

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BABERGH COUNCIL HELD IN KING EDMUND CHAMBER - ENDEAVOUR HOUSE, 8 RUSSELL ROAD, IPSWICH ON TUESDAY, 24 JULY 2018

PRESENT: Barry Gasper - Chair

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Clive Arthey | Melanie Barrett |
| Simon Barrett | Tony Bavington |
| Peter Beer | David Busby |
| Tina Campbell | Sue Carpendale |
| Michael Creffield | Luke Cresswell |
| Derek Davis | Siân Dawson |
| Kathryn Grandon | John Hinton |
| Bryn Hurren | Richard Kemp |
| Frank Lawrenson | James Long |
| Alastair McCraw | Mark Newman |
| Adrian Osborne | Jan Osborne |
| Lee Parker | Peter Patrick |
| Stephen Plumb | Nick Ridley |
| William Shropshire | Ray Smith |
| Fenella Swan | John Ward |
| Stephen Williams | |

29 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

29.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ayres, Councillor Sue Burgoyne, Councillor Peter Burgoyne, Councillor Burrows, Councillor Ferguson, Councillor Holt, Councillor Jenkins, Councillor Maybury, Councillor Nunn, Councillor Rose and Councillor Steer.

30 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

30.1 Councillor Busby, being a board member of the Babergh Holding Board for CIFCO declared a local non pecuniary interest in Item 12 and Item 14 (BC/18/15) Capital investment Fund Company (CIFCO Capital LTD) Business Trading and Performance Report.

31 BC/18/12 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 JUNE 2018

It was Resolved:-

That subject to Minute 19.14 being amended to read “Minute 19.7” the Minutes of the meeting held on the 19 June 2018 were approved as a true record.

32 BC/18/13 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND LEADER

32.1 The Chairman introduced his report and drew attention to two errors contained in the report.

Firstly, that he had not attended the NSPCC AGM and reception held at Orwell Park due to an error in his diary and secondly that the Vice Chair was in attendance at Suffolk Day.

- 32.2 The Chairman then invited the Leader to present his report.
- 32.3 The Leader announced that Councillor Patrick had stepped down from the Cabinet. In view of this the Leader had taken on the responsibility for the Finance Portfolio. Councillor Simon Barrett had been appointed as the Cabinet Member for the Economy and had re-joined the Conservative Group.
- 32.4 The Leader updated the Council on the Suffolk Public Sectors Leaders meeting that had taken place on 13 July 2018. At the meeting the Leaders had reviewed a number of proposals for projects to be funded from the business rate retention pilot that was taking place in the County this year.
- 32.5 Each district had submitted a list of projects that could be funded through the business rates collected. The Babergh list included the following items:-
- Sudbury Town Centre Regeneration
 - Angel Court redevelopment and work around the Delphi site
 - Newton Road and the South Suffolk Business Area of Sudbury
 - Smart Grid Energy Project for the former Sproughton Sugar Beet Site (potentially joint funded with IBC)
- 32.6 The Leader went on to say that he would update Council further once details of the funding that had been granted was known.
- 32.7 Suffolk Public Sector Leaders had also agreed to support bids from the pooled business rates as follows:-
- £200k with a possible further £200k to tackle youth unemployment in the county.
 - £255k for the Safer and Stronger Community Group to support its ongoing work, particularly in tackling domestic abuse.
- 32.8 Commenting further the Leader reported that the Suffolk Growth Portfolio Holders Group had also made a recommendation to Suffolk Public Sector Leaders to back three priority infrastructure projects.
- 32.9 The Leader reported that he and the Deputy Leader had taken part in a question and answer session at Shotley. Twenty two residents had attended and had asked questions on a range of topics including specific planning applications of interest and the possibilities and options for local government reorganisation in Suffolk.
- 32.10 Finally, the Leader was pleased to announce that he had attended the East Anglia Building Excellence awards where the Council's new social housing at Meadow Close Lavenham was shortlisted, in addition the Building Control team were involved in winning an award for the best individual house.

33 **TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

33.1 The Corporate Manager for Democratic Services reported that a petition had been received for the Cuckoo Hill planning application signed by 872 people.

