

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK COUNCIL** held in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House on Thursday, 21 December 2017- 5:30pm

### PRESENT:

Councillor: Derrick Haley – Chair

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Michael Burke
	David Burn	James Caston
	Rachel Eburne	John Field
	Julie Flatman	Jessica Fleming
	Elizabeth Gibson-Harries	Nick Gowrley
	Kathie Guthrie	Lavinia Hadingham
	Matthew Hicks	Glen Horn
	Barry Humphreys MBE	Diana Kearsley
	Anne Killett	Sarah Mansel
	Wendy Marchant	John Matthissen
	Lesley Mayes	Suzie Morley
	Dave Muller	Mike Norris
	Penny Otton	Andrew Stringer
	Keith Welham	Kevin Welsby
	David Whybrow	Jill Wilshaw

### In attendance:

Chief Executive (AC)  
Monitoring Officer (EY)  
Corporate Manager – Democratic Services (JR)  
Assistant Director – Corporate Resources (KS)  
Governance Support Officer (RC)

### 101 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

101.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillors John Levantis, Tim Passmore, John Whitehead, Jane Storey, Gerard Brewster, Esther Jewson, Gary Green and Derek Osborne.

### 102 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

102.1 Councillor Nick Gowrley declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Stowmarket Town Council.

102.2 Councillor Andrew Stringer declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Woodland Trust Councillor, Tree Champion.

103 **MC/17/26 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 NOVEMBER 2017**

103.1 The minutes of the meeting on 23 November 2017 were confirmed and signed as a true record subject to the following amendments:

- That it be noted that the minutes of the meeting on 26 October 2017 contained an inaccuracy that the constitution did not allow for Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committees. It is noted that the Constitution does allow for Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committees as listed on page 208 7.7.2 of the Constitution.
- That Minute 88 be corrected to read that "Councillor John Field declared a non-pecuniary interest in Paper MC/17/25 as he knew the landowner."
- That minute number 97 be amended to read that Councillor Otton was happy to accept the name of the Ward as Onehouse.

104 **MC/17/27 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

104.1 The Chairman corrected report MC/17/27 that only he attended the visit to the Sheltered Housing in St Peters Court Claydon and that Vice Chair, Councillor John Levantis, did not.

104.2 The Chairman reported that he and the Vice Chair were well received at the Sheltered Housing who praised Mid Suffolk for their efforts. He added his concern that a number of Sheltered Housing Managers did not want the Chair to visit, and asked that action was taken regarding this.

**104.3 It was RESOLVED**

**That the Chairman's report be noted with the correction that Vice Chair Councillor John Levantis did not attend the Sheltered Housing visit to St Peters Court, Claydon.**

105 **MC/17/28 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

105.1 The Leader advised that his report was on page 13 of the papers and requested that the third paragraph be substituted with the paper that had been circulated to Members' at the beginning of the meeting as detailed below:

**MID SUFFOLK - POSITION STATEMENT**

As all Members are aware, an "opposition" motion was lodged at Babergh's full Council meeting on Monday evening, which sought to "frustrate" activity regarding "merger" and also to remove Councillor Jennie Jenkins as Leader of Babergh District Council.

Having carefully considered her options, Jennie took the honourable decision to resign as Leader of the Council. Jennie did this ahead of any consideration of the motion, and so in line with Babergh's Constitution, Councillor Jan Osborne (the

Deputy Leader) has become acting Leader of the Council, and the Cabinet remains in place. An Extraordinary Babergh Council meeting has been called for Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018, in order for the Council to elect its new Leader.

The remaining elements of the opposition motion were passed. These are:

*1. No BDC money be allocated in the next budget (2018-2019) and no staff time be used from April 2018 for the purposes of the Proposed Merger without the formal approval of the full Council ("Full Council Approval"); and*

*2. As a condition precedent to the obtaining of Full Council Approval, the Leader be requested to guarantee that a new local referendum shall be held in which the votes of the electors of BDC are counted separately on the model of the 2011 referendum and only a vote in favour by the electors of BDC shall constitute a mandate from BDC to proceed (respectively "Condition Precedent" and "Referendum Approval")*

This motion has no impact upon the current work in this financial year, with regard to "merger". As such, the public engagement work will continue, and close on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Depending on the outcome of this engagement, it remains the intention to then produce a business case for "merger".

