

COUNCIL



THURSDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2020 - 4.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs K Mayor (Chairman), Councillor A Miscandlon (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor Mrs S Bligh, Councillor C Boden, Councillor G Booth, Councillor D Connor, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor S Count, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor D Divine, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor K French, Councillor A Hay, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor M Humphrey, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor A Lynn, Councillor D Mason, Councillor C Marks, Councillor A Maul, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor D Patrick, Councillor M Purser, Councillor W Rackley, Councillor C Seaton, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor S Tierney, Councillor S Wallwork, Councillor Wicks and Councillor F Yeulett

APOLOGIES: Councillor A Bristow, Councillor J Clark, Councillor S Clark, Councillor R Skoulding, Councillor M Tanfield, Councillor D Topgood and Councillor Wilkes

C61/19 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 9 January 20 were confirmed and signed, subject to the following amendments.

- Councillor Booth highlighted that C55/19 (point 4), should read, that there was a motion which was considered by 'Council' in May 2019.
- Councillor Booth stated that C58/19 (point 6), should read 'democratic'.

C62/19 CIVIC ENGAGEMENTS UPDATE.

Councillor Mrs Mayor drew member's attention to the civic activities undertaken by herself and the Vice-Chairman in the weeks preceding Full Council.

C63/19 TO RECEIVE ANY ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE.

The Chairman thanked those members that attended the Twinning Association Annual General Meeting and Tea Party, which took place on 22 January. The event was well received, with several new members joining the association. The Chairman added that the Tea Party is vital to securing sponsors to host visitors from Stadt Nettetal in 2021 when they next visit Fenland.

C64/19 TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS FROM, AND PROVIDE ANSWERS TO, COUNCILLORS IN RELATION TO MATTERS WHICH, IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIRMAN, ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PROCEDURE RULES 8.4 AND 8.6.

This item was withdrawn from the agenda, due to the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Michelle Tanfield.

C65/19 TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM AND ASK QUESTIONS OF CABINET MEMBERS WITH PORTFOLIO HOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE RULES 8.1 AND 8.2.

Members asked questions of Portfolio Holders in accordance with Procedure Rules 8.1 and 8.2 as follows:

- Councillor Booth addressed Councillor Boden, for an update with regard to parish street lighting which was discussed earlier at Cabinet. Councillor Boden stated that he had contacted the Parish Clerks over the last few months to obtain feedback which has concluded that the Parishes would prefer if the Council took control of their street lighting and also assume responsibility for all future expenditure and for the council to reimburse them for the expenditure they have already incurred. Councillor Boden added that he has received some detailed and helpful information from members of the Council, including information from Councillor Humphrey who had provided an additional proposal for Cabinet to consider. As a result of this information, an amendment to the motion on the subject at today's Cabinet meeting, in order to ensure that those parishes which have the worst proportion of number of street lights to concurrent grant receive additional monies. This amendment to the motion was passed at Cabinet today.
- Councillor Patrick addressed Councillor Tierney with regard to the Wisbech Customer Services Centre and asked whether he could be provided with some information concerning the reduction in footfall, since the centre moved to the Boathouse. Councillor Tierney stated that he is aware that there has been a significant reduction, however this reduction in customers is due to the fact that many customers now carry out their enquiries on line as opposed to face to face. Councillor Tierney agreed to obtain statistics for Councillor Patrick as requested.
- Councillor Bligh asked Councillor Boden if he could provide an update with regard to the review on the bus service and in particular the number 46 route. Councillor Boden stated that whilst he is not able to answer the question directly, the Mayor of the Combined Authority is keen to ensure that the more rural areas of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough are better served by public transport alternatives than they are currently.
- Councillor Wicks addressed Councillor Murphy and congratulated the 'Get it Sorted' team on the amount of information being passed to members and residents concerning recycling. Councillor Wicks stated that the bin collection day calendar, along with other items of literature which are distributed to all residents in Fenland cannot be recycled. He added that it would be beneficial to have the diary of collection dates placed on the district council website. Councillor Murphy stated that the collection dates are already on the council's website.
- Councillor Yeulett highlighted that he had seen an article on the Cambs Times newspaper concerning the initiative of the £100,000 houses and he asked Councillor Mrs Laws whether she can confirm whether the council supports the proposal. Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that the council is very much in favour of the initiative. She added that she has attended meetings along with Councillor Hoy and Councillor Benney, as well as a meeting with Charles Roberts from East Cambridgeshire District Council. She stated that the process is moving forward and the Fenland Developer Forum will receive a presentation in April. There is also the all member seminar planned on the subject.
- Councillor Wicks addressed Councillor Tierney with regard to the military covenant and asked whether the covenant could be publicised to the local veterans and military associations. Councillor Tierney agreed with Councillor Wicks and stated that it is very important to make it clear to all the members of the armed services, both serving and veterans, that they are supported along with their families. Councillor Tierney agreed to make contact with all associations.
- Councillor Mrs Bligh addressed Councillor Murphy with regard to the issue of dog fouling stencils and asked for an update concerning the commencement of their use. Councillor Murphy stated that it is still being discussed and approval would need to be sought from County Council, however he agreed to investigate the use of the stencils further.
- Councillor Miss French addressed Councillor Benney and asked for an update with regard to the disposal of the councils surplus assets. Councillor Benney stated that following an auction that had taken place earlier that day all of the assets were sold at auction. He added