34 **QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

34.1 There were no questions received.

35 **QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

35.1 The following questions were received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12:-

Councillor Bavington to the Leader of the Council

My questions are all to do with the continued productive existence of high precision engineering manufacture on the Sudbury site, making use of the outstanding levels of skill and professionalism of the existing workforce, when the production transfer of Delphi Technologies to Romania is completed in summer 2020; and the support that Babergh District Council can and will give to ensure that there is a successful and smooth transition of the site to a new employer who will be able to employ those outstanding skills to continue high precision engineering in the Sudbury area.

1. Are you aware that:

- the Delphi Sudbury site gives employment not just to people who live in Sudbury itself but to those who live in surrounding villages, for example Great Cornard?
 - Delphi supports other small engineering companies in the local area and beyond?
 - Delphi wage levels are the benchmark for the whole Sudbury sub-district area?
2. Do you accept that the loss of high precision engineering to the local economy will undermine the ambitions laid out in the recently published 'Sudbury Vision for Prosperity' document?
 3. Has Babergh District Council commissioned an Economic Impact Assessment of the devastating effects full Delphi site closure would have on the local economy?
 4. What active steps is Babergh taking to encourage a new employer with a good business fit in high-precision automotive or aerospace related industries to take over the site and take the development of this uniquely talented workforce to the next level?
 5. What financial incentives, for example business rate relief and business development grants, are the Council offering to suitable potential employers to take on this site without any time gap once Delphi leave in 2020?

6. What co-ordination is there between Babergh District Council and the South Suffolk Taskforce set up by James Cartlidge MP? Is Babergh contributing to the 'Options Appraisal' apparently being undertaken and will he ensure that any report is published in a reasonable timescale?
7. As far as I am aware, there has been no discussion of this issue at either Council or Cabinet. What steps will you take to ensure that the Council is kept informed of the steps you are taking to preserve this unique high-precision machine tool design manufacturing capability in the most highly populated corner of our district?

Response from the Leader, Councillor John Ward

In terms of the employment in Sudbury and surrounding villages. Yes, obviously I and also my colleagues are aware of the impact on employment in all of the villages and communities around Sudbury, we know that the Delphi site is a major employer and as Members and representatives for those communities, we are acutely aware of the impact. That is why we are working hard to come to a resolution and a way forward for this. In terms of the other small engineering companies, again yes I and other Members are aware of the supply chain for Delphi and the support that is provided at Delphi by other engineering companies and will make sure whatever solutions that comes up for the site, will mitigate the impact on those companies. The Delphi wage levels, yes this is certainly the benchmark for salaries in those precision engineering skills in the town. Not necessarily sure that they are the benchmark for the whole of the Sudbury district, but definitely for the type of skills that the Delphi employees have. Consequently, we are looking for a suitable employer, and will make sure that the type of jobs, the type of employment will match those salary levels. Secondly, your question relating to the loss of high precision engineering possibly undermining the public Sudbury vision for prosperity - the Sudbury vision for prosperity is a Babergh document for the whole of the town, it is not there to address individual companies or indeed employment sectors, it is there to look at development and what Sudbury needs as a town and consequently I don't believe that the two are that closely linked. In terms of your next few questions, just to reassure everyone, we are acutely aware of the importance of Delphi to the broader South Suffolk area, as it has been a vital part of the community and not just in an economy context for so many years. Many people in Sudbury and neighbouring settlements have worked or know people who have worked at Delphi and the company has a long-standing reputation for looking after their people. Their employees are highly skilled, well trained, and most should and are, being able to acquire new jobs in the advanced manufacturing sector or through use of their transferable skills. Since we became aware of the position at Delphi, we have helped form and been an active part, of the South Suffolk Task Force which includes the local MP, new Anglia LEP and the Sudbury Town Council working with the Delphi management to explore possible configurations and understand what could practically be achieved at the site. Further inward investment, marketing of the site, attempting to retain existing industrial use is going on via British Embassy's and other channels. Babergh has contributed to that work with the new Anglia LEP and the regional representative from the department for international trade, including a later site visit meeting with the plant manager that took place on 4th July 2018. Babergh is making a financial contribution and also providing linked officer support and resource for the options appraisal work.

