

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

4.30PM – 17 JULY 2008

BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

#### MINUTES

Present: Councillor Peltzer Dunn (Mayor); Councillors Alford, Allen, Bennett, Mrs Brown, Carden, Caulfield, Mrs Cobb, Davis, Mrs Drake, Elgood, Fallon-Khan, Fryer, Hamilton, Harmer-Strange, Hawkes, Hyde, Kemble, Lainchbury, Lepper, Marsh, McCaffery, Meadows, Mears, Mitchell, Mrs A Norman, K Norman, Older, Oxley, Pidgeon, Simpson, Mrs Simson, Smart, Smith, Taylor, Mrs C Theobald, G Theobald, Turton, Watkins, Wells and Young.

#### 1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 1.1 There were no declarations of interest.

#### 2. MINUTES

- 2.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 15 May 2008 be approved and signed as a correct record of the proceedings.

#### 3. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 The Mayor stated that in view of the action taken by UNISON he was mindful that a number of Members had chosen not to attend the meeting and that others only wished to be present for the debate on the two Notices of Motion that related to the strike issue. In this respect, he proposed to bring forward on the agenda Item No's 12(a) and 12(b), immediately after Item No 6 Deputations. There would then be a single debate followed by each notice of motion being put forward for decision.
- 3.2 The Mayor also noted that two Mayoral Charity events were forthcoming on 10 and 26 September, a fish & chip supper and Buffet at the Royal Pavilion respectively.

#### 4. PETITIONS

- 4.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from Councillors. He reminded the Council that petitions would be referred to the appropriate decision-making body without debate and the Councillor presenting the

petition would be invited to attend the meeting to which the petition was referred.

- 4.2 Councillor Oxley presented a petition signed by 86 residents concerning parking restrictions in the area surrounding Hove Methodist Church.
- 4.3 Councillor Mrs Cobb presented a petition signed by 98 residents concerning the provision of a crossing near the Surgery in Sackville Road, Hove.

## **5. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

- 5.1 The Mayor reported that one written question had been received from a member of the public and invited Ms Paynter to come forward and address the council.

- 5.2 Ms Paynter asked the following question:

"Brighton and Hove City Council is willing to provide £2.7million enablement funding towards the provision of Affordable Housing at the proposed King Alfred development.

Can the Council give assurances that it is not prepared to increase that amount or contribute further towards enablement of this development now it is indicated publicly that the financial viability is shaky and if the developers come back to the Council requesting it be increased?"

- 5.3 Councillor Mears stated that "I welcome the opportunity to reply to your question as there is a lot of rumour and speculation about the council's position in respect of the King Alfred development.

My Cabinet would not agree to increase the enabling funding you refer to for the Frank Gehry scheme that has planning permission. Indeed money will now need to be found by the council to cover its costs associated with keeping the leisure centre open beyond the previously planned closure date.

To put this into context, there is no doubt that the credit crunch has impacted on the project and that ING is reconsidering its position. I have called for a full options analysis and until such time that meetings with Karis and ING have taken place and the options analysis has been properly considered it would be most unwise for me or anyone else to speculate on what the council may or may not do, what any development may look like or when it will get built."

- 5.4 Ms Paynter asked the following supplementary question:

"The present Administration inherited an expenditure record from the old Labour Administration concerning the entire King Alfred project and with continuation is also creating a record expenditure of its own.

How much did the previous Administration spend on the King Alfred proposals and council expenses and what is the sum total of the council expenses to date in connection with the current King Alfred development proposals?"

- 5.5 Councillor Mears responded "You have actually asked a very detailed question that I cannot answer at this moment in time but I will make sure you receive a written response."

## **6. DEPUTATIONS**

- 6.1 The Mayor reported that one Deputation had been received, which concerned a request for a pedestrian crossing at Queen's Park Terrace and the Mayor invited Mr T Satterthwaite, as the spokesperson, to come forward and address the Council.

- 6.2 Mr Satterthwaite thanked the Mayor and stated that:

"I am here on behalf of the parents, carers and staff of children at St Luke's Infant and St Luke's Junior Schools to present a petition about a crossing in Queen's Park Terrace.

