



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

CABINET ADDENDUM

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
164. OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RECEPTION CLASSES FOR SEPTEMBER: PROPOSED TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF GOLDSTONE, WESTDENE, QUEENS PARK AND CONNAUGHT.	1 - 6
165. PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR THE PROVISION OF 3 JUNIOR FORMS IN PORTSLADE	7 - 18
169. HEALTH & WELLBEING BOARD DEVELOPMENT (SHADOW YEAR)	19 - 22

Subject:	Options for additional reception classes for September 2012: Proposed Temporary Expansion of Goldstone, Westdene, Queens Park and Connaught		
Date of Meeting:	19th January 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, People		
Lead Cabinet Member:	Cabinet Member for Children & Young People		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Gil Sweetenham	Tel: 29-3474
	Email:	Gil.sweetenham@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	Yes/No	Forward Plan No:	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Note: The special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 7, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act as amended (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the consultation ended on 13 January 2012 and sufficient time was required to properly consider and address the responses within the report.

1 SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Projected pupil numbers for the city has shown that for September 2012 there is an increase in reception class numbers of approximately 120 children.
- 1.2 These numbers can be accommodated in the city as there are sufficient reception class places in total.
- 1.3 However annual analysis of post code data and demographic changes shows that the majority of the additional places needed are in Hove and on the Brighton/Hove border, areas where there is no spare capacity.
- 1.4 The Council has committed to providing local places for local children wherever possible. Rather than send children out of their local area the Council proposes to extend, for one year only, the intake number at four schools in the area where numbers have risen.

2 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Cabinet note the responses to the consultation undertaken since the Cabinet meeting on 10th November
- 2.2 That Cabinet agree the proposal to temporarily increase the intake of Goldstone Primary, Westdene Primary Queens Park Primary and West Hove infant (Connaught Road site) by one form of entry for September 2012 only.

- 2.3 That Cabinet authorises the Strategic Director People to submit a request to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator for an in year variation in respect of Goldstone Primary, Westdene Primary, Queens Park Primary and West Hove Infant School Connaught Road site.

3 RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 The need for additional reception class places in the City over the last three years has been addressed by providing permanent additional forms of entry at Davigdor Infant School, Benfield Primary School, The Connaught Building (through West Hove Infants), Goldstone Primary School, Westdene Primary School and Queens Park Primary School, a total of 8.5 forms.
- 3.2 Currently, the only vacant reception class places are in the East of the City, a significant distance from the post code areas showing increased numbers.
- 3.3 Recent expansions at Queens Park Primary School, Goldstone Primary School, Westdene Primary School and West Hove Infant School (Connaught Building) has given each school a number of new classrooms that will be empty in September 2012. These classrooms will remain empty until the schools have filled up with their natural intake by September 2017.
- 3.4 This will mean that towards the end of the additional intakes primary education temporary classrooms will need to be provided. These proposals are consistent with Government policy of expanding popular schools and the use of vacant accommodation.
- 3.5 The Cabinet meeting on 10th November 2011 agreed to consulting schools and the wider community on these proposals.
- 3.6 This consultation concluded on 13th January 2012 and the purpose of this report is to inform cabinet of the results of that consultation.

4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 A short consultation document was prepared and sent out to all schools in the city, including the head teacher and chair of governors of the schools subject to the proposals (a copy of this has been placed in the members rooms).
- 4.2 The document was also published on the councils consultation portal.
- 4.3 A meeting was held at Westdene Primary School on Monday 9th January 2012. The meeting was attended by governors of the school, the head teacher and approximately 70 parents of children at the school. The general points to come out of the meeting was that those attending the meeting did not support the proposal on the grounds of traffic and safety issues, the effect on the organisation of the school, a disbelief that the additional pupils will be local to the school, the consequential impact on future sibling links and the impact on the quality of teaching and learning.