that most reached their reserve price and one exceeded its reserve price. Councillor Benney highlighted the unique property in Wisbech, which has no downstairs or access, was auctioned for £1.00.

- Councillor Sutton addressed Councillor Mrs Laws with regard to the housing delivery test which Fenland had failed. Councillor Sutton stated that the information was on the Governments website and shows that we have failed the test by 5%. The percentage last year was 97% and by dropping 5%, currently the figure is 92% and an action statement needs to be provided. Councillor Mrs Laws advised Councillor Sutton that she will need to look into this matter further.
- Councillor Sutton addressed Councillor Benney with regard to the £4000 rental charge for the premises that stores the Vivienne Fire Engine. He added that the charity that looks after the fire engine have no income and he would like this reviewed. Councillor Benney agreed to look into this further.
- Councillor Sutton addressed Councillor Boden in the absence of Councillor Sam Clark, with regard to the recent visit from the professional boxer Jordan Gill, who had recently visited and promoted the leisure centres. Councillor Sutton stated that there has been no press release to reflect those visits. Councillor Boden asked Councillor Tierney to respond to this question. Councillor Tierney stated that he is very keen to promote the news and he will contact the communications team to address this.
- Councillor Miss French addressed Councillor Benney and asked for a progress update with regard to the new staff appointments to the Economic Assets team. Councillor Benney stated that the new Economic Growth Manager commences his employment in April. The Business Account Manager commences their new role on Monday 24 February.
- Councillor Cornwell asked for clarification that he has read recently in the local press that the glass Christmas tree from Peterborough has been donated to Fenland District Council and then allocated to Wisbech Town Council. Councillor Boden responded by saying this matter is not relevant to the Council.
- Councillor Booth addressed Councillor Hoy with regard to an article in the press with regard to concerns around the Military Covenant and the veterans that live in Fenland. Councillor Hoy stated that she has seen the press article and she has asked officers to provide her further information. Councillor Hoy stated that Fenlands housing stock is managed by external providers, who dictate who housing tenancies, are given to. She added this is not just a Fenland issue; it is a nationwide concern, where frustrations have been raised with regard to how registered providers are not housing those that we would consider as a priority. Councillor Hoy agreed to review the situation further and provide feedback.

Councillor Count entered the Council Chamber at 16.10pm

C66/19 MOTION SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLOR TIERNEY REGARDING THE PROPOSAL OF AN INCINERATOR FACILITY IN WISBECH.

Councillor Tierney presented a motion regarding the proposal of an incinerator facility in Wisbech and stated that.

This Council understands that there is a proposal to build an Incinerator Facility in Wisbech.