However, the additional aspect of this motion is to prevent work in BDC beyond April 2018 without first obtaining majority support of their Council, and to require a Local Poll to be conducted in Babergh before seeking such support from their Council.

Neither Council is legally required to hold a Local Poll, but it does need to be able to demonstrate "broad" Council support to the Secretary of State. Conversations will therefore need to be held with the DCLG as to whether he would accept the submission of a Business Case, without complying with this motion, or whether Babergh will now have to hold a Local Poll if it wishes to push forward with the Business Case.

### **Implications & Position Statement for Mid Suffolk**

1. It appears to be the case that many Babergh Councillors (even some supporting the motion) are in favour of a merger, but politically feel obliged to obtain a democratic mandate from the electorate (reversing their 2011 poll) before proceeding.
2. The first draft of a Memorandum of Understanding between Mid Suffolk and Babergh that provides a route map into and beyond merger was considered by Babergh's Cabinet this morning, and will shortly come to the Mid Suffolk Cabinet.
3. It remains vital to test public support at this stage (in the ways already underway) as this is the same approach adopted by the other two pairs of districts that are seeking to merge, and who have successfully obtained "minded to" support from the Secretary of State.
4. Similarly it remains vital to produce, and consider the strength of, a Business Case for "merger".

5. All the current work should therefore continue as planned and advice sought from the DCLG regarding the motion adopted by Babergh.
  6. Should MSDC consider it prudent, provisions exist to force such mergers where there are potentially unwilling parties. It is thought that these provisions will expire before they could be implemented in Mid Suffolk and Babergh, and it is proposed that the Chief Executive urgently explores this too with DCLG.
  7. Advice from Government regarding a number of matters has indicated that Parliamentary time between April 2018 and April 2019 has been entirely set aside for Brexit matters. As a result, it now appears highly unlikely that a merger could be implemented before May 2020.
  8. If ultimately Babergh does feel obliged to hold a Local Poll then Mid Suffolk will need to consider whether to do the same. No decision can be made on this until we have received the outcome of the current engagement activity and a draft Business Case. If the engagement activity clearly re-endorses the outcome of Mid Suffolk's Local Poll in 2011 then there would appear to be no reason (legally) for Mid Suffolk to repeat the Local Poll. We could of course always choose to do so however, if we believe there is good reason to do so.
  9. Given the expectation that a new council could not be created before May 2020 we will of course therefore have our ordinary elections (albeit with a new council size and warding pattern) in May 2019. Both Councils may therefore prefer to seek a mandate through manifestos at that election rather than conducting a Local Poll.
  10. Regrettably, it has become clear that the culture and behaviour of some Babergh Councillors is alien to Mid Suffolk. We therefore need to consider if we will be able to work with those Councillors and whether Mid Suffolk should still be pursuing "merger" with Babergh.
  11. We should remember of course that a "merger" is actually the creation of a new Council, with candidates having to both be selected and then elected as Councillors. Similarly an election in 2020 would enable a more detailed Boundary Review to be carried out specifically for the new authority. It could therefore make further council size and ward changes.
  12. If we are to deliver a "merger", we need to be able to work with Babergh's administration in the meantime; and our desire for "merger" is clearly being impacted by their political situation. Whilst I still believe the best option for Mid Suffolk is to "merge" with Babergh, I have asked the Chief Executive to consider and present alternative options for Mid Suffolk.
- 105.2 The Leader outlined that the replacement paragraph in the announcement provided the position statement from Mid Suffolk District Council following the meeting of Babergh District Council on 19 December 2017 and put on record his thanks for Councillor Jennie Jenkins for her support, concluding

that Suffolk would be a poorer place without her presence.