- 4.4 There was also a meeting with parents of pupils who would benefit from the proposal being implemented. These parents were very supportive of the proposal on the grounds that it would allow these pupils to access their most local community school.
- 4.5 The governing body of Westdene Primary School submitted a response to the consultation stating that they remain opposed to the proposal for their school. The reasons are the same as those mentioned in paragraph 4.3 above.
- 4.6 There were three petitions started as a result of the proposal as it relates to Westdene Primary School. Two of these were opposed to the proposal, a paper petition received 452 signatures and an on-line e petition received 176 signatures. The third petition, an on-line petition supporting the proposal received 78 signatures.
- 4.6 52 individual responses were received to the consultation. Of these 42 (81%) did not support the proposal and 10 (19%) were in favour. 50 (96%) of these responses related to the proposal for Westdene, 1 related to Queens Park and 1 related to Goldstone. No written representations were received regarding the proposal as it relates to the Connaught. A copy of all responses received have been placed in the members rooms for information.
- 4.6 The Governing bodies of Queens Park Primary School and West Hove infant School (Connaught Road Site) both accepted the proposal.
- 4.8 The governing body of Goldstone Primary school also remains opposed to the proposal on the grounds of traffic and safety issues, the effect on the organisation of the school and the amount of disruption the school have faced over the last few years.
- 4.9 The next stage of the process is to inform the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) of the result of the consultation exercise. The view of the OSA at the time we initially discussed this with them was that that the proposal to temporarily increase numbers as a result of increased pressure in certain areas will fit within the criteria for 'in-year' variations. This would ensure that the temporary increase proposed does not become permanent for future years.

5 FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of the recommendations in this paper although it may be necessary to provide mobile temporary accommodation at the schools as the schools reach capacity.

Finance Officer Consulted: Andy Moore

Date: 06/01/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 Under section 88E of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 Local Authorities can make an application to the Schools Adjudicator for an in-year variation to school admissions arrangements, where there has been a major

change in circumstances since the time that the arrangements were determined. This report outlines the projected increases in reception class numbers for September 2012, and the potential difficulties in providing local places for local children. As the Authority is under a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places in the city, and also wishes to ensure that they are in the geographical areas which will have no spare capacity, a referral to vary the determined admission arrangements will be necessary in order to make the proposed changes.

Lawyer Consulted:

Serena Kynaston

Date: 10/01/2012

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 Planning and provision of school places is conducted in such a way as to avoid potentially discriminatory admissions priorities or planning processes. The city council and voluntary aided school governing bodies must be mindful of best practice as described in the Admission Code of Practice.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 Providing school places close to the community where the service is required is more sustainable than requiring parents and young children to cross the city to access a school place.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 By including the community in the development and use of the facilities at the schools crime and disorder in the local area will be reduced. This will be further improved by offering extended use of the facilities to the community outside of the school day

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 It is important that this opportunity is taken to ensure the future provision of learning and teaching, and continuing improvement in standards of education in the city

Public Health Implications:

- 5.7 There are no public health implications arising from this report.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.8 These proposals are an essential element in providing additional places in local areas for local children.

6 EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 The other options available to the Council are:

- To send children outside of their local area to vacant places in the east of the City
- To extend other schools in the area of need by adding mobile accommodation funded from the schools capital programme.

7 REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The proposal represents the best option to satisfy the need for local places for local children and best value in that they use empty classrooms already provided from the Councils schools capital programme

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

None

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Consultation document
2. Copies of all responses received to the consultation.

Background Documents

None

Subject:	Proposed options for the provision of 3 Junior forms Portslade		
Date of Meeting:	19th January 2012		
Report of:	Strategic Director, People		
Lead Cabinet Member:	Cabinet Member for Children & Young People		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Gil Sweetenham	Tel: 29-3474
	Email:	Gil.sweetenham@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Key Decision:	Yes/No	Forward Plan No:	
Ward(s) affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

Note: The special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 7, Access to Information Rule 5 and Section 100B (4) of the Local Government Act as amended (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the consultation ended on 13 January 2012 and sufficient time was required to properly consider and address the responses within the report.

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 Current and projected pupil numbers for the city as a whole show there is an immediate and ongoing need for additional school places in the city as a whole. This need is most acute in the west of the city.
- 1.2 As part of the solution for providing these places, Benfield Junior School was made into a primary school in September 2010. This has resulted in a mismatch in the numbers of forms of entry for infant places and junior places.
- 1.3 This report sets out the preferred option for providing the 3 additional junior forms of entry that are needed.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That Cabinet approves the preferred option of making St Peters Community Infant School, Portslade Infant School and St Nicolas Church of England Junior school into all through primary schools from September 2013.
- 2.2 That Cabinet agrees to undertaking the necessary formal consultation processes arising from the proposal.
- 2.3 That Cabinet note that following further investigations the preferred option for the provision of junior places in Hove is at Hove Police Station.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