Incinerators are actually wasteful. They burn much of what it otherwise recyclable and their demand for fuel can sometimes result in a reduction in recycling due to their need to bid for more and more waste. This means that it becomes typical for incineration to lead to a reduction in recycling and discourages efforts to preserve resources and creates incentives to generate more waste.

Waste Incineration is not a renewable source of energy. Incinerator companies are marketing “waste-to-energy” as a source of renewable energy. But unlike other renewables the fuel does not come from infinite natural processes. On the contrary, it is source from finite resources.

Burning waste produces toxic emissions. Burning waste is hazardous for citizens’ health and the

environment. Even the most advanced technologies cannot avoid the release of vast amounts of pollutants that contaminate air, soil and water, and end up entering the food chain. Incinerators are major emitters of carcinogenic pollutants as well tiny particles of dust that can lead to decreased lung function, irregular heartbeat, heart attacks, and premature death.

Burning waste creates less employment opportunities than recycling. Incinerators offer relatively few jobs when compared to recycling. The large footprint of a huge Incinerator could clearly produce more jobs as regular manufacturing space. The idea that the Incinerator is a valuable job creator for local people is bluster.

The World is embracing Zero Waste, and Incineration is a backwards step. "Waste-to-energy" is often described as a good way to extract energy from resources, but in fact it works against the circular economy, producing toxic waste, air pollution and for those that are concerned about Climate Change - contributing to it.

Wisbech Roads will be heavily affected. An Incinerator of the size proposed would create hundreds of additional large lorry journeys daily creating significant additional congestion and wear and tear on already busy roads.

Wisbech Rail is under threat. Wisbech' long held hope to re-open its rail line has been champions by the Mayor of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, the local MP and all local Councils. Millions of pounds have been invested to get to the current point. The proposed location of the Incinerator limits the potential options for a new rail station and cuts off part of the potential route it could take.

In 2019, Wisbech Town Council's motion to oppose the Incinerator project met with nearly unanimous support. An original local campaign opposing the Incinerator has since been joined by a second Campaign doing the same thing. Rallies, public meetings and large campaigns are in place.

Many Environmental Groups are opposed to Incineration due to the issues already discussed. The public are overwhelmingly opposed to the building of an Incinerator in Wisbech.

The Incinerator proposal is of such a large size that it bypasses the usual Planning route through local Councils and instead will be decided directly at Government level. This means local people and local Councils have very limited opportunities to make their views known.

It is important that local people see that Fenland District Council as an organisation understands the strength of public opinion against the Incinerator and that it is willing to stand up and be counted in the campaign to try and prevent it ever happening.

THIS COUNCIL STATES THAT:

- 1/ We do not support the construction of an incinerator in Wisbech.
- 2/ We will write to the Secretary of State to make clear our opposition to these plans.
- 3/ We will take any and all legal avenues and processes available to us to continue to fight on behalf of the residents of Wisbech, the surrounding villages, and Fenland as a whole and to challenge this unwelcome scheme every step of the way.

Councillor Patrick seconded the motion and Councillor Mrs Mayor opened the motion up for debate.

- Councillor Boden stated that he hoped that the motion would be passed unanimously. He added that the proposal of the incinerator is deemed as a national infrastructure project, and therefore will be dealt with at a national level, rather than at County Council. Councillor Boden outlined the first stage of the process which commenced in late December 2019, with a deadline of providing feedback to the planning inspectorate of early January. Councillor Boden thanked Councillor Count for working with officers at County Council and at Fenland, to ensure a robust response was provided to the National Planning Inspectorate.
- Councillor Meekins stated that Wisbech Town Council discussed the incinerator in 2019 and at that time he abstained from the vote, as in his opinion he felt he did not have sufficient information to make a decision; however, as more information is now in the public domain, he will support the campaign to oppose the incinerator.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he will not be supporting the motion, as he feels he does not

have enough information on the proposal.

