
Council



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Council** held on
Tuesday 24 April 2018 at 7.00 pm at the **Conference Chamber, West**
Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

Mayor Terry Clements
Deputy Mayor Margaret Marks

Trevor Beckwith	John Griffiths	David Roach
Sarah Broughton	Wayne Hailstone	Barry Robbins
Simon Brown	Diane Hind	Richard Rout
Tony Brown	Beccy Hopfensperger	Andrew Smith
Carol Bull	Paul Hopfensperger	Andrew Speed
John Burns	Ian Houlder	Clive Springett
Mike Chester	Jane Midwood	Sarah Stamp
Patrick Chung	Sara Mildmay-White	Peter Stevens
Max Clarke	David Nettleton	Peter Thompson
Mary Evans	Clive Pollington	Jim Thorndyke
Robert Everitt	Alaric Pugh	Julia Wakelam
Paula Fox	Joanna Rayner	Frank Warby
Susan Glossop	Karen Richardson	Patricia Warby

(Contrary to information published on the agenda, the meeting was not opened with prayers as the Mayor's Chaplain was unfortunately unable to be present.)

333. **Remembrance**

A minute's silence was held in remembrance for the late former Borough Councillors Colin Muge and Derek Redhead.

334. **Introduction**

Councillor Max Clarke, newly elected Member for St Olaves Ward, was formally introduced and welcomed to his first meeting of Council.

335. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 February 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

336. Mayor's announcements

The Mayor reported on the civic engagements and charity activities which he and the Mayoress, and the Deputy Mayor and her Consort had attended since the last ordinary meeting of Council on 20 February 2018.

337. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jason Crooks and Anthony Williams.

338. Declarations of Interests

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

Whilst officers' attendance was not usually recorded in the minutes, Members noted that any officers of the Leadership Team present at the meeting would leave the room whilst Agenda Item 9, 'Senior Pay' was under consideration.

339. Leader's Statement

Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, presented his Leader's Statement as contained in Paper No: COU/SE/18/008.

Following the publication of the agenda and papers, a minor amendment had been circulated which indicated that the late former Councillor Muge had actually represented Sextons Ward in Bury St Edmunds, which later became part of Minden Ward.

In addition to his written statement, Councillor Griffiths drew attention to matters in connection with the following:

- (a) options for proposed new ward boundaries for West Suffolk; and
- (b) the review of the senior pay banding and a potential amendment to one of the recommendations in Report No: COU/SE/18/011 to align its implementation with the review of the pay structure for the entire workforce planned to take effect from 1 April 2019 (see minute 343 below).

In response to questions, Council was informed that:

- (a) it was disappointing that there had been a lack of discussion or consultation with Suffolk district/borough councils regarding Suffolk County Council's (SCC) intention of commissioning a unilateral review of the county's local government by ResPublica. It was acknowledged that SCC should be working more closely with district/borough councils to achieve better outcomes for residents. This may include SCC delegating duties to district/borough councils, such as highway issues, to assist improved delivery of services. The Suffolk Public Sector Leaders' Group was addressing this and similar matters with the Leader of Suffolk County Council.

- (b) It was agreed that it could be confusing to residents regarding different Council responsibilities for services and it was important to communicate these responsibilities in the most effective way possible.

340. **Public Participation**

The following questions were put and answered during Public Question Time:

1. **Ian Steel**, Chairman of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council, asked a question in connection with the proposed options for the West Suffolk Council Electoral Review, with particular reference to the boundary options for Rougham Ward, as set out in Option A, and for Moreton Hall, as set out in Option E and F1 of Report No: COU/SE/18/010, to be considered later at agenda item 8.

Mr Steel expressed concern that the parish of Rushbrooke with Rougham would be divided into two should the proposed Option for Rougham Ward be accepted by the Council and subsequently, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). This option would be a two-Member ward comprising councillors that may have an affiliation towards a mix of rural and urban or solely urban issues (emanating from the neighbouring Moreton Hall Ward); however, Mr Steel considered Rushbrooke with Rougham parish should not be divided and should retain its present status within a rural ward.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, stated that the LGBCE encouraged the Council to submit as many options as possible, including consultation responses received from the various organisations and interested parties, which included those from Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council and those from within the neighbouring Moreton Hall ward, both 'sides' of which had provided strong cases. Any subsequent comments made in addition to these before the submission deadline of 4 May 2018 would be included. This was therefore the planned approach of the Council.

