



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Agenda Item 4

Minutes of the Meeting of East Cambridgeshire
District Council held in the Council Chamber,
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Thursday
8 January 2015 at 6.00pm

PRESENT

Councillor Allen Alderson	Councillor Lindsey Harris
Councillor Michael Allan (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Bill Hunt
Councillor Ian Allen	Councillor Tom Kerby
Councillor Christine Ambrose Smith	Councillor Chris Morris
Councillor David Ambrose Smith	Councillor Neil Morrison
Councillor Sue Austen	Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Anna Bailey	Councillor Charles Roberts
Councillor Derrick Beckett	Councillor Hamish Ross
Councillor David Brown	Councillor Mike Rouse
Councillor Tony Cornell (Chairman)	Councillor Joshua Schumann
Councillor Lorna Dupre	Councillor Robert Stevens
Councillor Kevin Ellis	Councillor Hazel Williams MBE
Councillor Lis Every	Councillor Sue Willows
Councillor Jeremy Friend-Smith	Councillor Gareth Wilson
Sheila Friend-Smith MBE	Councillor Pauline Wilson
Councillor Tony Goodge	Councillor Andy Wright

2 members of the public were in attendance at the meeting

57. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions received.

58. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lavinia Edwards, Councillor Colin Fordham, Councillor Elaine Griffin-Singh, Councillor Richard Hobbs, Councillor Tom Hunt, Councillor Tony Parramint and Councillor Philip Read.

59. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interests were received.

60. **MINUTES**

Council received the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2014. Councillor Morrison referred to the response to his question in Minute 47 which stated that the first staff 'pulse survey' would be conducted by the end of December 2014 and he commented that this was not factually correct, as the survey had not taken place. The Chief Executive stated that this information had been accurate at the time, but the up to date position was that the 'pulse survey' had been drafted and now would be completed by February 2015.

Councillor Stevens referred to the third paragraph on page 9 of Minute 50 'Bell Road, Bottisham Masterplan – Interim Policy Guidance' and stated that Councillor Ellis and himself did not have any particular 'interests' in relation to the Masterplan, but had not been involved in the drafting of the Masterplan due to membership of relevant Council Committees.

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 50 'Bell Road, Bottisham Masterplan – Interim Policy Guidance' – page 9 third paragraph third sentence: replace word 'interests' with 'membership of relevant Committees'.

61. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

Urgent Item of Business

The Chairman stated that, in the light of a meeting held earlier in the day, he had agreed to allow consideration of a report on Ely and Soham Dial-a-Ride (ESDAR) as an urgent item of business as Agenda Item 6A.

In connection with the urgent item of business, Councillor Gareth Wilson stated that Council Procedure Rules set out a defined order of business for ordinary Council meetings, and therefore requested that the urgent item of business be taken after Agenda Item 7 on 'Notice of Motions under Procedure Rule 10'. The Chief Executive stated that it was a matter for the Chairman to decide whether and where to take an urgent item of business on a Council Agenda and suggested that the Chairman conclude his announcements and then Councillor Wilson could put forward his case to attempt to persuade the Chairman to revise his decision on where to take the urgent item at the relevant point on the Agenda.

Agenda Item 8 – Questions from Members

The Chairman stated that he had agreed to allow Councillor Lorna Dupré to ask the tabled question on red paper under Agenda Item 8.

Richard Kay – Strategic Planning Manager

The Chairman welcomed Richard Kay, Strategic Planning Manager, from Peterborough City Council, who had been appointed under a Service Level Agreement with that Council. He would be presenting items 10 and 11 on the Council Agenda.

62. **PETITIONS**

No Petitions had been received.

63. **ELY AND SOHAM DIAL A RIDE (ESDAR)**

Councillor Gareth Wilson repeated his request that the urgent item of business be taken after Agenda Item 7 on 'Notice of Motions under Procedure Rule 10'. He stated that although he was very happy with the content of the urgent report, it seemed logical to debate the Motion before considering the urgent report to point out that the Council was concerned with the position on ESDAR. Upon being put to the vote by the Chairman, the request to further revise the order of business was declared to be lost.

Councillor Beckett then queried if full Council could take a decision to commit funding as detailed in the report, when Members had only received the report that day. The Principal Democratic Services Officer explained that under the urgency rules defined in Section 100B 4(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chairman could agree to take an urgent item of business and decide where on the agenda it would be considered, having given grounds for the urgency. Council should also have a written report explaining the issues and what they are being requested to make a decision on. As these requirements had been fulfilled, Members could take a decision on the matter this evening.

In accordance with Section 100B 4(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, Council considered an urgent report on the outcome of a meeting between the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive with representatives of Ely and Soham Dial a Ride (ESDAR) earlier in the day on 8 January 2015. The Chief Executive explained the nature of the discussions with the 3 representatives of ESDAR.