- Councillor Booth stated that members need to be kept informed on a stage by stage basis. He added that he is particularly concerned about the dioxins that will be produced.
- Councillor Lynn stated that any member that does support this motion should be apologising to their parishes.
- Councillor Mrs Bligh stated that she would like to thank Councillor Tierney for including the villages within the motion, as it will also have an impact on the surrounding villages. She added it is not just the toxic omissions she has concerns over, but also the impact on the traffic in particular the A47.
- Councillor Hoy stated that the reason people are lacking information concerning the proposal, is because there has been insufficient information provided.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that he would like to have seen more information concerning the proposal. He added that the motion is good, but due to the lack of information, he is unsure as to which way to vote.
- Councillor Yeulett stated he cannot support the motion, due to the lack of information.
- Councillor Count stated that Peterborough Incinerator is primarily to deal with the waste generated from that area. The Wisbech incinerator proposal is to be built to deal with Norfolk's waste. He added that this will mean that the waste collection vehicles will be driving across the whole of Norfolk to drive into Cambridgeshire with their waste which is not a very ecological proposal. He stated that in his opinion it is an easy decision to support the motion, as he feels there is sufficient information available. To have an incinerator in Fenland when it is another county's waste is not a sound prospect. Councillor Count asked for a recorded vote to take place on this item.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she fully supports the motion and added that having an incinerator in Wisbech, is not going to reduce the volume of traffic, it is not going to make the people of Fenland healthier, and will be detrimental and therefore the motion should be supported.
- Councillor Wicks thanked Councillor Count for clarifying some of the missing points and added as it is Norfolk's waste it should not become a problem for Cambridgeshire.
- Councillor Patrick stated that there had been a rally held in Wisbech and it had been well attended. One of the speakers who attended had stated that the number of incinerators is increasing and councils will be tied into having to buy rubbish to burn. Councillor Patrick concluded by stating that the proposed location is not suitable, there are residential houses and schools in the vicinity and the future generations must not have to be impacted by the proposal.
- Councillor Tierney thanked Councillor Patrick for his comments which he agrees with. Councillor Tierney addressed Councillor Sutton and asked him to reconsider his decision not to support the motion.

A Recorded vote was taken on the Motion.

In Favour: Councillor Benney, Councillor Mrs Bligh, Councillor Boden, Councillor Booth, Councillor Connor, Councillor Cornwell, Councillor Count, Councillor Mrs Davis, Councillor Divine, Councillor Mrs French, Councillor Miss French, Councillor Hay, Councillor Hoy, Councillor Humphrey, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Lynn, Councillor Marks, Councillor Mason, Councillor Maul, Councillor Meekins, Councillor Murphy, Councillor Patrick, Councillor Purser, Councillor Rackley, Councillor Seaton, Councillor Tierney, Councillor Wallwork and Councillor Wicks.

Against: None

Abstentions: Councillor Sutton and Councillor Yeulett.

The motion was adopted.

C67/19 FINAL BUSINESS PLAN 2020-21.

Members considered the Final Business Plan 2020-21 Report presented by Councillor Boden.

Councillor Boden stated that the report has been widely distributed and the main purpose of the document is to set out the key challenges and opportunities that the council has over the next 12 months. He added that the report was discussed at a recent Overview and Scrutiny meeting and as a result, a few changes were made to the document, in particular with regard to the indicator for recycling performance and also the statement for grade 1 agricultural land has been amended.

Councillor Boden stated that the plan presents some interesting and challenging opportunities for the council over the next 12 months.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and AGREED to approve the Final Business Plan 2021-2021.

C68/19 GENERAL FUND BUDGET ESTIMATES 2020/21 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (MTFS) 2020/21 TO 2024/25; CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2020 - 2023.

Members considered the General Fund Budget Estimates 2020/21 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) report 2020/2021 to 2024/25 presented by Councillor Boden.