Emphasis was placed on the fact that the LGBCE's work to create boundaries for the new Council would not change the boundary between the Bury St Edmunds parish and the Rushbrooke with Rougham parish. Following the Borough Council's Community Governance Review undertaken in 2015/2016 which reviewed all parish boundaries, there were no plans to revisit potential changes to the parish boundary between Rushbrooke with Rougham parish and Bury St Edmunds parish. However, Councillor Griffiths explained that district warding might divide a parish, where the LGBCE considered it necessary, in order to reflect community identity and effective local government.

No supplementary question was asked.

2. **Peter Langdon**, Vice- Chairman of Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council, asked a question in connection with the same subject matter as Mr Steel. He firstly wished to express, in his opinion, some inaccuracies in the submissions contained in Report No: COU/SE/18/010, before questioning the option of dividing of Rushbrooke with Rougham parish set out in Option A.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, reiterated the issues outlined to Mr Steel above, including emphasising that Mr Langdon's comments would be included as part of the Council's submission to the LGBCE.

No supplementary question was asked.

3. **Cliff Hind**, Chairman of Moreton Hall Residents' Association asked a question in connection with the proposed options for the West Suffolk Council Electoral Review, with particular reference to the boundary options for the Moreton Hall Ward. He objected to the option of splitting the existing ward into two as he considered it would lose cohesion, reasoning that it was not for Eastgate Ward to take up issues in Moreton Hall. He also felt that the new housing developments in Rougham Ward should be in Moreton Hall as transport links, education facilities, community links and other facilities for these dwellings were closer to Moreton Hall and not Rougham, the centre of which was three miles away, with no footpath or cycleway currently provided to the centre of Rougham.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, stated that Mr Hind's comments would be taken into consideration and included as part of the Council's submission to the LGBCE.

No supplementary question was asked.

4. **James Sheen** of Bury St Edmunds, asked a question in connection with the positive influence of the mayoralty and the historical significance of borough status in St Edmundsbury.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, agreed with Mr Sheen's sentiments regarding the work of the mayoralty in St Edmundsbury. The creation of a new Council for West Suffolk gave the opportunity to consider what Civic Leadership should be in the future, and with this in mind confirmed that having discussed with the Leader of Forest Heath District Council, it was his intention to seek to form a Civic Leadership Working Group. Terms of reference for this Group would be presented to a future meeting of the West Suffolk Shadow Council.

In his supplementary question, Mr Sheen sought assurance that a binding decision could be taken by the Shadow Council for an application to be made for borough status for West Suffolk Council.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, stated an application to the Privy Council for borough status for the new West Suffolk Council could be made on the binding decision of the Shadow Council, should this be the course of action the Shadow Council wished to take.

5. **Mark Cordell**, Chief Executive of 'Our Bury St Edmunds' Business Improvement District, asked a question in connection with the proposed redevelopment of 17-18 Cornhill, Bury St Edmunds which included a proposal to widen Market Thoroughfare as part of the scheme.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, stated that the Cabinet had supported the proposed ambitious redevelopment project and had recommended its approval under agenda item 7 on this Council agenda; which included the proposed widening of Market Thoroughfare which was now possible now that 17-18 Cornhill was under Council ownership, and that the redevelopment would serve as a catalyst to help improve this part of Bury St Edmunds and St Andrews Street South.

No supplementary question was asked.

6. **Kevin Hind**, of Bury St Edmunds, asked a question in connection with agenda item 9 on this Council agenda, 'Senior Pay', and whether the proposed increase in the Leadership Team's salaries could be deferred to April 2019 when the current pay agreement between unions and the Local Government Association ended in 2019/2020.

In response, Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, reiterated the comments he made during the introduction of his Leader's Statement (see minute 339 above) that an amendment would be sought to one of the recommendations in Report No: COU/SE/18/011 to align the senior pay structure with the whole review of the workforce for implementation on 1 April 2019.

In his supplementary question, Mr Hind asked why the pay banding for Service Managers were not included in the proposals. In response, Councillor Griffiths sought clarification on this technical matter from the former Assistant Director (Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Services), who stated that Council was required to consider and approve the pay banding for the Leadership Team (Chief Executive, Directors and Assistant Directors). Once these parameters had been set, the rest of the payline, which included Service Managers and other employees could be determined by the Head of Paid Service (the Chief Executive) under delegated authority.