As part of the Safer Routes to School Initiative in the area of St Luke's Infant and Junior Schools, the pedestrian island halfway along Queens Park Rise at the junction with St Luke's Terrace was removed and the pavement was widened. The intention was to make it safer for parents with their children to walk to school. Unfortunately the result has been exactly the opposite, we now have parents with their children, two times a day unable to cross the road. The road is quiet most of the day but in the mornings and late afternoon it becomes very busy and it can be impossible to get across and quite dangerous. You can have dozens of parents standing lined up along the edge of the road trying to get across, cars do not know they have to stop because there is no crossing.

In my own experience, which is why I became involved in this campaign, I was crossing the junction about six weeks ago with my young son who is three years old, the traffic was stationary and because it was stationary a motor cycle took advantage of that moment to weave through the traffic and missed me and my little boy by about three feet. The main reason being that there was no crossing, no signage so he did not know that he had to stop.

Myself and two other parents have led a campaign to obtain signatures for a petition to present to you. We have 389 signatures which if I could read out:

'We the parents and carers of children at St Luke's Infant School and St Luke's Junior School find the junction between Queen's Park Rise and Queen's Park Terrace dangerous and difficult to cross. We call on Brighton & Hove City Council to install a pedestrian crossing at this junction

to improve safety and ensure the priority of pedestrians.’

Now, with the weight of various letters to the council there was a review carried out and my understanding is that the decision was to make no changes. I would assure you that anyone using the junction on a regular basis would profoundly disagree with that. We have some interest from virtually everybody who ever goes across that crossing from the school. There has been a mistake made which should be relatively easy to sort out. A zebra crossing with Belisha beacons is what is clearly needed, so that at quiet times of the day cars can come and go and at busy times cars know to stop and allow children to safely cross with their parents.

A final point I would make is that we ought to encourage children to be able to go to the park, which is at the bottom of this route, on their own safely. Without a crossing they cannot do this, so I do hope this petition will carry some weight with you and an urgent review will be begun.”

- 6.3 Councillor Theobald thanked Mr Satterthwaite for outlining the Deputation and stated that: “The safety of road users, especially children, across the city is a very important issue. In this instance, the current crossing arrangement has been designed, taking into account the response we received to the public consultation and expert technical advice on road safety. I know that the School Travel team are aware of, and have been looking into, this matter with local Councillors and parents, and a number of further assessments and improvements have been made in response to concerns raised.

By continuing to work together with key people, such as Headteachers and parents, we can ensure that the benefits of schemes like this are maximised for both the school and local communities.

As is the case with other similar schemes, officers will be visiting the site again early in the Autumn Term as part of the monitoring and evaluation process. Given the level of concern that has been expressed by you today and in the petition, I will ask them to look at this matter again and give further consideration to possible alternative solutions that are safe and feasible.”

- 6.4 The Mayor thanked Mr Satterthwaite for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the Deputation. He explained that the points made had been noted and along with the petition would now be referred to the Environment & Community Safety Cabinet Member Meeting. The persons forming the Deputation would be invited to attend the meeting and would be informed subsequently of any action taken or proposed in relation to the matters set out by the Deputation.

Note: The Mayor reminded Council that he had decided to take Item No's 12(a) and 12(b) after the Deputation and therefore invited Councillors Mitchell and Taylor to formally move their notices of motion.

**12. NOTICES OF MOTION****(a) Fair Pay for Council Staff**

12.1 The Notice of Motion as detailed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Mitchell and seconded by Councillor Turton.

12.2 The Mayor then put the following Notice of Motion to the vote:

“This council values its staff and recognises their contribution to the delivery of good quality public services that have improved the city’s neighbourhoods and helped individuals.

It believes that local government workers deserve a fair wage that is at least comparable to other public sector staff.

To this end, this council calls upon the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Local Government Association to re-open negotiations with the staff unions in order to reach a fair and just pay settlement that reflects current inflationary trends.”

12.3 The motion was carried.

**(b) Local Government pay settlement, support for Trade Unions**

12.4 The Notice of Motion as detailed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Taylor and seconded by Councillor Fryer.

12.5 The Mayor then put the following Notice of Motion to the vote:

“This Council notes the formal pay dispute between local government employers and employees.