Councillor Mrs Mayor reminded members that this item would be subject to a recorded vote as set out in the Constitution.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- Councillor Yeulett thanked Councillor Boden for the summary and made reference to the comment that had been made with regard to challenges that are to come in the future, including a further funding review in areas that affect the council. Councillor Yeulett also added that there are also challenges with regard to business rates moving forward. He stated that he has highlighted previously the issues surrounding councils investing in property companies and the difficulties in accessing their funds when they wish to do so.
- Councillor Booth stated that he will be supporting the budget but made reference to page 76 of the council agenda pack, item 8.2, where the council net services expenditure is shown to rise on a year on year basis. He stated that if the council were business like in their approach as had the figure as a 0% rise, then savings would not need to be sought.
- Councillor Boden stated that we do not know any further details of other financial aspects which may change in the next twelve months
- Councillor Boden stated that with regard to property investment, the council is not going to invest in property companies; it is going to invest in property funds which are carefully regulated and only those that have sufficient liquidity and are approved from the Section 151 Officer.
- Councillor Boden referred to the point that Councillor Booth had highlighted with regard to net services expenditure and the medium term financial strategy, is to make an estimate based on the council's current financial position and to look at what the likely expenditure will be over the next few financial years.
- Councillor Booth stated that he was expressing the view that the council does not have a policy in place which asks officers not to increase the budgets over the medium term financial period. Councillor Boden added that there is a policy in place which is enforced by officers and ensures that every service department reviews at its expenditure on a regular

basis to ensure expenditure costs are kept to a certain level. The medium term financial strategy should be reflection of the policies that are in place.

A Recorded vote was taken on the recommendation which was unanimous and adopted.

In Favour: Councillor Benney, Councillor Mrs Bligh, Councillor Boden, Councillor Booth, Councillor Connor, Councillor Cornwell, Councillor Count, Councillor Mrs Davis, Councillor Divine, Councillor Mrs French, Councillor Miss French, Councillor Hay, Councillor Hoy, Councillor Humphrey, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Lynn, Councillor Marks, Councillor Mason, Councillor Maul, Councillor Meekins, Councillor Murphy, Councillor Patrick, Councillor Purser, Councillor Rackley, Councillor Seaton, Councillor Sutton, Councillor Tierney, Councillor Wallwork and Councillor Wicks and Councillor Yeulett.

Against: None

Abstentions: None

C69/19 COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION.

Members considered the Council Tax Resolution proposal presented by Councillor Boden.

Councillor Mrs Mayor reminded members that this item would be subject to a recorded vote as set out in the Constitution.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Lynn and AGREED to pass the resolution set out in the report as follows:

- **To approve the Council Tax Resolution to reflect a 0% Council Tax increase for Fenland District Council for 2020/21.**

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 impose an obligation on Local Authorities (after 25 February 2014) to record all votes on decisions on budget and council tax, with this in mind Members voted on this item as follows:

In favour of the proposal - Councillor Benney, Councillor Mrs Bligh, Councillor Boden, Councillor Booth, Councillor Connor, Councillor Cornwell, Councillor Count, Councillor Mrs Davis, Councillor Divine, Councillor Mrs French, Councillor Miss French, Councillor Hay, Councillor Hoy, Councillor Humphrey, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Lynn, Councillor Marks, Councillor Mason, Councillor Maul, Councillor Meekins, Councillor Murphy, Councillor Patrick, Councillor Purser, Councillor Rackley, Councillor Seaton, Councillor Sutton, Councillor Tierney, Councillor Wallwork and Councillor Wicks and Councillor Yeulett.

Against: None

Abstentions: None

C70/19 PROPOSED REMOVAL OF THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT POLICY (CIA).