341. **Referrals Report of Recommendations from Cabinet**

Council considered the Referrals Report of Recommendations from Cabinet contained within Report No: COU/SE/18/009.

(A) Referrals from Cabinet : 27 March 2018

1. Tackling Rogue Landlords: Civil Sanctions Policy

Approval was sought for new officer delegations associated with the Housing Standards - Civil Sanctions Policy. Approval of the policy itself was given by Cabinet on 27 March 2018.

Councillor Sara Mildmay-White, Portfolio Holder for Housing, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including responding to a question associated with the apparent specific behaviour of landlords in Haverhill. Whilst the concerns were noted, it was important to acknowledge that agencies and organisations must work together to rectify specific problems, as the incidences described were largely the result of anti-social behaviour rather than poor management of housing standards.

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

RESOLVED:

That the new delegations regarding the enforcement powers described within the Housing Standards – Civil Sanctions Policy contained in Appendix A to Report No: CAB/SE/18/021, be incorporated into the Scheme of Delegation, contained in Part 3 of the Constitution, to enable these housing standards civil sanctions to be enforced.

(B) Referrals from Extraordinary Cabinet : 17 April 2018

1. Investing in the Regeneration of Bury St Edmunds Town Centre: 17-18 Cornhill

Approval was sought for a preferred option and policy approach for the future of 17-18 Cornhill, Bury St Edmunds, and the necessary funding required to deliver the preferred option.

An addendum to Report No: COU/SE/18/009, which together with its recommendations on the above report which had been considered following the publication of the agenda and papers for this meeting, contained corrections to typographical errors contained within Report No: CAB/SE/18/027. Recommendation (3) was amended to read:

*Approve **£8.4m** ~~£8.24m~~ capital budget (includes £1.68m purchase and redevelopment budget), funded through the Investing in our Growth agenda fund, in line with paragraph 1.9.*

For completeness the table in paragraph 1.9.2 of the Cabinet report was also amended as shown in the addendum to Report No: COU/SE/18/009.

Members noted the background to the Council's acquisition of 17-18 Cornhill, including that the purchase had accorded with the adopted Local Plan (Vision 2031) and the aspirations of the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Masterplan.

Since the acquisition in December 2016, the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Masterplan Advisory Group, which comprised Members (including the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth), officers and stakeholders had explored and agreed objectives for the site and these informed future detailed design work. A project team was established to develop the objectives, which included appointing external expertise relative to the project, as set out in Section 1.6 of the Cabinet report.

A detailed options appraisal was undertaken and this was now presented for consideration, as summarised in Section 1.8 of the Cabinet report. The options were:

- Option 1: 'Do nothing'
- Option 2: Resell to the market (following the purchase of the site in December 2016)
- Option 3: Refurbishment of the existing site
- Option 4: Redevelopment of the site

Councillor Alaric Pugh, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including expressing his full support for Option (4), which was to redevelop the site, which through retaining the front elevation and demolishing the remaining buildings aimed to achieve all objectives set and maximise the potential to deliver wider community benefits. The benefits of this option were summarised in the Cabinet report.

This option would require a further capital allocation of £6.72m, which if assessed as a financial investment alone, was a breakeven option. (This option assumed the purchase costs of £1.68m which would be funded by capital receipts). However, Councillor Pugh reiterated the economic, community, social and indirect financial benefits this option would generate for the town, which were all key elements of the West Suffolk Growth Investment Strategy adopted in February 2018. The redevelopment option also linked to the forthcoming proposals for the St Andrews Street redevelopment, which was also a key feature of the aspirations of the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre masterplan.