- 105.3 Councillor Andrew Stringer posed a question to the Leader regarding the East Anglian Daily Times Article on 20 December 2017 regarding Mid Suffolk Councillors concerns over a stalemate at Babergh District Council and the consideration of options other than Merger.
- 105.4 The Leader responded that he had no knowledge of where the information had come from but that it had not been from him.
- 105.5 Councillor Rachel Eburne questioned the leader regarding the possibility of an election in 2019 and another in 2020, if a merger took place, and whether it would be possible to extend the term of office to only have one election in 2020.
- 105.6 The Leader responded that if the Council did wish to approach the Secretary of State that this could be a possibility but that the Council needed to wait and see what Babergh's position was after 4 January 2018 when a new Leader is elected.
- 105.7 Councillor Penny Otton questioned the Leader regarding Suffolk being a pilot area for business rate retention and what might be the impact of coping with this new regime.
- 105.8 The Leader responded that the regime would allow extra financial capacity within the authority do deal with growth in the district. He added that although this had just been announced and once officers had worked through the ramifications they would bring a report for Cabinet and Full Council.
- 105.9 Councillor Stringer questioned the Leader regarding the regeneration of the former Needham Market HQ site and suggested that a better wording than regeneration be considered.
- 105.10 The Leader responded that he understood the point and noted it.
- 105.11 Councillor Wendy Marchant questioned the leader regarding compulsory purchase powers being used for the ex-car showroom on the High Street which is currently empty to make best use of that area.
- 105.12 The Leader responded that he was unsure about the detail but he would look into the matter.

105.13 **RESOLVED**

**That Council Notes the report.**

106 **TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PROCEDURE RULE**

106.1 A petition had been received from Redgrave Parish Council stating: objection to SSO486 (in the Joint Local Plan Consultation) shown as a potential housing development as the development would be inappropriate it would cause harm to the village community by loss of its play area, open space, recreation area, sports area, village hall and all its clubs and off-road parking which are in a safe location next to the village centre. It would increase the area occupied by housing in Redgrave by a massive 50% detrimentally changing its character from a historic and scenic village to a suburbia which no facilities, infrastructure, jobs or transport. It is therefore contrary to government planning policy and defies logic.

The petition has been signed by 228 valid signatures and has been passed onto the Planning Policy team as part of the Joint Local Plan consultation.

107 **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

107.1 None received.

108 **QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

108.1 **Councillor John Matthissen to Councillor Horn**

What alternative arrangements have been made for a control centre in case of an emergency in the district, now we no longer have an HQ building in Needham Market?

**Answer**

In preparation for the move to Endeavour House the entire emergency preparedness plan was reviewed and revised to ensure that in advance of the move, during the move and after the move, the Council was able to meet its duties under the civil contingencies act and offer an effective emergency response. As part of this review, new arrangements were set in place to operate the Emergency Control Centre from Endeavour House. On the 17<sup>th</sup> October (prior to the move) a team of Emergency Control Centre Staff carried out an exercise to establish and operate the new Emergency Control Centre from Endeavour House. This exercise was successful, and the centre worked effectively.

When the two councils were based in Hadleigh and Needham Market respectively each site acted as a back-up site for the other. If for any reason, the Emergency Control Centre could not be established in the lead council location the other HQ site provide an alternative location. The Stowmarket Customer Access Point now forms the back-up site for our Emergency Control Centre if Endeavour House is not viable. Should we face the situation where both Endeavour House and the Stowmarket Customer Access Point are unavailable we are able to utilise West Suffolk House in Bury St Edmunds.

**108.2 Councillor John Matthissen to Councillor Gowrley**

When will an appropriate meeting or briefing be held in our District rather than in Ipswich, as promised by the Council Leader 14/9/17:

“As always intended, some meetings may be held in our District if there is an item of particular community interest. This will be at the discretion of the Chairman of the relevant meeting.”