The employee’s umbrella organisation, the National Joint Local Council for Local Government Services (NJC) negotiates on behalf of members of both the Unison and Unite Trade Unions, while the employers are represented by Local Government Employers (LGE). The employees have asked for a 6% settlement, or 50p per hour (whichever is the greater), while LGE has offered 2.45%

This Council further notes;

- the Retail Price Index is currently increasing at 4.3%, pa
- that, with the 2.45% increase applied (with an additional £100 for the 230,000 Unison members on the bottom 3 pay grades) the new bottom rate for Brighton & Hove Council staff will be £6.20 per hour - just 40p above the national minimum wage (from Oct 2008)
- This Council is one of the city's largest employer and therefore plays a crucial role in the local economy

- Brighton and Hove has some of the highest accommodation and living costs in the country, yet some of the lowest wages
- In reflection of its concern over low rates of pay its meeting of April 24, 2008 this Council resolved to support the raising of the national minimum wage to £7 per hour.

This Council believes the NJC's claim of 6% wage increase is just and fair and represents an appropriate recompense for the high standard of professional work undertaken by our staff.

Therefore this Council resolves to instruct the Chief Executive to write to Sec of State for Communities and Local Government, Hazel Blears and Sir Steve Bullock, Chair of the Local Government Association's Human Resources Panel calling for

1. Negotiations to be reopened and an improved offer made;
2. A commitment from central government to fund an improved offer through an additional settlement to local authorities."

12.6 The motion was lost.

Note: Following the conclusion of the debate and decisions on the two Notices of Motion, Members of the Labour Group, Green Group and Liberal Democrat Group left the meeting. The Mayor then reverted back to the order of the agenda.

## **7. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- 7.1 The Mayor reminded the Council that Councillors' questions and the replies from the appropriate Councillor were now taken as read by reference to the list, which had been circulated.
- 7.2 The Mayor noted that Councillor Fryer had given notice that she wished to withdraw both of her questions listed on the agenda at Item No's 7(a) and 7(d).
- 7.3 The Mayor noted that the Members responsible for the written questions were not present and therefore could not put forward a supplementary question. He asked that copies of the written answers be sent to them. He then asked whether any Members present wished to put a supplementary question to any of the questions listed and detailed below:
- (b)  
7.4 Councillor Hamilton asked: "A confidential list of council properties to be considered for disposal was drawn up for The Conservative Administration and was featured in an article in the local press in May. Portslade council offices featured on that list. Please will you give assurances to the residents of the western part of the city that this public building will remain open to provide services to local residents, and that Portslade Town Hall

and the adjoining bowling greens will remain as amenities for public use?"

- 7.4 Councillor Mears replied: "Yes. Preliminary consideration has been given to the possibility of replacing the existing offices behind the Town hall with new offices making better use of the site and providing more accommodation. However, the Town Hall and the bowling green would have remained untouched and available as before. This proposal was part of the wider accommodation strategy for the Council aimed at making better use of our own buildings, providing better offices and releasing accommodation leased from private owners. The proposals for the offices have not been taken further at this stage as the accommodation strategy is currently focussing on Kings House."
- 7.5 Councillor Harmer-Strange asked a supplementary question, "Would Councillor Mears agree that it is right and proper for the Council to seek optimum value for money for its council tax payers and that this should include looking at all possible options for its considerable property portfolio? And I would like to add that I am pleased that the Leader has been able to quash these rumours about Portslade Town Hall today."
- 7.6 Councillor Mears replied, "Yes, I am delighted to confirm that it would not be proper of the council if it did not review its entire property portfolio."
- (c)  
7.7 Councillor Duncan asked: "Can Councillor Mears outline her vision for the future of funding for area-based working and regeneration work across the city: specifically, can Cllr Mears give this council a guarantee that the administration is committed to devolving some elements of decision-making, backed with appropriate funding, to neighbourhoods, as envisaged in the Local Government and Involvement in Public Health Act 2007?"
- 7.8 Councillor Mears replied: "We need to make sure our area based working really makes a difference to people on the ground. The end of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding is a challenge, but also an opportunity to review our approach. The Reducing Inequality Review showed that inequality is most serious in our most deprived areas, but that it is also spread in pockets across the city. To address that, we need to work in new ways. If Councillor Duncan wants more detail on our vision and targets in this area, he can find it in the Corporate Plan and the Local Area Agreement.