Councillor Palmer moved the recommendations in the urgent report and this was seconded by Councillor Lis Every. Councillor Palmer, in moving the recommendations, stated that, arising from the meeting with ESDAR, the Council needed to make decisions and act on them quickly. Whilst the Council may not have been able to provide funding to ESDAR in recent years, the savings from the re-structuring had given the Council leeway to be able to

provide some funding for 2015/16. ESDAR were faced with a number of issues and commercial constraints that they needed to address themselves, but the Council was willing to provide some financial support, as well as non-financial advice and assistance, to help them to do this within the tight timescales available. This would be subject to ESDAR conducting a 'root and branch' review of the service. Therefore, Councillor Palmer asked Members to support the recommendations.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Every stated that ESDAR was a very important local service and the recommendations represented a short-term solution to help them to continue and to develop a leaner, more efficient operation.

Councillor Wright commented that Members should support the recommendations but that the requirement for a 'root and branch' review of the service was incredibly important. Councillor Wright explained that the service had started as a group of volunteers but, having downloaded the accounts for the organisation, now had expanded to be a commercial organisation with increasing turnover and large levels of income from contracts, fares and membership. It employed 23 people with only 2 volunteers and therefore also had an increasing payroll bill. This left a lot of issues to be addressed by people with business acumen to ensure the viability of the service. Therefore, the grant from the Council would 'buy time' for ESDAR to get relevant advice to accurately assess its position.

Councillor Pauline Wilson stated that she was delighted that the Council was proposing to support ESDAR, but that this had taken 4 years and was prior to the District Council elections.

Councillor Bill Hunt commented that everyone recognised the value of community transport and that it was not a crime for the Council to have a balanced Budget and Reserves which enabled it to assist organisations like ESDAR. He was pleased that this Council was able to provide both a small level of financial support but also advice, guidance and expertise to ESDAR and suggested that other public sector bodies such as Health, Social Services and Parish Councils should be approached for assistance as well, due to the health and community benefits of the service.

Councillor Williams stated that she also supported the recommendations but that the Council should learn a wider lesson, since this was the second time in recent months that it had been called upon to help a local voluntary organisation in crisis, referring to Mepal Outdoor Centre. Councillor Williams stated that some Parish Councils already provided contributions to Community Transport schemes, using the example of her Parish, Burwell, which contributed to the Newmarket scheme since it served that village. Councillor Williams commented that the Council needed to ensure that the correct people at ESDAR tackled the issues to be addressed and that our £15,000 was not wasted due to inadequate governance of the organisation.

Councillor Gareth Wilson stated that he was very pleased to see the report and support the recommendations. He stated that he understood that the County Council had given a verbal commitment to subsidise half the fare for concessionary passes to Community Transport Groups in 2015/16, but he was disappointed that this was not the full fare and that written confirmation of this was needed. Councillor Wilson understood that Fenland DC supported their Community Transport scheme by subsidising the other half of the fare. He highlighted that ESDAR provided a door-to-door service for those who would otherwise be unable to get out of the house, giving health and social benefits, and boosted the local economy by bringing people into the Market at Ely each Thursday. Therefore, he agreed that the County Council and Health Services should also provide assistance in recognition of the health and social benefits of the service. Councillor Wilson acknowledged that ESDAR had a large number of areas that it needed to address, including legal/commercial constraints, generating extra income, gift aid on donations, etc. However, it was not necessarily in a critical financial position, if reviewed properly. So he was happy that the Council was offering to provide advice and support to them in doing this. Therefore, he thanked Councillor Palmer and the Chief Executive for their work.

Councillor Dupré endorsed Councillor William's comments on local organisations in crisis and also referred to Littleport Leisure Centre. She emphasised the need to support the recommendations and the Motion to follow and expressed disappointment that the urgent report could not have been considered as an amendment to the Motion.

Councillor Bailey commented that crisis reports were brought about by events in the community rather than by this Council. However, when things did go wrong, the Council would attempt to help where it could. The 'cap in hand' culture of organisations needed to change and they needed to be properly funded by the bodies that they provided a service to. ESDAR was not failing since it had not received a grant from this Council for 4 years, but due to a number of factors. Whilst it was untenable not to have Community Transport schemes, these needed to serve the communities where there was the most demand and deprivation. A County Council review of Community Transport was ongoing at present, and Community Transport grants currently were very uneven across the County. It was hoped that the review would result in greater parity across the County. Councillor Bailey stated that she supported the giving of a one-off grant, but that a proper review was needed to ensure that it was not disappearing into a 'black hole'.

Councillor Allen stated that this was a matter of political choice, as ESDAR was a subsidised service with grants provided from various bodies. He agreed that a 'root and branch' review was required, but ESDAR was in a 'cleft stick' position, needing to balance its community values against acting in a more commercial manner and directly competing with local taxi companies. He expressed disappointment at the manner in which this item had been dealt with in the order of business at this meeting, since Councillor Pauline Wilson had been promoting the cause of ESDAR for a number of years in the Council and should have been afforded the opportunity to put her Motion first. The

Council claimed to support ESDAR and had used its logo on Council literature. However, if the County Council and District Council were not providing direct funding to ESDAR, why should Parish Councils be expected to do so? Furthermore, if the County Council could fund a £15M bypass, why did it not fund Community Transport schemes?

In response to an earlier comment by Councillor Williams, Councillor Brown stated that residents of Burwell did use ESDAR.