The Council is now scoping out and commissioning that work and has already started the procurement element of that. Outcomes from that work, including viability assessments for each identified option will be shared in due course. Whilst we attempt to commission this work, we also need to be mindful of the Delphi management teams wishes and their separate and sensitive negotiations and processes that are underway which extend to unions and staffing support arrangements. Delphi have been very good and have provided generous redundancy terms. As of May, 180 employees have taken voluntary redundancy with 79 going into other employment locally and 29 taking early retirement. There has already been some local interest in both the site and workforce, the management of Delphi and Unite both have a concern and desire that the unique skills workforce is not dissipated and that a new occupier can be found as soon as practicable. Colliers one of the premier global real estate services companies has been appointed to market the site. On a further note, Babergh is also due on 1st September 2018 to take over as landlord, from the current shared responsibility with Suffolk County Council for the 24 business units comprising South Suffolk business centre near to the Delphi site in Alexandra Road, Sudbury. That is currently operating at 100% occupation and we see this Babergh commitment as an important and tangible contribution to supporting the business community in the Sudbury and broader South Suffolk area. In terms of your questions 5 – financial incentives business rates relief. We haven't considered that at the moment because we have no news yet as to potential employers, obviously we would need to revisit that as soon as we have further information about that. But what I will say is that we are confident that we will find a positive outcome, the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy is making the most of its contacts, Babergh, as I said is working in partnership with the LEP and James Cartlidge MP and we do expect that we will have a positive and good news story to come for this site. The task force did actually meet most recently in May and it met both the unions and Delphi management and we all agreed that the number one priority is to retain this as an industrial site. The task force remit is of course broader and not really focused entirely on Delphi, nor indeed does it have political purposes. Its remit is to address the broader business challenges in the Sudbury area and we are inviting businesses across Sudbury to see what can be done to make the town more competitive. So that, on the last question in terms of Cabinet reporting or Council reporting. As I stated earlier the task force will be reporting back but I will ensure that the reports are formally made to Cabinet and to Council.

Supplementary Question

How much effort are you putting in to achieving an outcome where another very high precision engineering manufacturing company comes into the site?

Response from the Leader, Councillor Ward

The task force is acutely aware of the uniqueness of the skills at Delphi. You won't find them anywhere else in this country, we know that. Our options appraisal work will be evaluating all of the possible options, whether it is a single high precision engineering company or to re-use the site for a number of small businesses. We have to look at all those options, we can't guarantee at this stage what will be the eventual outcome. But I can assure you that the number one priority of the task force is to find a similar high skilled engineering company to come into that site.

But at the moment I can't promise anything. The work has been undertaken, the site is being marketed as such through the Embassy's and High Commissions around the world and I know that it is James Cartledge's number one priority to get that kind of employer into the site. That is certainly the priority of all of the other partners of the task force, it is our top priority but at this stage I can't guarantee anything.

36

TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM CABINET MEMBERS

36.1 Councillor Ward introduced the reports and invited questions from Members:-

8a. CMU9 Cabinet Member for Assets and Investment – Councillor Lawrenson

Councillor Arthey to Councillor Lawrenson

- Q. The Council recently gifted a property known as the Gainsborough Chambers, how does this compare with the ongoing negotiations with Lavenham Parish Council about the future of the Tourist Information Centre?

Response: Councillor Lawrenson

- A. Nothing is effectively off the table at this point, negotiations are continuing so it would be unwise of me to pre-empt anything at this stage.

Councillor Arthey to Councillor Lawrenson

- Q. In paragraph 3.2 of the report it provides details about Angel Court and the consultation - how will this be funded?

Response: Councillor Jan Osborne

- A. This will be mainly funded by the Housing Revenue Account but also some funding may be supplied from the business rates retention scheme.

8b. CMU10 Cabinet Member for Communications – Councillor Grandon

Councillor Hurren to Councillor Grandon

- Q. Can Councillor Grandon explain what is meant by infographics?

Response: Councillor Grandon

- A. They are the whizzy designs and illustrations contained in the report. If any Member has any interesting information or case study that they may wish to put forward for the end of term report, could they please send it to the Comms team.

Councillor Hurren to Councillor Grandon

- Q. Presumably this is a report on the last four years of this current Council - will it be something that the whole Council can study and approve before it goes out or will it be based on a party- political basis?

Response: Councillor Grandon

- A. It is still in the early stages of being formulated, but it is something the whole Council can contribute to. As to whether the whole Council will be approving it, I don't think that will be the case, however there is a team working on it to produce a well- balanced interesting report.