As to the funding, we have agreed transitional arrangements for 2008/09 so we can preserve the learning and experience of staff, members and communities. Most importantly, we want to preserve the strong relationships that have been built between communities and the council. We are keen to sustain what has worked and expand the offer wider, and will be addressing this through the normal budgeting round.

On devolution, the City Council and LSP are developing a Community Engagement Framework for the city. The Framework will be the principal reference guide for all LSP members. It will also identify actions that need to be taken to improve community engagement in the city. The framework

is currently under extensive consultation which will finish in early September. The results of the consultation will be used to inform our future approach to area working. We are committed to giving communities information, support and opportunities to take control and we will look at the best ways to achieve that with an open mind. All members will have the opportunity to input into the development and deliver of the priority actions in the Framework."

7.9 Councillor Simson asked a supplementary question, "Would Cllr. Mears agree that the previous Administration badly let down some of the most vulnerable residents of the City by failing to properly plan for the end of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding and that this lackadaisical approach has led to unnecessary worry for council staff, external partners and members of those communities and it has taken this Administration to find the funding to keep the best of this work going?"

7.10 Councillor Mears replied, "Yes, the previous Administration had no plans for taking this matter forward and the Conservative Administration was working with officers to ensure the council could deliver on community engagement across the city."

(e)  
7.11 Councillor Taylor asked: "Could the councillor tell me the costs of holding a meeting of full cabinet, and the average costs for holding a cabinet member meeting?"

Such costs should involve venue charges, documents, catering, security and salaries and allowances for staff and members in attendance."

7.12 Councillor Mears replied; ""It has always been perceived that the cost of holding full cabinet and cabinet member meetings would be cheaper than the cost of running the former committee meetings. However, I feel that the actual amount of officer time it would take to research and quantify this as you have asked would be both unreasonable and out of proportion with the amount of information it would provide.

As you know there will be a review of the new governance arrangements at the end of the first six month period and if there are concerns at that point, it may be appropriate then for the council to review the cost of providing documentation and catering for each of them."

7.13 Councillor Oxley asked a supplementary question, "Would the Leader of the Council agree that the costs associated with the system were anticipated to be similar to those under the committee system which all Members had wanted to retain and that they would be looked at as part of the 6-month review?"

7.14 Councillor Mears replied, "Yes, it was intended to look at costs as part of the review."

(f)  
7.15 Councillor Davey asked: "When the Cabinet Member for the Environment announced his decision not to implement the wide scale ban on dogs using



the City's beaches we were assured that this was evidence of the council listening to the public and then acting accordingly. Could the appropriate cabinet member please explain why they have not continued this laudable practice in response to the consultation on the North Street Mixed Priority Route (MPR) Road Safety Scheme? In her recent decision Cllr Young recently ignored the majority public opinion over the preferred options for both the North Street Quadrant and Ship Street, in the latter case introducing a fourth option that hadn't even been consulted on."

- 7.16 Councillor Theobald replied: "Thank you for your question in connection with the North Street Mixed Priority Route report that was approved at the recent Cabinet Member Meeting.

Public consultation makes an important contribution in helping decision makers determine what the priorities and concerns are for all members of the community. Councillors and officers use this information to help them design policy or focus resources or, as in this case, continue with the development of proposals for a transport scheme."

- (g)  
7.17 Councillor McCaffery asked: "Would the Cabinet Member for Environment tell the Council what action City Clean takes when residents put their recycling out for collection without properly sorting it?"

- 7.18 Councillor Theobald replied: "If the box is full of unsorted recyclables City clean employees should sort it into the relevant compartments on the side of the truck. If the box is full of just rubbish, they will not collect it and they should either leave a card letting the resident know why the box was not collected, what the resident needs to do in the future, and the crew will report the problem to their manager."

## **8. REPORTS OF CABINET AND COMMITTEES**

### **(a) Callover**

- 8.1 No items were reserved for discussion:

### **(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports**

- 8.2 The Chief Executive confirmed that the reports of the Cabinet and Committees appearing under item 8(a) on the agenda with the recommendations or resolutions contained therein be approved and adopted.

- 8.3 The Council agreed.

### **(c) Oral Questions from Members**

- 8.4 There were no oral questions from Councillors on the items, which had not been reserved for discussion.

