stated that support had been shown in principle for this survey from Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority.

Members also reiterated the importance of the delivery of the aspirations identified in the Masterplan.

On the motion of Councillor Alaric Pugh, seconded by Councillor David Roach, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Masterplan for Haverhill Town Centre, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/007, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

5. North East Haverhill: Masterplan

(In the interests of transparency, Councillor Tony Brown declared that he was the Suffolk County Councillor for Haverhill East and Kedington Division. Councillor John Burns declared a local non-pecuniary interest as he lived adjacent to the proposed strategic development site. Both Members remained in the meeting for the consideration of this item.)

Approval was sought for the adoption of the North East Haverhill Masterplan.

Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that the resulting Masterplan had been formulated taking account of a range of opportunities

and constraints, as detailed in the report to the Sustainable Development Working Party (Report No: SDW/SE/15/008 refers).

Councillor Karen Richardson, Ward Member for Kedington Ward reiterated the views of the members of the public that had spoken during agenda item 6; considered the consultation had been unsatisfactory and felt the number of homes planned would adversely impact on the residents of Kedington and other neighbouring villages.

Councillor Tony Brown also expressed similar concerns including that although it was acknowledged that discussions were being undertaken to make improvements to the existing A1307 trunk road, the present infrastructure and poor transport links could currently not support the planned development and growth set out in the Masterplan.

Councillor Pugh proposed the motion, which was duly seconded by Councillor Ivor McLatchy. Councillor Tony Brown requested that the vote be recorded and this was supported by more than five other Members, as required by the Constitution. The votes recorded were 31 votes for the motion, 8 against and 3 abstentions, namely:

For the motion:

Councillors Broughton, Simon Brown, Chung, Clements, Everitt, Glossop, Griffiths, Hailstone, Hind, Beccy Hopfensperger, Houlder, Margaret Marks, Tim Marks, Betty McLatchy, Ivor McLatchy, Mildmay-White, Pollington, Pugh, Rayner, Roach, Rout, Rushen, Speed, Springett, Stamp, Stevens, Thompson, Thorndyke, Wakelam, Frank Warby and Patsy Warby.

Against the motion:

Councillors, Tony Brown, Burns, Crooks, Paul Hopfensperger, Midwood, Nettleton, Richardson and Robbins

Abstentions:

Councillors Bull, Fox and Wade.

The motion was duly carried and

RESOLVED:

That the Masterplan for North East Haverhill, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/008, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance.

6. South East Bury St Edmunds Strategic Development Site: Masterplan

Approval was sought for the adoption of the Masterplan for the South East Bury St Edmunds Strategic Development Site.

Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that following a detailed discussion at the meeting of the Sustainable Development Working Party and subsequent ratification by Cabinet, it had been recommended to reinstate the

site for the proposed Gypsy and Traveller accommodation as originally proposed in the earlier draft Masterplan.

Councillor Sarah Stamp, one of the Ward Members for Southgate Ward, considered that many of the concerns that had been raised during the consultation had been addressed, however she would remain opposed to the reinstatement of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site as she believed this was not an appropriate location and alternative options should be considered.

Other Members supported the concerns of Councillor Stamp but acknowledged other merits of the Masterplan. The majority of Members supported approval for the Masterplan.

On the motion of Councillor Alaric Pugh, seconded by Councillor Margaret Marks, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the Masterplan for the South East strategic land allocation, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/009, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance, subject to the reinstatement of the site of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller accommodation as originally proposed in the earlier draft Masterplan.

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

92. **Devolution in Suffolk**

Council considered Report No: COU/SE/15/029, which sought endorsement of Suffolk's Expression of Interest to Government regarding devolution as the basis for future detailed negotiations with Government; and of the proposed approach to negotiation with Government throughout autumn 2015, in advance of final sign-off of more detailed proposals by Council.

Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including that since the devolution proposal, contained in Appendix A, had been submitted to Government on 4 September 2015, some feedback had been received. Alongside taking forward the work on integrating the public sector in Suffolk, advice had been given to consider the possibility of forming a wider combined authority with Norfolk, to which Government could devolve powers around growth and infrastructure.

He added that commitment was still shown for the proposals contained in Appendix A, whether they would be taken forward by a combined authority; on a Suffolk-wide basis or in another way was to be determined.

Discussion was held on the tight timescales regarding the submission of the bid, which was because plans needed to be in place for decisions to be taken by Government before the Spending Review in November 2015; however the majority of Members recognised the benefits that could be had for West Suffolk, including pursuing the issue of subsidiarity (double devolution) i.e. what SCC could devolve to the Suffolk district and borough councils.

Liz Watts, one the two Directors for the West Suffolk councils, would shortly be leaving the organisation to take up the post of Chief Executive for East Hertfordshire District Council. Councillor Griffiths wished to place on record his sincere thanks to Liz and commended her sterling work with the councils over the previous years. Members supported this sentiment.

On the motion of Councillor John Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Ian Houlder, and duly carried it was

RESOLVED: That

- (1) Suffolk's ambition for devolution contained in its Expression of Interest to Government as the basis for future detailed negotiation with Government throughout the autumn 2015, be endorsed;
- (2) the approach to negotiating more detailed proposals with Government be endorsed; and
- (3) it be agreed that following negotiation with the Government, any proposed devolved arrangements will be subject to consideration and agreement by full Council.

(Councillor Jim Thorndyke left the meeting during the consideration of this item.)

93. **Right to Challenge Parking Policies**

Council considered Report No: COU/SE/15/030, which sought approval for changes to the Council's Petition Scheme to reflect a duty which gave local residents and businesses the right to challenge parking policies set out in Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

Councillor Peter Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including the proposed amendments were contained in Appendix A with information on the statutory guidance on parking petitions (DCLG 2015) provided in Appendix B.

On the motion of Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That the changes to the Petition Scheme for St Edmundsbury Borough Council, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: COU/SE/15/030, be approved.

94. **Questions to Committee Chairmen**

There were no questions of Committee Chairmen on business transacted by their committees since the last ordinary meeting of Council on 7 July 2015, as outlined below:

Committee	Chairman	Dates of meetings
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Diane Hind	22 July 2015
Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Sarah Broughton	30 July 2015
Development Control Committee	Cllr Jim Thorndyke	6 August 2015 3 September 2015
West Suffolk Joint Standards Committee	Cllr Jim Thorndyke	19 August 2015

95. Urgent Questions on Notice

Councillor Julia Wakelam, Deputy Mayor, had given notice under Paragraph 8.5 (b) of the Council Procedure Rules, of the following question to Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, Portfolio Holder for Housing:

'Has St Edmundsbury Borough Council informed the Government of the willingness of our community to welcome up to five refugee families to Bury St Edmunds, and the willingness of our Council to assist in that, and if not, will it now do so?'

In response, Councillor Mildmay-White, stated that the Home Office had asked that councils in two-tier areas should be encouraged to collaborate and feed back potential numbers of refugees that could be accommodated via the Strategic Migration Partnership. In light of this guidance, the Suffolk Public Sector Leaders' Group had agreed to establish a county-wide task force to prepare any specific request made by Government.

Specifically, St Edmundsbury Borough Council had started initial conversations with Havebury Housing Partnership to identify any potential properties which may be suitable for accommodating refugees.

In respect of utilising privately-owned accommodation, housing needed to be self-contained and safeguarding issues taken into account; however, it may be possible to consider second homes if owners made them available.

96. 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 at the time the Council agenda was published, no executive decisions had been taken under the special urgency provisions of the Constitution.

97. Exclusion of Press and Public

See minute 98 below.

98. Exempt Minutes: 7 July 2015

No reference was made to specific detail of the exempt minutes, therefore this item was not held in private session.

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record under Minute 82 above and signed by the Mayor.

The meeting concluded at 11.16 pm.

Signed by:

Mayor