**Answer**

The principle that was adopted when we moved the office was that meetings will always be booked to happen at Endeavour House (so that we ensure that we have a room) but that the Chairman of each Committee had discretion to take any meeting to a different location (we have a list of venues with appropriate facilities already identified for this purpose). I have asked Democratic Services to pro-actively discuss this with the Committee Chairman in preparation for each meeting.

**Supplementary Question**

Could the list of alternative venues that have been worked up be provided to Members relatively soon.

**Answer**

To be provided outside of the meeting.

**108.3 Councillor Sarah Mansel to Councillor Horn**

As we seem to be no further forward following the discussion at the last Council meeting, when are Members to be equipped with Skype for Business Telephony, and given a briefing about the new ICT capabilities following the move to Endeavour House?

**Answer (given by Councillor Morley, Lead Member for Customer Service)**

Skype functionality will be rolled out to all Councillors by the end of January 2018. The functionality will enable Video and Audio capability, so Councillors can participate in Skype meetings and use instant messaging. The functionality will not include a new landline phone number.

Some written training material will be made available to all Councillors when the new functionality is switched on. We will also run some in person training/briefing updates in the New Year, to support Councillors use the new functionality. If any Councillors would like to use a telephony headset, rather than the microphone and speakers built into their laptops, these will be available for collection from the IT platform, we will confirm the date that they can be collected from, in the New Year.

**108.4 Councillor Sarah Mansel to Councillor Horn**

How much are the Touchdown Points being used by staff and are there any plans to increase the number of Touchdown point locations across the district, given that there were initial plans to utilise some of the common rooms in our de-sheltered housing?

**Answer**

At the moment there are no immediate plans for further Touchdown points to be initiated. However we will continue to monitor demand and review accordingly.

Approximately 128 staff have completed electronic inductions in order to use and access the Touchdown points, and some 227 bookings to use a desk at a Touchdown point, have been made.

Staff are required to sign in and out on a paper register, on every occasion they work from the Touchdown point (for health & safety purposes). Unfortunately, as this would be a paper based exercise, we have not had time to provide further detail.

**108.5 Councillor Rachel Eburne to Councillor Whitehead**

At the meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> October 2017 I asked a question about costs for the move out of the offices in Needham Market. I have yet to receive a response regarding costs of consultants. Please can you advise the costs incurred on consultants for this work since the decision was taken in September 2016.

**Answer (given by Councillor Gowrley, Council Leader)**

Consultant's costs for the future use of Needham office to date are: £40k.

Estimated costs for project support for the move are £86k, to be split 50:50 with Babergh.

**Supplementary**

Is there a point in which we will know the full costs and process of the move?

**Answer**

There will be one in due course.

In terms of transformation and customer access improvements the Councils are forecasting costs of £173k for transformation project management and support, dealing with customer access, archiving and digital by design work, again this will be split 50:50 with Babergh.

**108.6 Councillor Rachel Eburne to Councillor Burn**

Question regarding licensing of charity collections:

What is the current policy on charity collections and is this the same all year round or are there special arrangements around Christmas?

**Answer**

We are currently bound to 1930's regulations as the law has not significantly changed, despite a 2009 attempt at modernising the law (to better cater for non-cash collections and improve standards/consistency) which did not progress to statute. At a local level our procedures and processes attempt to avoid clashes of regulated collections, and to be vigilant towards unregulated collectors or causes that are not for charitable or beneficial purpose.



Activity in this area increases in the run up to Christmas as you'd expect but the same regulations apply.

Regulations are available to view on the Council website or directly from the Licensing Team.