**9. Corporate Plan 2008-11**

- 9.1 The report of the Cabinet in relation to the Corporate Plan 2008-11 had not been called and therefore the recommendations contained therein were approved.

**10. Local Area Agreement 2008-11**

- 10.1 The report of the Cabinet in relation to the Local Area Agreement 2008-11 had not been called and therefore the recommendations contained therein were approved.

**11. Annual Report 2007/08**

- 11.1 The Annual Report 2007/08 of the Overview & Scrutiny Organisation Committee had not been called and therefore the recommendations contained therein were approved.

**12. NOTICES OF MOTION****(c) Ballot as a Means of Consultation**

- 12.7 The Mayor noted that Councillor Duncan was not present and in the absence of any other Member wishing to move the motion, in accordance with Procedural Rule 8.6 the motion would be deemed to have been postponed.

**13. NOTICES OF MOTION REPORTED TO COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION**

- 13.1 The Mayor noted that the following notices of motion and the decisions thereon had been reported back to the Council in accordance with Procedural Rule 24 for information only and would therefore be noted:

**(a) Bottled Drinking Water.**

- 13.2 The Cabinet considered the following Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 13 March 2008 by Councillors Morgan and Mitchell. An amended version of the Notice of Motion was tabled at the meeting reflecting the amendments moved by the Green Party and adopted at Council on 13 March 2008.

“This council notes that the majority of restaurants in Brighton and Hove serve bottled mineral water, and that while most will provide tap water on request, some do not.

Tap water is of very good quality, up to 500 times cheaper than bottled water and emits around 300 times less CO<sub>2</sub> in processing than bottled alternatives. A glass of tap water has a carbon footprint of 0.3g of CO<sub>2</sub>, a bottle of mineral water has a carbon footprint of up to 185g of CO<sub>2</sub>. Much of the bottled water we drink is shipped in from overseas, and shipping has been shown to have emissions greater even than airfreight. The use of

bottled water too often contributes to landfill where glass and plastic bottles used to provide the water are not recycled. In many organisations, including the council, disposable plastic cups are often used to serve the water, and these are also frequently not recycled.

This council notes the “London On Tap” campaign run by Thames Water and the Mayor of London, and the competition to design reusable carafes for use in restaurants across the capital, and resolves to consider a similar initiative.

This council resolves to encourage restaurants, cafés and hotels in the city to provide tap water on request or as a matter of course, and to encourage the use of reusable carafes which encourage people to opt for the cheaper and more sustainable alternative to bottled water.

This Council asks that the relevant committee considers whether bottled mineral water and disposable plastic cups should continue to be provided within the city council and whether instead to provide tap water served in reusable glasses to councillors, staff and visitors, and also to consider a review of the use of water coolers to ensure that water used is as far as possible locally sourced and sustainable.”

13.3 The Chairman invited Councillor Morgan to speak to the motion.

13.4 Councillor Morgan addressed the Cabinet on the substantive points of the motion.

13.5 **RESOLVED –**

(1) That the Notice of Motion be noted and

(2) That the Cabinet would determine the provision of water when the current contract expired.

**(b) Promoting responsible Dog Ownership**

13.6 The Cabinet considered the following Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 13 March 2008 by Councillors Duncan and Davey.

‘This Council recognises the social and health benefits of responsible dog ownership, the harm caused by irresponsible dog owners failing to clean up after or control their animals, and expresses its support for preserving open access to public areas including (but not limited to) beaches and golf courses for dog owners acting responsibly.

This Council notes that:

- Dogs play an essential role in improving health, welfare and quality of life for many thousands of residents of and visitors to the city
- Proposals to ban dog walking on outlying beaches and open spaces in the city will effectively ban dog owners from accessing such spaces, since many such residents’ only use of these facilities is during their

- daily walking of the dog
- Dog owners and walkers who fail to control their companion animals or clean-up after them are endangering the health and welfare of others. This is contrary to both national legislation and local bye-laws and should not be tolerated
- Any extension of the current ban on dogs on beaches between the two piers could force visitors to the city to leave their pets in vehicles with probable adverse consequences on the welfare of the animals concerned.