Councillor Hurren to Councillor Grandon

- Q. Who makes the decision about what is included in the report?

Response: Councillor Grandon

- A. There is a cross party group working on this. There will more information on this in the next report, I was merely referring to this earlier for those Members that are here today who may wish to submit information for it.

Councillor McCraw to Councillor Grandon

- Q. What is the membership of this Group?

Response: Chief Executive

- A. As Councillor Grandon has already said this is not a specific item for this report. However, we will come back in greater detail but perhaps outside of the meeting where we can circulate the full details in that regard, including the initial scoping and the planned timetable.

8c. CMU11 – Cabinet Member for Communities - Councillor Maybury (in the absence of Councillor Maybury, the Leader accepted questions on behalf of the Portfolio Holder)

Councillor Hinton to Councillor Ward

- Q. Do members of the Communities Team regularly meet with the SNT's?

Response: Councillor Ward

- A. I will find out and come back to you

8d. CMU12 Cabinet Member for Economy – Simon Barrett

Councillor Bavington to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. Do we have an industrial strategy and if so should we urgently review it and if not, should we have one now?

Response: Councillor Simon Barrett

- A. What has happened, is over the last few years those strategies went from being just Babergh strategies to becoming Suffolk Wide with the overall strategy being mitigated to the Suffolk Growth Group. However, when an enquiry comes in relating to any area of expertise such as Delphi has, then that enquiry is filtered to that area. When we get enquiries coming into the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce then those enquiries are filtered to the officer in post. So, the Strategy is there but at a Suffolk level.

Councillor Bavington to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. Is the strategy up to date and does it need to be reviewed further, in light of Delphi?

Response: Councillor Simon Barrett

- A. I think with the Delphi situation there is a cross over between us as a Council and the realities of the business community. I think the role of the district Council and the county Council is to make the area suitable for people to want to invest there and we have to make it easy for them, so there is least resistance to that pathway. Where you have a situation where an employer decides to move their plant, the Council are unable to influence this decision. What we need to do is to ensure that we have a robust plan for this type of situation. However, this is difficult as I don't know how you can provide a catch all for any one industry as it may be a completely different skill set. What we can do is where we get an enquiry, see what the Council can do to make it easier for that Company, which I believe that was the point Councillor Ward was making about business rates.

Councillor Bavington to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. When Councillor Ward gave me his responses to my questions, he didn't answer my question where I gave an example of business development grants, is that something we are able to do under the law and is that something we would consider?

Response: Councillor Simon Barrett

- A. There could be a case to have some sort of enterprise zone, industrial regeneration like what is happening with the Sproughton site, that is something that is possible. However, if you had a company that was willing to take on the asset as it is, then we may not need to. But I would say if a company was coming and wanted to take over an aged asset which is going to cost a lot to refurbish, then yes, I think it is something that should be considered.

Councillor Bavington to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. Are we taking steps to make sure that the future of the Delphi sports and social club including the playing field is secured for the community.

Response: Councillor Simon Barrett

- A. The Delphi Management have made it quite clear that it is part and parcel of the overall curtilage of the site and we must assume that it will go with the site.

Councillor Arthey to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. Does the delegated authority that was granted to the Strategic Director to negotiate a lease or disposal arrangement with a view to Lavenham Parish Council taking over the TIC building include gifting?

Response: Chief Executive

- A. The delegated authority of lease or disposal would be by any means and would include gifting.

Councillor Hinton to Councillor Simon Barrett

- Q. We have talked about the South Suffolk Strategy which includes our MP, James Cartlidge and the work around the Delphi site, has he had any discussions with Network Rail to relax their draconian rules?
- A. He has had extensive discussions with Network Rail to see whether they would relax their policy on the gate movements but as far as I am aware there has been no developments in that area. The only thing is whether they then actually go to the next stage and redevelop the underpass and make a proper underpass, but that is an ongoing conversation.

8e. CMU13 Cabinet Member for the Environment – Councillor Campbell

Councillor Beer to Councillor Campbell

- Q. Do we really see there is a future for a Building Control Service in this authority?