Members considered the proposed removal of the Cumulative Impact Assessment Policy (CIA) report to members presented by Councillor Humphrey

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- Councillor Tierney stated that when the CIA was first proposed a number of years ago, he opposed the policy, as he did believe it would resolve the issues. He added that the community of Wisbech have requested that the issue of anti-social behaviour caused by street drinking needs to be addressed. He added that whilst he appreciates that the CIA policy was not introduced for that reason specifically; many people hoped it would address the issue, but it has not.
- Councillor Tierney added that the policy protects businesses that are not operating correctly and prevents new businesses from opening. He added that it also distracts the council from addressing the problems it needs to deal with.
- Councillor Tierney expressed the view that there needs to be policies in place that challenge the problems that Wisbech has. He added that Wisbech Town Council did not support the policy because in their opinion, the policy does not work and he will support the proposal of the removal of the Cumulative Impact Assessment Policy, so real measures can be taken to solve the problem.
- Councillor Sutton stated that in his opinion, he does not agree with the comments made by Councillor Tierney. Councillor Sutton stated that the policy was never intended to stop street drinking. He added that the policy was introduced for licensing applications to prove that the three licensing objectives would not be affected and he added that he will not be supporting the proposal to remove the policy.
- Councillor Hoy expressed the opinion that all premises in Wisbech that apply to sell alcohol are faced with objections from Public Health who have shown concerns over additional premises selling alcohol in Wisbech which will add to the cumulative effect. She added that street drinking has reduced slightly due to the work that the council has been undertaking and also a greater police presence. She stated that the homeless hub has also helped by engaging with the street drinkers.
- Councillor Hoy expressed the view that she believes there is a solution to the problem and she will be working with the Cabinet members to find a satisfactory resolution.
- Councillor Booth stated that in his opinion, the policy should not be removed. He added that the consultation responses that were received were in favour of keeping the policy, including Public Health. He added that he is pleased to hear that further work is being undertaken to try and find a solution. He stated that the policy is in place to be used in conjunction with other legislation, which in his opinion is not being utilised fully.
- Councillor Benney stated that the purpose of the 2003 licensing act was to open up the sale of alcohol to the general public, to enable the public to choose when they drink. He expressed the opinion that the policy goes against that.
- Councillor Humphrey stated that a Cumulative Impact Policy cannot be put in place unless there is evidence of issues and problems in a specific location. He added that in his opinion, the policy has helped whilst it has been in place and he added that there is a misconception with regard to street drinking. He stated that he respects the views of Wisbech Town Council and the conclusion that the licensing committee came to. He expressed the view that he is grateful for the action that Wisbech Town Council are taking with regard to enforcement and compliance. He stated in his personal opinion, he was content with keeping the policy but he is happy to work with the revised policy.

It was proposed by Councillor Humphrey, seconded by Councillor Lynn and decided that that Council APPROVE the removal of the Cumulative Impact Assessment Policy (CIA)

Councillor Patrick left the Council Chamber at 17.39pm

C71/19 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS - CABINET MEETINGS.

Members considered the Constitutional Amendment report presented by Councillor Boden.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- Councillor Booth asked for clarification with regard to the review period over the frequency of the cycle of meetings. Councillor Boden clarified that a review will take place after 6 months.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he broadly agrees with the changes. He expressed the view that he does have concerns with regard to the Planning Committee, meeting 5 weekly, as there are going to be extensions of time requests with regard to planning applications and his preference and proposal would be to have monthly meetings rather than 5 weekly.
- Councillor Boden clarified that this item is to note and not to decide.

It was proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided that that Council APPROVE the Constitutional Amendments.

Amy Brown, Deputy Monitoring Officer, left the Council Chamber at 17.45pm

C72/19 NOTIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MONITORING OFFICER.

Members considered the Notification of the Appointment of the Deputy Monitoring Officer report presented by Councillor Boden.

It was proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Miscandlon and decided that that Council APPROVE the recommendation.

Amy Brown, Deputy Monitoring Officer, entered the Council Chamber 17.46pm.

Members congratulated Amy Brown on her appointment.

Councillor Tierney was not present when members agreed to note this item.

C73/19 SENIOR MANAGER PAY POLICY STATEMENT.

Members considered the Senior Manager Pay Policy Statement Report presented by Councillor Boden.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

- Councillor Booth expressed the view that this is a policy and if members are minded then they can vote against the policy.

Proposed by Councillor Boden, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and AGREED to adopt the Senior Manager Pay Policy Statement for 2020/21 as required by the Localism Act 2011.

5.48 pm

Chairman