13.7 This Council therefore

- Expresses its opposition to proposals to extend the current summer ban on dogs between the two piers to all beaches within the city limits and require dogs to be on leads on other open spaces including Hollingbury Golf Course
- Resolves to take firm action against irresponsible owners who do not clean up after their dogs or control them properly in public places
- Supports the sentiment in the petition organized by local campaign group 'It's Barking Mad', the text of which follows, and which has been signed (as at Monday, March 3) by 576 people including a Member of the European Parliament, one of the city's Members of Parliament, three Prospective Parliamentary Candidates and 20 members of this council.

"We fully support the need to have some designated dog-free beaches as currently in place. We are for fair access to the beaches for all and oppose an all out ban on dogs on the beaches between April and September. We are for a crack down on fouling. We are against unnecessary dog restrictions on the promenade, the Undercliff Walk and at Hollingbury & Waterhall golf courses."

13.8 The Chairman invited Councillor Duncan to speak to the motion.

13.9 Councillor Duncan addressed the Cabinet on the substantive points of the motion.

13.10 **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the Notice of Motion be noted and
- (2) That the Notice of Motion be considered when determining Item 20 on the agenda ('Dog Control Order').

**(c) Dog Control Orders**

13.11 The Cabinet considered the following Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 24 April 2008 by Councillors Randall and Duncan.

This council applauds the excellent work of the Brighton and Hove Older People's Council (OPC).

It also notes the all-party support for local democracy expressed recently and often in the debate on the introduction of the cabinet system in Brighton and Hove.

In the spirit of this commonly expressed belief:

The council resolves to work with the Brighton and Hove Older People's Council to remove the clause from the OPC constitution that threatens with suspension any member who:

'Speaks or publishes any written work with the intention of affecting public support for a political party' or 'canvasses in the interests of any political party with the exception of delivering political party leaflets.'

13.12 The Chairman invited Councillor Randall to speak to the motion.

13.13 Councillor Randall addressed the Cabinet on the substantive points of the motion.

13.14 **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the Notice of Motion be noted and
- 2) That discussions with the Older Peoples Council be held as to their ability to determine their own terms of reference.

**(d) Identity Cards**

13.15 The Cabinet considered the following Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 24 April 2008 by Councillors Kitcat and Randall.

This council notes that the Home Secretary has announced that some foreign nationals will begin carrying ID Cards in November 2008 with some UK citizens to start receiving the cards in 2009. The introduction of these cards will have an effect upon all of the people of Brighton & Hove. This council believes that:

1. The disadvantages of such a scheme will outweigh any likely benefits to the people of Brighton & Hove;
2. The scheme will do little, if anything, to prevent terrorism, crime or fraud;
3. The national database that underpins the identity card scheme may facilitate criminal fraud, terrorism and potential state abuses of human rights;
4. The ID card and database proposals are likely to fundamentally alter the relationship between the state and the individual. According to Government estimates, the cost of the scheme will reach £5.5 billion,

with independent commentators predicting substantially higher costs. Brighton & Hove residents will be required to pay an estimated £30 for a stand-alone ID card or £93 for a passport and ID card together.

5. The city's share of the scheme's £5.5 billion cost over ten years would amount to approximately £24 million equivalent to 40 additional police officers on our streets for the next ten years.

This council resolves to:

1. Affiliate to the 'No2ID' campaign, which already includes MPs and several political parties;
2. Make representations at every possible stage, reiterating this council's opposition to ID cards;
3. Take no part in any pilot scheme or feasibility work in relation to the introduction of national identity cards;
4. Make it a policy of the council to ensure that national identity cards would not be required to access council services or benefits unless specifically required to do so by law;
5. Only co-operate with the national identity cards scheme where to do otherwise would be unlawful;
6. Instruct the Chief Executive to write to the Home Secretary expressing these views and asking her to reconsider her decision to push forward with this scheme.

13.16 The Chairman invited Councillor Kitcat to speak to the motion.

13.17 Councillor Kitcat addressed the Cabinet on the substantive points of the motion.

13.18 In reaching their decision the Cabinet also considered the petition as presented by Councillor Kitcat at item 8.5.

13.19 **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the Notice of Motion be noted.
- (2) That the principle of the motion be recognised and that relevant intervention be undertaken as and when Government begin formal consultation or initiation of the project.

**The meeting concluded at 5.50pm.**

**Signed**

**Mayor**

**Dated this**

**day of**

**2008**