Response: Chief Executive

- A. We have statutory responsibilities to provide a building control service in relation to non- fee charging aspects, so we are the provider of last resort if you like, when anything goes wrong. That doesn't mean we have to directly deliver it in house, we could commission somebody externally to provide it on our behalf, but we cannot remove ourselves from the statutory obligation to provide certain building control functions.

Councillor Beer to Chief Executive

- Q. There was a move a few years ago to make Building Control more self sufficient are we self sufficient or getting near self sufficient or are we the opposite?

Response: Chief Executive

- A. We still retain a loyal client base, the challenge is that we do a comprehensive job where the private sector is not obliged to. We have seen in the last twelve months, events that can happen when the building control functions are not fully and properly performed. A paper went forward to the Suffolk Chief Executives looking to bring forward some funding to support marketing and collective work. This will hopefully provide a more resilient and a more timely service for customers because we do provide a slightly different offer to the market. But clearly for national house builders it is much easier for them to deal with one national building control provider rather than dealing with the local building control providers on their particular patch in relation to a particular development. So, this will always be a challenge, but I don't think unless Members tell me otherwise that you wish to get out of the building control business in its entirety.

Councillor Beer to Councillor Campbell

- Q. Can Councillor Campbell assure us that BDC will continue to have a Building Control department - a department which is held up quite highly by the general public?

Response: Councillor Campbell

- A. How long term do you want the assurance for, I am not able to give that. Currently we have managed to recruit people so let's hope we can continue to do so.

Councillor Cresswell to Councillor Campbell

- Q. Why is there no mention of the air quality management area in the report particularly in reference to Cross Street in Sudbury and would you consider Benton Street and perhaps have an air quality action plan as well?

Response Councillor Campbell

- A. With Benton Street the reading isn't high enough to actually warrant it. The Cross Street situation is due to some parking spaces, and if we were able to remove those parking spaces then the traffic would flow more freely and there would not be a problem. However, I understand that local residents are opposed to these spaces being removed.

8f. CMU14 Cabinet Member for Law and Governance.**Councillor Cresswell to the Assistant Director for Law and Governance**

- Q. Will there be a review of polling stations and what will be the timescale?

Response: Assistant Director for Law and Governance

- A. Once we have the final recommendations from the Boundary Commission we will need to undertake a review of polling districts and polling places across the district to ensure that we have adequate provision for polling, that complies with the new boundaries that are presented to us. As part of that the Returning Officer will review the actual polling stations.

Councillor Beer to the Assistant Director for Law and Governance.

- Q. Will the revised polling stations come back to Council and will ward Members be involved?

Response: Assistant Director for Law and Governance

- A. Polling districts and polling places are a matter for Council to decide so they will come to Council for approval. The polling station itself is a matter for the Returning Officer to decide, but typically we do report these to Council and there will be an opportunity for Council to comment on the arrangements that the Returning Officer is proposing.

8g. CMU17 Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery – Councillor Davis.

Councillor Parker to Councillor Davis

- Q. I am heartened to see throughout the report that performance targets are improving. However, can we be assured that we are putting in place some sort of key performance measurement as at the moment we appear to be reactionary and where customer services are concerned I personally think we need to be more proactive?

Response: Councillor Davis

- A. I think you make a very valid point, in terms of the performance indicators there are targets in there, the risks are also in there and how well we are doing against each one. I am quite happy for you to be sent what we are looking to achieve and how well we are achieving that. The Assistant Director and her team have done a fantastic job in reaching those standards. Babergh's IT and CIL team are also leading on a pilot scheme with a fantastic piece of software called Exicom. You are right we do need to set gold standards - standards have already been set by the Chief Executive for officers to respond to Members, but everybody including Members need to respond within those timescales. We are not there yet but we are getting there.

8f. CMU18 Cabinet Member for Planning – Councillor Ridley

Councillor Bavington to Councillor Ridley

- Q. Why does our five-year land supply go up and down like a yoyo?

Response: Councillor Ridley

- A. I don't think it's a yoyo, I actually think it's a great achievement. We have been granting an enormous amount of applications and doing everything possible to encourage developers to start those developments. This year we are building over 300 houses. It doesn't matter whether you look at the lower figure or the higher figure it is very good news indeed and it is not yoyoing.