### **Supplementary**

Thank you Cllr Burn for that. I did look at the website actually, and it doesn't, it's a policy it just gives an application form of practice and that is why I wondered what the policy was. But residents have been in contact with me as they have been concerned that the traditional Salvation Army band that plays in Stowmarket at Christmas, and there are lots of people enjoy hearing them play, but they are not permitted to put their collecting boxes out at that time because other charities have got the collection dates as it were and also that collectors have been told not to collect. The view that I have had is that at Christmas can there be a different system be looked at for Christmas collecting because obviously it is a key time of year for charity collections and I think some locals expect there to be particular arrangements in Stowmarket.

### **Answer**

That sounds to be a very reasonable request. I can but refer it to the Licensing team and see what the response is.

## 109 **MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

## 110 **COUNCILLOR PENNY OTTON HAS GIVEN NOTICE OF HER INTENTION TO MOVE THE UNDER-MENTIONED MOTION AT THE MEETING:-**

110.1 Councillor Penny Otton Proposed the following motion to Council:

110.2 Suffolk has the ambition to be "the Greenest county", I congratulate the Minister for the Environment, Michael Gove, on his initiative to look at introducing a plastic bottle return scheme. It is a well established fact that plastic is one of the worst pollutants of the environment.

A recent report (available from link below) to the Government by Eunomia showed that a deposit return scheme would lead to savings of between £62,000 and £495,000 for any local authority that introduces it, by reducing the authority's waste handling costs. It would also send a strong message that plastics are not for single use and would significantly cut the amount of plastic ending up in the marine environment, endangering our sea life.

The Council also notes that recycling rates for plastic bottles in Britain stands at 57% - in comparison to over 90% in countries that have a Deposit Return Scheme (e.g. Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark)

Suffolk is ranked as the second-best performer out of 32 Waste Disposal Authorities in two tier areas for the recycling of dry-recyclables so we will

always welcome any proposals brought forward to further improve our performance.

Therefore we ask the Chief Executive to write to the minister informing him that this council supports the proposed scheme and that Mid Suffolk council will look favourably upon any pilot proposals and will seek to participate where we believe the pilot would help to improve environmental outcomes and reduce costs in Suffolk.

<http://www.eunomia.co.uk/reports-tools/impacts-of-a-deposit-refundsystem-for-one-way-beverage-packaging-on-local-authority-waste-services/>

110.3 Councillor Otton concluded by congratulating Iceland and the CO-OP who were prepared to support the premise, and proposed the motion to the Council.

110.4 Councillor Wendy Marchant seconded the motion commenting on the impacts of plastics which had been illustrated in David Attenborough's recent television programmes.

110.5 Members outlined their support for the motion tackling the problem of plastic littering, the influence of the Suffolk Waste Partnership, that Mid Suffolk were the first district in the county to put forward the proposal, the impact of the charge of plastic carrier bags, the possibility of a Deposit Return Scheme, that the motion would need to complement the current kerbside collections, the impact on the environment, and that further concepts could be implemented from other nations.

**110.6 By a Unanimous Vote**

**110.7 RESOLVED**

**It was Resolved That Mid Suffolk District Council adopt the motion:**

- **Suffolk is Ranked as the second-best performer out of 32 Waste Disposal Authorities in two tier areas for the recycling of dry-recyclables so we will always welcome any proposals brought forward to further improve our performance**
- **Therefore we ask the Chief Executive to write to the minister informing him that this Council supports the proposed scheme and that Mid Suffolk Council will look favourably upon any pilot proposals and will seek to participate where we believe the pilot would help improve environmental outcomes and reduce costs in Suffolk.**

111 **COUNCILLOR DAVID BURN HAS GIVEN NOTICE OF HIS INTENTION TO MOVE THE UNDER-MENTIONED MOTION AT THE MEETING:-**

111.1 Councillor David Burn Proposed the following Motion to Council:

111.2 As Cabinet Member for Environment I should like to propose the following

motion at Mid Suffolk District Council's meeting on 21 December 2017:

That this Council signs the Woodland Trust' Charter for Trees, Woods and People in support of the ten principles that the Charter promotes as a basis for harmony and mutual benefit between trees and people.