A detailed discussion was held with support and enthusiasm demonstrated by a significant number of Members for the redevelopment Option. Issues raised included:

- (a) the intention to preserve the frontage of the building. Whilst the building was located in the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Conservation Area, neither it nor the Victorian façade was listed. Minor modifications may be appropriate in keeping with the façade's historic status; however, recognition was given to protecting its context and impact on the street scene;
- (b) as 17-18 Cornhill was now under Council ownership, the opportunity had been presented to widen Market Thoroughfare, which had been part of the original plan for the arc development;
- (c) the positive impact the redevelopment would have on Bury St Edmunds town centre and its role in the aspirational objectives of the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Masterplan;
- (d) a general breakdown of the capital budget required, including that contributions would be sought for other sources of funding to help deliver this scheme and the breakeven financial position was the worse case scenario;
- (e) Members commendations towards the team of officers and the input of stakeholders of the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Masterplan Advisory Group for aiming to achieve such an exciting redevelopment scheme which fully met the objectives set for the future of this site.

On the motion of Councillor Alaric Pugh, seconded by Councillor Peter Stevens, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That:

- (1) the project objectives set out at paragraph 1.3.1 of Report No: CAB/SE/18/027 for the site, be endorsed;
- (2) as the preferred option and policy approach, the redevelopment (Option 4) of 17-18 Cornhill, be approved;
- (3) an £8.4m capital budget (includes £1.68m purchase and redevelopment budget), funded through the Investing in our Growth agenda fund, be approved in line with paragraph 1.9 of Report No: CAB/SE/18/027;
- (4) it be acknowledged that in line with Recommendations (2) and (3) above, officers will proceed in the development of the site in line with the Council's agreed Scheme of Delegation; and
- (5) the Council's Section 151 Officer will make the necessary changes to the Council's prudential indicators as a result of Recommendation (3).

342. **West Suffolk Council - Electoral Review**

Council considered Report No: COU/SE/18/010, which presented proposed options for the warding boundaries for the new West Suffolk district.

Following the distribution of the agenda and papers, the following typographical amendments were circulated:

Paragraph 2.6.2 of the above covering report, as shown in **bold**:

2.6.2 The options in Appendix A have been subject to consultation with the Future Governance Steering Group. The FGSG recommended that all options should be submitted to MHCLG for consideration, and that:

- a) The "other options" for the rural wards should include the potential of moving Icklingham to the Manor Ward, albeit recognition should be given that the current proposal – including Icklingham in a Risby Ward – follows the A1101 giving a natural community cohesion corridor;*
- b) Option **C** for Brandon should be the preferred option in light of the feedback received from local members at the Councillors drop-in session;*
- c) Option **H** for Haverhill should be a preferred option in light of feedback from the consultation;*
- d) Option **I** for Mildenhall should be a preferred option as it reflects the views of the recent Mildenhall Parish Council meeting; and*
- e) Option **K** for Newmarket should be a preferred option (reflecting the views of Newmarket Town Council)*

In addition, the following amendment to the table in Appendix A: Option A – Rural Wards, as shown in **bold**:

Ward No: 17

Risby Ward

No. of electorate: ~~1938~~ **2237**

%Away from Average: ~~minus 5.74%~~ **+ 8.80%**

Councillor Carol Bull, Chairman of the Future Governance Steering Group introduced this item and provided some background. As there were several issues and Options to consider, the Mayor then invited the Service Manager (Democratic Services) to set out how the debate would be handled, which included inviting the Director and Electoral Services Manager to speak during the item to provide background to the particular Option under consideration and assist with any questions Members may have.

The Service Manager (Democratic Services) duly set out the procedure to be followed and the Mayor then asked Members to turn to the Options in Appendix A, which were intended to be considered individually, starting with Option A for the Rural Wards.

The Electoral Services Manager provided background and the debate proceeded with comments made from the following Members:

- (a) **Councillor Mary Evans:** Expressed concern regarding the reduction in the overall number of West Suffolk councillors from 72 to 64 and the option presented to abolish Hundon Ward. Councillor Evans identified that community links were not established between some of the smaller villages within the draft proposals.
- (b) **Councillor Sara Mildmay-White:** Was not in agreement with Option A, but agreed with Option B, which would be considered later. She added that Rushbrooke with Rougham Parish Council would submit its own response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).
- (c) **Councillor Peter Stevens:** Agreed with this Option for Cavendish Ward for his reasons given.
- (d) **Councillor Beccy Hopfensperger:** Two of the three villages within the existing Fornham Ward had expressed concern to her regarding this Option for her reasons given. Concerns expressed over equal representation should the new two-Member ward option be accepted by the LGBCE.
- (e) **Councillor Karen Richardson:** that community links were not established between some of the smaller villages within the existing Kedington Ward and the key service centres identified. Concern expressed that two-Member wards could be ineffective with one Member wards being more productive.