- 3.1 Pupil numbers across the city are rising generally and the rise in Hove and Portslade is greater than the city generally and already causing a pressure on school places that cannot be met locally.
- 3.2 The need for additional reception and infant class places in the city over the last three years has been partly addressed by providing permanent additional forms of entry Benfield Primary School. As a result of this change there still exists a need to find sites for three additional forms of entry for juniors (school years 3 to 6) in Portslade.
- 3.3 At its meeting on 10th November 2011 Cabinet approved negotiations with St Nicolas Church of England Junior School and St Peters Community infant school.
- 3.4 Following the Cabinet meeting officers met with the governing body at St Nicolas Junior School and the Diocese of Chichester to discuss the options that may be available. The school also invited the governing body of Portslade infant school to the meeting.
- 3.5 Both governing bodies and the diocese felt that their preferred option would be to make both schools all through primary schools rather than making St Nicolas a four form entry junior school and undertaking no work at all at Portslade infant School.
- 3.6 Officers also met with the head at St Peters Community Infant School who confirmed that the school is very keen to become an all through primary school.
- 3.7 It will be necessary to acquire a site adjacent to St Peters Infant school to be able to expand the school. Negotiations are underway on this element of work.
- 3.8 There is also a need to provide an additional 3 forms of entry for junior age children in Hove from September 2014. This is to provide junior places for the three forms of infant pupils who started at the Connaught building in September 2011.
- 3.9 A number of options were initially considered but all had draw backs of some description. The preferred option at the present time is to acquire Hove Police Station once it is vacated by the Police authority. This proposal will be the subject of further consultation and a separate Cabinet report in April.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

- 4.1 Following the Cabinet meeting on 10th November officers met with the head teachers and governing bodies of St Nicolas Junior and Portslade infant schools to discuss the options available.
- 4.2 A short consultation document was sent to each school in Portslade explaining the options available. This information was also sent to ward councillors affected by the proposals and the executive member for children's services,

representatives of the two dioceses covering Brighton & Hove and West Sussex County Council.

- 4.3 The directly affected schools passed the consultation document to their staff, parents and pupils and the views expressed have been summarised in Appendix 1.
- 4.4 A total of 164 responses were received to the consultation of which 159 respondents were broadly in favour of making changes to St Peters Community Infant school, Portslade Infant School and St Nicolas Church of England Junior School.
- 4.5 The majority of these respondents favoured making St Peters Community Infant school a one form entry all through primary school by purchasing an adjacent site and making both Portslade infant School and St Nicolas Junior School two separate two form entry all through primary schools.
- 4.6 If the recommendations of this report are approved a further round of more formal consultation will be undertaken following the statutory provisions contained in the Education and Inspections Act 2006.
- 4.7 Guidance issued by the DfE entitled "Making changes to a maintained mainstream school' sets out the procedures that will have to be followed by the Authority in order to effect these proposed changes. A copy of this document is in the members rooms for information.
- 4.8 There will need to be public consultation on the junior school proposal for Hove both in terms of the proposed site and the management arrangements for the school.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 There are no direct implications as a result of the recommendation to note the outcome of the informal consultation on the proposal to extend the age range of the three schools, or the recommendation to undertake formal consultation, however if the proposals are approved at a later stage then any Capital implications of the expansion will have to be met from the existing Capital programme in 2012/13. The cost of acquiring the site adjacent to St Peters Infants School will have to be met from the existing Capital programme in 2012/13 along with the costs of furnishing the new building in 2013/14 which will also have to be found from the existing Capital programme. The revenue costs of funding the new forms of entry will be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2013/14 onwards.
- 5.2.1 The cost of acquiring any new site for the junior element for Portslade will need to be met from the existing Capital programme, presumably in 2012/13 or 2013/14, in order to allow for any refurbishment or costs of furnishing a building in 2013/14 and 2014/15, which will also have to be found from the existing Capital programme. The revenue costs of funding the new junior school will be met from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) in 2014/15 onwards.

Finance Officer Consulted: Andy Moore

Date: 06/01/12

Legal Implications:

- 5.4 If Cabinet approves the preferred options as outlined in paragraph 2.1 above, the Authority will need to carry out a formal consultation of all interested parties as required under the Education and Inspections Act 2006. Results of the consultation will be referred back to Cabinet for a decision as to whether to take the proposals forward with the publication of statutory proposals.