111.3 Councillor Burn informed the Council of the history of the Charter for Trees dating back to Henry III Charter of 1217 of the Forrest and Woodland to the founding of the Woodland Trust in 1972. Councillor Burn outlined the achievements of the Woodland Trust and the challenges that they were facing, due to increased urbanisation and changing lifestyles.

111.4 Councillor Burn concluded by saying that Suffolk County Council had voted to sign the Charter and asked for a seconder for the Proposal.

111.5 Councillor Andrew Stringer seconded the Motion and declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Woodland Trust Tree Champion. Councillor Stringer outlined his support for the application commenting on his previous advocacy for the planting of trees, the statistics of Suffolk's population with access to woodlands, and the benefits of trees not just to the community but to the environment.

111.6 Members outlined their support for the Motion outlining the monitoring and improvement of tree cover being included in the Joint Local Plan, the importance of Planning Policy and the positive contributions that can be made to the landscape.

111.7 Councillor David Whybrow added that he would report back to the Planning Department ensuring that the Charter be embraced and that it be fully implemented.

111.8 Members continued to discuss the motion on the role of Tree Preservation Orders and the benefits that Trees could bring to the local environment.

111.9 **By a Unanimous Vote**

111.10 **RESOLVED**

**It was resolved that the Council approve and adopt the motion as follows:**

**That this Council signs the Woodland Trust' Charter for Trees, Woods and People in support of the ten principles that the Charter promotes as a basis for harmony and mutual benefit between trees and people.**

## 112 **TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM CABINET MEMBERS**

112.1 **CMU3 – Assets and Investments**

112.2 The Leader presented report CMU3 to Council as the Cabinet Member for

Assets and investment.

112.3 Councillor Wendy Marchant posed a question to the Leader regarding the possible development on the Needham Market HQ site for NHS Child immunisation, Suffolk and Norfolk Police training dog unit or Film Suffolk. She added that it would help the local economy as businesses were already losing trade and whether these options would be considered.

112.4 The Leader responded to the question that everything was going to be considered in the proposal.

112.5 Councillor Wendy Marchant posed a question regarding the possibility of reducing rental income and security costs if commercial activity was sought and why did these options not go to the All Together group in October.

112.6 The Leader responded that he had raised it with Officers and will be considered in the future.

**112.7 CMU4 - Communities**

112.8 Councillor Julie Flatman presented report CMU4 as the Cabinet Member for Communities.

112.9 Councillor Penny Otton posed a question regarding the Regal Cinema in Stowmarket and the Councils proposals.

112.10 The Leader declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Stowmarket Town Council and responded that a Cabinet report would be coming forward shortly to outline Mid Suffolk District Councils view.

112.11 Councillor Keith Welham posed a question regarding the promotion of cycling and cycle routes and if there was a possibility of having a cycling programme.

112.12 Councillor Julie Flatman responded that she would report this back to the Communities team and that they were doing everything they could to promote cycling and that there were further details to come forward.

**112.13 CMU5 – Environment**

112.14 Councillor David Burn presented report CMU5 as the Cabinet Member for Environment.

112.15 Councillor Anne Killet posed a question regarding the loss of staff and performance in the Licensing team, Building Control team, Planning Enforcement Team, and Heritage Team and of the 83 members of staff that have left this year how many exit interviews were conducted.

112.16 The Chief Executive responded that it was standard practice to offer exit interviews but that it was up to the employee as to whether they took up the offer. The Chief Executive added that he did not have the information with him but that it would be distributed to all Members after the meeting.

112.17 Councillor John Field posed a question regarding the Warm Homes Fund and whether the scheme was open to all including owner occupiers, tenants in rented properties, and the Council.

112.18 Councillor David Burn responded that he did not have the information with him but would investigate.

**112.19 CMU6 – Organisational Delivery**

112.20 Councillor Glen Horn presented report CMU6 as the Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery.

112.21 Councillor Rachel Eburne posed a question regarding the End of Year report as to whether it would include successes and also points to learn from.