The debate continued with some Members of the urban wards seeking clarity on what they were voting upon, particularly where there were conflicting

opinions between some rural ward Members that represented the residents' views of those located within their own wards. It was therefore considered not to be clear whether an Option should be accepted, amended or deleted.

As it was the LGBCE's responsibility to determine the council size and new warding pattern, it was suggested that **all** Options set out in Appendix A be submitted for its consideration. It was noted that the LGBCE would undertake its own consultation on its warding pattern proposals later in the year, therefore there would be a further opportunity to submit responses to that consultation. This was agreed to be a sensible approach.

On the motion of Councillor Andrew Speed, seconded by Councillor David Nettleton, and duly carried, it was

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the reporting of comments on them made at this meeting [24 April 2018], or submitted to officers by 27 April 2018, all of the Options set out in Appendix A of Report No: COU/SE/18/010, be adopted unchanged for submission to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Consideration was then given to Recommendation (2) as printed in the report.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Chief Executive be authorised to prepare and submit the Council's representation based on the information contained in Report No: COU/SE/18/010 and its appendices and the decisions made by Council at this meeting [24 April 2018].

(At this point at 9.12pm, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for a short comfort break. During the break, Councillors Beccy Hopfensperger and Thorndyke left the meeting and did not return. The meeting resumed at 9.24 pm.)

343. **Senior Pay**

(Councillor Simon Brown declared a local non-pecuniary interest as his son was an employee of the West Suffolk Councils within a pay banding below Leadership Team level, and remained in the meeting for the consideration of this item. No officers of the West Suffolk Councils' Leadership Team were present for this item.)

Council considered Report No: COU/SE/18/011, which sought approval for the amendments to the proposed salary range for the Leadership Team, with effect from 1 April 2018.

The salary bands of the top three pay tiers (Leadership Team) of the Councils were determined by the band of the Chief Executive, calculated as a

percentage of the highest salary band. Approval would, therefore, also, increase the pay bands of the two Directors and the six Assistant Directors, who comprised the Councils' Leadership Team. The proposed pay bands to be amended were set out in paragraph 1.2.1 and it had been recommended that the new bands became effective from 1 April 2018.

The Mayor welcomed Karen Points to the meeting, former Assistant Director (Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Services), having recently left the West Suffolk Councils for employment with Abbeycroft Leisure. Mrs Points was invited to partake in the discussions to answer technical questions on behalf of the Leader of the Council.

Councillor John Griffiths, Leader of the Council, drew relevant issues to the attention of Council, including reiterating his intention to amend one of the recommendations to make the pay bands for the top three pay tiers effective from 1 April 2019 to align with the review of the rest of the workforce, which was intended to be implemented from that date, as alluded to earlier in the meeting (see minutes 339 and 340).

A detailed discussion was held and the majority of Members acknowledged the quality of the existing Leadership Team in post, agreed the pay banding should be reviewed and the proposed increases were justifiable to ensure the West Suffolk organisation continued to attract and retain a high calibre workforce; however the rationale for deferring the implementation date to 1 April 2019 was given as follows:

- (a) it would align with and enable a broader review of the payline for the entire workforce to be facilitated in 2018/2019; and
- (b) it was appropriate to combine implementation with the creation of West Suffolk Council.

Some Members expressed concern that other public sector workers outside the organisation, albeit below the top three tiers of management level, had not received comparable increases in their salaries and therefore the proposed changes to the Leadership Team's pay bands should not be supported.

Councillor Griffiths moved the following recommendation, as amended from the report, which was duly seconded by Councillor David Nettleton:

That Council:

- (1) *approves the proposed salary range for the Joint Chief Executive of the West Suffolk Councils and the subsequent amendment to Leadership Team pay bands, as set out in Section 1.2 of Report No: COU/SE/18/011, subject to deferring implementation until 1 April 2019; and*
- (2) *notes that the Pay Policy Statement will be revised accordingly.*

Councillor David Nettleton, leader of the Charter Group and seconder to the substantive motion, requested a recorded vote, which was duly supported by more than five other Members.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote. Of 39 Members present, the votes recorded were 29 votes for the motion, 7 against and 3 abstentions. The names of those Members voting for and against being recorded as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors Broughton, Bull, Chester, Chung, Clarke, Clements, Evans, Everitt, Glossop, Griffiths, Hailstone, Houlder, Marks, Midwood, Mildmay-White, Nettleton, Pollington, Pugh, Rayner, Richardson, Roach, Rout, Smith, Speed, Stevens, Thompson, Wakelam, Frank Warby and Patsy Warby.