Lawyer Consulted: Serena Kynaston

Date: 10/01/2012

Equalities Implications:

- 5.5 Planning and provision of school places is conducted in such a way as to avoid potentially discriminatory admissions priorities or planning processes. The city council and voluntary aided school governing bodies must be mindful of best practice as described in the Admission Code of Practice

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.6 All new extensions to Brighton and Hove Schools utilise, where ever possible, environmental and sustainable principles such as higher than minimum insulation levels, the use of efficient gas condensing boilers, under floor heating, solar shading and natural ventilation. Materials are sourced from sustainable sources where ever possible.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.7 Throughout the development of the proposals consultation will be undertaken with community groups and the Community Safety team and police liaison officers. It is anticipated that by including the community in the development and use of the facilities at the schools that crime and disorder in the local area will be reduced. This will be further improved by offering extended use of the facilities to the community outside of the school day

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.8 It is important that this opportunity is taken to ensure the future provision of learning and teaching, and continuing improvement in standards of education in the city.

Public Health Implications:

- 5.9 There are no public health implications arising from this report.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.10 These proposals are an essential element in providing additional places in local areas for local children.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 This paper presents the range of options available to address the need for future primary places within this part of the City.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Current and projected pupil numbers for the city as a whole show there is an immediate and ongoing need for additional school places in the city as a whole. This need is most acute in the west of the city on the Portslade / Hove border.
- 7.2 To meet the projected future growth in pupil numbers we need to provide three additional forms of entry in both Hove and Portslade.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Summary showing the responses to the consultation

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. Copies of all responses to the consultation
2. DfE document 'Making changes to a maintained mainstream school'

School	Options	Option No.
St Peters: Expand St. Peters to become a one form of entry Primary School	Purchase a site next to the existing school and provide 3 further classrooms plus toilets re-provide dining facilities etc	1a
	Purchasing a site in the locality and providing 3 further classrooms and additional space to cater for the split site.	1b
St Nicolas CE VA Junior School and Portslade Infant School	Expand St Nicolas to a four form entry Junior school	2a
	Expand St Nicolas and Portslade Infant school to two separate two form entry primary schools	2b
	Merge St Nicolas and Portslade Infants into one four form entry primary school from September 2013	2c
St Nicolas CE VA Junior School, Portslade Infant School and Peter Gladwin	Expand Peter Gladwin to a two form entry primary school on existing site and make Portslade Infants into three form entry infant school, and St Nicolas into a three form entry Junior School	3
Peter Gladwin and Downs Park Special School	Expand Peter Gladwin using vacant accommodation at Downs Park Special School. Peter Gladwin would be a one form entry primary school with a linked two form entry Junior school	4
Portslade PCC Sixth Form site	Adapt to create a two form entry Junior School	5

PROPOSED OPTIONS/PROVISION OF 3 FORMS OF ENTRY FOR JUNIOR AGE PUPILS IN PORTSLADE- ANALYSIS

SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL

Total
For = 159

Comments	From School (where applicable)	Preferred Option	Parent	Staff	Govern.	Other
Ward Councillor. Possibly use Sellaby house? - Consider PeterGladwin in the future.		2b				1
Ward Councillor.		2b				1
Petition		1				1
4-form entry would lose the 'family feel', many parents prefer continuity of all-through primaries	St Nicolas	2b			1	
School response (in consultation with parents)	St Peter's	1b			1	
	St Peter's	1	1			
Fantastic plan	St Peter's	1	1			
Fab plan	St Peter's	1	1			
would enable my son to continue beyond KS1	St Peter's	1	1			
Would improve the lives of children in South Portslade	St Peter's	1	1			
St Peters has a fantastic community atmosphere	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
	St Peter's	1	1			
St Peters is a wonderful school	St Peter's	1	1			
Our son would really benefit from the continuity during his primary years	St Peter's	1	1			
A great idea as long as the school does not lose its community feel	St Peter's	1	1			
Very much in favour - St Peters is a brilliant school	St Peter's	1	1			
Places in this part of the city are urgently needed-St Peters is in excellent position to expand	St Peter's	1	1			
Very much in favour - St Nicks is not an option for non-christians	St Peter's	1	1			

Response Number

19 January 2012

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Brighton and Hove City Council Health & Wellbeing Board Development		
Date of Meeting:	19 January 2012 26 January 2012 - Council		
Report of:	Extract from the Proceedings of the Governance Committee Meeting held on the 10 January 2012		
Contact Officer:	Name: Mark Wall	Tel: 29-1006	
	E-mail: mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk		
Wards Affected:	All		

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

4.00 pm 10 January 2012
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Councillors Littman (Chair), A Norman (Deputy Chair), Bowden, Cobb, Cox, J Kitcat, Mitchell, Morgan, Powell and Randall

PART ONE**57. BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL HEALTH & WELLBEING BOARD DEVELOPMENT**

57.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, People and Director of Public Health and Adult Social Care concerning the establishment of a Health and Wellbeing Board. The report summarised the proposed approach to establishing a Health and Wellbeing Board, and sought approval for the approach outlined for the establishment of a Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board in April 2012 as set out in the Terms of Reference.