112.22 Councillor Glen Horn responded that he hoped it would and that it would be honest and that there will be an opportunity for Members to comment before it goes to the public.

112.23 Councillor John Field posed a question regarding the cost of the move of the server room from the Needham Market HQ and whether there had been an impact on resilience.

112.24 Councillor Glen Horn responded that the full cost of the move would be reported to Full Council in due course and that Constantine House was the backup and that the changes would be reported to all Members.

**112.25 CMU7 – Planning**

112.26 Councillor David Whybrow presented report CMU7 as the Cabinet Member for Planning.

112.27 Councillor Jessica Fleming posed a question regarding paragraph 3.5 in the report on who the contact was for Parish Councils and Ward Councillors regarding neighbourhood planning and the Local Plan.

112.28 Councillor David Whybrow responded that he would circulate the appropriate staff contact details in the new year.

112.29 Councillor Andrew Stringer posed a question regarding the amount of housing expected of local authorities and consultations to deliver and asked for reassurance that this would not delay the joint local plan.

112.30 Councillor David Whybrow responded that the Planning and Planning Policy team would continue until such a time that it may or may not be that the information becomes out of date. He added that Members would be informed if there was any disruption to the creation of the Plan.

112.31 Councillor Elizabeth Gibson-Harries posed a question regarding the double glazing windows in listed buildings.

112.32 Councillor Whybrow responded that this would be a matter of National Planning Policy.

### **112.33 RESOLVED**

#### **That Council Notes the Reports**

### **113 MC/17/29 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT**

113.1 Councillor Rachel Eburne presented the Overview and Scrutiny Committee report to the Council noting that a Joint Overview and Scrutiny meeting had been held on Monday 18 December looking at the Community Infrastructure Levy and urged all Members to attend the briefings. Councillor Eburne added that the Committee had also reviewed the Shared Legal Service with the decision of an improvement required and report this back to the Committee and that for any future partnerships a business case is put forward before any partnership commences.

113.2 Councillor Eburne responded to Members questions regarding the one off pay roll costs and the lack of recommendations associated with the item and that a large amount of the budget had been spent on interims and consultants.

113.3 Katherine Steel, Assistant Director – Corporate Resources, responded that she would report to Council the figures on the interims, consultants and how many previous vacancies had been filled.

113.4 The Leader responded to a question from Councillor Otton regarding the continued use of interims to which the Leader responded that wherever possible the Council will employ staff directly but that, at times, there was a need for external staff for exceptional circumstances.

### **114 MC/17/30 ADOPTION OF REVISED COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION (CTR) SCHEME FOR WORKING AGE HOUSEHOLDS - EFFECTIVE 1 APRIL 2018**

114.1 The leader Introduced report MC/17/30 outlining that the report had previously been before Members and had now been returned to Council after a period consultation. The Leader explained that there was an error in paragraph 8.1 to which Members had been notified in advance of the meeting. The Leader outlined that it should read “confusion is currently caused by Babergh District Council having a maximum reduction of 91.5% whilst Mid Suffolk have a Maximum of 95%.” The Leader outlined the options in the report, the responses from the consultation, and proposed the report for approval.

114.2 Councillor Julie Flatman seconded the proposal.

114.3 Councillor Anne Killet posed a question regarding the information on page 39 section 6.5 referring to Appendix C on how many respondents there were to the consultation.

114.4 The Leader responded that there were 12 responses to the consultation.

114.5 Councillor John Field outlined the current arrangements and compared them to those proposed and that the report had been overcomplicated and asked that in future and that a better effort be made in future.

114.6 **By a Unanimous vote**

114.7 **RESOLVED**

**That Mid Suffolk District Council adopt the Council Tax Reduction (Working Age) Local Scheme (Revised) from 1 April 2018, as set out in Appendix A of the report.**

115 **APPOINTMENTS**

115.1 No Appointments were made.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 7.01 pm.

.....

Chairman