Against the motion:

Councillors Beckwith, Tony Brown, Fox, Hind, Paul Hopfensperger, Robbins and Springett.

Abstentions:

Councillors Simon Brown, John Burns and Sarah Stamp.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (1) the proposed salary range for the Joint Chief Executive of the West Suffolk Councils and the subsequent amendment to Leadership Team pay bands, as set out in Section 1.2 of Report No: COU/SE/18/011, subject to deferring implementation until 1 April 2019, be approved; and
- (2) it be noted that the Pay Policy Statement will be revised accordingly.

(Note: There were presently two vacancies on the Borough Council and Councillors Beccy Hopfensperger and Thorndyke had left the meeting before this item was considered and the vote taken.)

344. Mayoralty: 2018/2019

The Chairman of the Mayoral Advisory Committee, Councillor Carol Bull, reported that the Committee had recommended that:

- The present Deputy Mayor, Councillor Margaret Marks be nominated for the office of Mayor of St Edmundsbury for the 2018/2019 civic year; and
- Councillor Patrick Chung be nominated for the office of Deputy Mayor of St Edmundsbury for the 2018/2019 civic year.

The elections of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for 2018/2019 would be held at the Annual Meeting of the Council on 17 May 2018.

Both Councillors Marks and Chung were delighted to accept their respective nominations and thanked Members for their support.

The present Mayor, Councillor Terry Clements, was also thanked for his valuable contribution to the mayoralty during the 2017/2018 year.

(Note: Subject to the creation of West Suffolk Council in April 2019, the Deputy Mayor for 2018/2019 is unable to be nominated for the office of Mayor of St Edmundsbury in 2019/2020.)

345. Questions to Committee Chairmen

Council considered a narrative item, which sought questions of Committee Chairmen on business transacted by their committees since the last ordinary meeting of Council on 20 February 2018, as outlined below:

Committee	Chairman	Dates of meetings
Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Cllr Diane Hind	7 March 2018 18 April 2018
Development Control Committee	Cllr Jim Thorndyke	12 March 2018 5 April 2018
Licensing and Regulatory Committee	Cllr Frank Warby	10 April 2018
West Suffolk Joint Standards Committee	Cllr John Burns (Vice-Chairman)	16 April 2018

No questions were asked of the above Chairmen.

346. Urgent Questions on Notice

No urgent questions on notice had been received.

347. Exclusion of Press and Public

See minute 348 below.

348. Report on Special Urgency and Use of Chief Executive's Urgency Powers (para 3)

Council received and noted Exempt Report No: COU/SE/18/012, which reported details of a matter where it was necessary to implement the Cabinet's Special Urgency provisions and exercise the Chief Executive's urgency powers.

As no details of a specific nature were requested to be raised, the meeting remained in public session.

The matter related to the Cabinet endorsing the exercising of the Chief Executive's urgency powers to negotiate at auction, the purchase of the freehold of 20 High Street, Haverhill, which was scheduled to be auctioned on 28 March 2018 (the day after the Cabinet meeting). A successful purchase would provide the Council with a property offering both strategic and investment potential. In the short to medium term the property would provide an income from the current tenant (Iceland Foods Ltd), whilst in the

longer term there would be the opportunity to help shape the High Street and improve pedestrian circulation and connectivity in the retail core. It also supported the aspirations of the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan and accorded with the West Suffolk Growth Investment Strategy.

Exempt Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/18/026 provided further details of the proposal and Exempt Report No: COU/SE/18/012 provided further details of the reporting of the implementation of the Cabinet's Special Urgency provisions and the exercising of the Chief Executive's urgency powers. As the purchase was successful within the allocated budget and the completion date had passed, both these reports were now available in the public domain as the exemption due to commercial sensitivity no longer applied.

The Meeting concluded at 10.05 pm

Signed by:

Mayor