57.2 An amendment to the draft Terms of Reference was proposed by Council Randall and seconded by Councillor Kitcat. The proposed amendment was circulated to the members. The amendment related to the second bullet point in paragraph 3 'Membership' of the draft Terms of Reference and read:
'Six additional elected Members which, taken together with the Elected Member as Chair set above, will be allocated to the different groups in proportion to the number of seats they have at Council'.

Council Kitcat spoke on the amendment and said the six additional members would ensure that there would be a majority of councillors on the Health and Wellbeing Board, which would make the Board as democratic as possible.

- 57.3 Councillor A Norman noted the proposed amendment and whilst agreeing that it would allow councillors to be more involved, had concerns that a great deal of consultation had taken place and the working group had carefully considered the membership. Councillor Norman suggested it might be more appropriate for the proposed amendment to be considered first by the working group.
- 57.4 Councillor Bowden supported the amendment as, whilst he did not want the Board to be too big and unwieldy, he felt additional Members on the Board would allow for a more democratic decision making process and would assist officers who may find themselves in a difficult situation having to vote on certain issues.
- 57.5 Councillor Mitchell had hoped that membership of the Board would be small, but accepted that it was important to protect officers from having to make some decisions. Councillor Mitchell asked whether the Board would be able to monitor and comment on what the partner agencies spent. The Committee were advised that the Board would be able to look at health outcomes for the city, and consider the proposals of how to meet them, but would not be looking at the actual contracts etc.
- 57.6 Councillor Cobb noted the suggested amendment and stated that she had similar concerns to Councillor Norman, and felt that the working group should have considered them first. Councillor Cobb suggested that another option would be to remove the voting rights of the three Directors (as listed in the Terms of Reference Membership), and allow the Chair to have the casting vote. This would alleviate the need for officers to make decisions.
- 57.7 Councillor Morgan asked for clarification on whether the Board would be looking at issues such as alcohol abuse, mental health etc and whether there would be any overlap with other committees or boards. Councillor Morgan was advised that the Board would be looking at those types of areas, and if there were any overlaps they should become apparent during the shadow year.
- 57.8 Councillor Powell asked whether it was the intention for the Board to replace the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Adult Social Care and Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Powell was advised that the proposals for the new committees would be agreed in April, and the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board would be looked when proposing the new committees. Councillor Powell asked if there would be a scrutiny function within the Board, and was advised that the Board would be focusing on the health needs of the city and looking at whether those needs were being met.
- 57.9 Councillor Bowden referred to the suggestion made by Councillor Cobb that the directors on the Board don't have the right to vote and asked if that were legally possible. Councillor Bowden was advised that the directors were required to be full members with equal rights and therefore they would have to be able to vote.
- 57.10 The Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that it was intention for the arrangements of the shadow board to be as close as possible to the final board. It was

not the intention for the Health and Wellbeing Board to replace other boards or committees, and having the shadow board would allow for any overlaps to be noted.

57.11 Councillor Norman noted that the government recommendations were to have one Member on the Board, and the working group had increased that to three Members. The suggested further increase was on the recommendation of the administration and not the working group and was concerned that to agree an increase at the meeting was inappropriate without it being looked at again by the working group.

57.12 Councillor Kitcat stated that the Health and Wellbeing Board would not be reporting to Council and it was important that councillors came first in any making any decision.

57.13 Councillor Randall confirmed that the suggested change to the membership had been discussed at the recent Leaders Group meeting.

57.14 Councillor Littman noted that there would be 14 members on the Board and therefore all the councillors, representing the political parties, would need to agree for issues to be agreed by the Board.

57.15 A vote was taken on the proposed amendment and the amendment was agreed.

57.16 **RESOLVED:**

(1) That Governance Committee recommends to Council the establishment of a Shadow Health and Wellbeing Board from April 2012 as set out in the report and in accordance with the draft Terms of Reference attached at Appendix One, with the following amendment:

‘That the second bullet point in paragraph 3 (Membership) reads: ‘Six additional elected Members which, taken together with the Elected Member as Chair set out above, will be allocated to the different groups in proportion to the number of seats they have at Council.’

(2) That Governance Committee refers the report to Cabinet for information.