37 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT

- 37.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee report was tabled for reference.
- 37.2 The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, Councillor McCraw introduced the report and drew attention to the work of the Committee over May and June and the areas that the Committee had been scrutinising.
- 37.3 Commenting further, Councillor McCraw highlighted a matter which had been previously referred to the Committee for scrutiny, which was void times for empty Council properties. The reduction in void times was particularly pleasing and Councillor McCraw thanked the previous Chairman for the work that he carried out on that issue.
- 37.4 Finally, the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny reported that the Committee had undertaken a robust review of CIFCO and were able to be a lot more confident in the ability of CIFCO to achieve its targets. Copies of that review had been included in the papers relating to the Business Plan for CIFCO LTD.

38 BC/18/14 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME UPDATE

- 38.1 Councillor Ridley introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations within the report.
- 38.2 Councillor Ridley went on to highlight the revised timescale to reflect a further round of public consultation to ensure the Joint Local Plan was robust and the Council could take account of the comments made before producing the draft Local Plan for examination. Thus, the Local Development Scheme timetable, proposed submission of the draft plan in the summer of 2018 for examination in late spring/early summer 2019.
- 38.3 Councillor Beer seconded the report and asked whether the plan would ensure that there was greater autonomy for the planning enforcement team?
- 38.4 In response Councillor Ridley stated that having a joint up to date plan would enable the Council to be more robust in its decision making and would probably give some additional weight to the decisions that enforcement officers may make.

- 38.5 Councillor Busby queried that where villages and parishes were working on Neighbourhood plans, what would be the cut off date for them to get them accepted to be included in this Local Plan, and if they produced reports after that would the Joint local plan to be updated to include those?
- 38.6 In response the Corporate Manager for Strategic Planning stated that Neighbourhood Plans need to be in conformity with the strategic priorities in the Local Plan but were part of the development plan alongside the Local Plan. If a Neighbourhood Plan is more up to date with policies than the Local Plan, then on local matters that would count.
- 38.7 The Chief Executive added that as there appeared to be a lot of confusion on this issue he suggested that a training session in relation to neighbourhood planning and local plans be provided as soon as possible.

It was Resolved:

That the revised timetable for the preparation of the Joint Local Plan be agreed and the revised Local Development Scheme be brought into effect by 31st July 2018.

39 **BC/18/14A COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS**

It was Resolved:

- (i) **That the Committees' size and numerical allocation of seats be approved as detailed in Appendix A to the report.**
- (ii) **That Council notes the following appointments to Committees:-**
 - (a) **Councillor Michael Holt appointed to the Planning Committee as a Conservative Group member.**
 - (b) **Councillor Melanie Barrett appointed to the Joint Audit and Standards Committee as a Conservative Group member.**
 - (c) **Councillor Peter Patrick appointed to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as a Conservative Group member.**

40 **BC/18/15 CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND COMPANY ('CIFCO CAPITAL LTD') BUSINESS TRADING AND PERFORMANCE REPORT 2017/2018**

- 40.1 Councillor Ridley introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report.
- 40.2 Commenting further he went on to say that the report was to provide the Council as a 50% shareholder, with an oversight of the CIFCO Capital Ltd performance activity in its first year of trading and its proposed investment strategy for 2018/9 forming the base of trading in year 2.

40.3 Councillor Ridley informed Council that a Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the plan on 28 June 2018 and had resolved that the additional information provided for by the performance of risk reporting structure had reassured the Committee that a reporting structure was in place to enable CIFCO Capital Ltd to achieve its targets within the business plan.

40.4 Councillor Beer seconded the report and reserved the right to speak.

It was Resolved:-

That the CIFCO trading activity and performance for the year to the end of April 2018 be noted.

41 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS)

41.1 On the proposal of Councillor Ward and seconded by Councillor Jan Osborne,

It was Resolved:-

That pursuant to Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the business specified in the Minutes on the grounds that if the public were present during discussion of this item, it is likely that there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as indicated in the report.

42 CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX - CIFCO CAPITAL LTD BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19 (EXEMPT INFORMATION BY VIRTUE OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF PART 1)

It was Resolved:-

That the CIFCO Capital Business Plan 2018/19 be approved.

43 BC/18/16 TO CONFIRM THE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTE OF 19 JUNE 2018 MEETING

It was Resolved:-

That the confidential Minute of 19 June 2018 be approved as a true record.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 8.15 pm.

.....
Chairman