Councillor Beckett commented that the debate had not reflected well on the Council and asked why this matter had come to Council on urgency grounds, since the decision of the ESDAR Board of trustees to 'wind up' the organisation on 31 March 2015 had been taken on 29 October 2014.

In summing-up, Councillor Palmer reiterated that the Budget savings realised from the restructuring enabled the Council to help where there was an issue. ESDAR had been reassured by the Council's offers of assistance and would be recommending these to its Board.

Councillor Schumann stated that his brother was a Trustee of ESDAR and whilst he had not spoken on the issue so far, asked the Monitoring Officer's advice. The Monitoring Officer advised that he should not vote on the issue.

It was resolved:

1. That approval be given to the allocation of £15,000 (non-recurring) in the 2015/16 revenue budget, subject to the continuation of the service beyond 31 March 2015 and a 'root and branch' review of the current service.
2. That the Chief Executive and Leader of Council be instructed to further assist ESDAR, specifically to:-
 - secure confirmation from the County Council of the award of a grant of £15,000 to ESDAR for 2015/16;
 - support ESDAR in their negotiations with the County Council in relation to existing and future contractual opportunities;
 - work in partnership with the County Council and other District Councils to facilitate a thorough review of community transport across Cambridgeshire;
 - support ESDAR and provide additional non financial resources in their review of the future of the organisation.

64. **MOTIONS**

The following Motion was proposed by Cllr Pauline Wilson and seconded by Cllr Gareth Wilson:

'The Council expresses its deep concern at the proposed closure of the Ely and Soham Dial a Ride from end March 2015.

The Council requests that the Leader of Council, as a matter of urgency, supported by relevant colleagues to show the cross party support for Dial A Ride, meet with the trustees and management of Ely and Soham Dial a Ride to discuss the charity's intentions and to develop proposals to ensure the sustainability of this key service for the district.'

In proposing the Motion, Councillor Pauline Wilson stated that she was not surprised by the urgent report, as Councillor Palmer had advised her that he was meeting with ESDAR, but she was disappointed that he had not worked with them on the issue.

Councillor Charles Roberts left the meeting at 7.02pm.

Councillor Pauline Wilson stated that ESDAR was a lifeline for those who used it and its winding-up would be a great loss for the local community. Therefore, she urged all political parties to support the Motion.

Councillor Stevens referred to the cuts in funding for all tiers down to Parishes and the fact that local bus service provision varied considerably both locally and across the country.

Councillor Charles Roberts returned to the meeting at 7.06pm.

Councillor Stevens stated that those with disabilities found it difficult to get to the nearest bus stop and these people should not be excluded from using transport services. Therefore, the changes to funding for concessionary fares by the County Council would affect all Community Transport services and the different tiers of local government, including Parish Councils, should consider the provision of adequate funding.

Councillor Gareth Wilson stated that he hoped that all Members could agree to the general principles and unanimously support the Motion. It was important for the ESDAR Trustees to know that the Council was willing to support them. This also was demonstrated by the Council continuing to use the service itself, for example for Planning Committee site visits.

It was resolved:

On being put to the vote, the motion was supported.

Councillor Allan left the meeting and did not return.

65. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

The following question was received from Councillor Lorna Dupré and responded to as detailed:

Question:

“In view of Tesco’s reported decision not to proceed with the development of a new superstore at Angel Drove in Ely, what is the Leader’s assessment of the effect on his strategy for the district including the Station Gateway and the Ely Southern Bypass, and what action does he propose to take?”

Response from Leader of the Council:

‘The Council was notified by a brief letter to the Chief Executive and Leader of Council this morning and I have had a number of meetings with officers today to assess the implications of the announcement.

From the perspective of this Council, this announcement will not stop me in my determination to make sure that the Government and the County Council can deliver the Ely Southern Bypass.

In terms of the Station Gateway, inevitably this announcement will impact on the original proposal although we have always regarded this development as a long term proposition and much wider than the existing Tesco site. We will take Tesco up on their offer to work with us in the future. I will continue to support those other aspects of the project including the relocation of Standen Engineering for example. I will also ensure that the Council talks to Mantles Estates as a matter of urgency.’

66. **SCHEDULE OF ITEMS RECOMMENDED FROM COMMITTEES AND OTHER MEMBER BODIES**

Council considered a report, P155 previously circulated, detailing a recommendation from Corporate Governance and Finance Committee:

Corporate Governance and Finance Committee – 4 December 2014

Localised Council Tax Reduction Scheme

It was resolved:

That Council note the continuation of the 2014/15 Localised Council Tax Reduction Scheme during 2015/16.

67. **APPLICATION TO DESIGNATE A NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA BY SUTTON PARISH COUNCIL**

Council considered a report, P156, previously circulated, detailing Sutton Parish Council's application to designate Sutton Parish as a Neighbourhood Area. Members noted that the summary of the consultation responses had been circulated on 6 January 2015 and copies were tabled at the meeting.

Richard Kay, Strategic Planning Manager, gave a brief explanatory background to Neighbourhood Planning and Business Area designation and the application from Sutton Parish Council, which was the first application of this nature received by the Council.

Councillor Beckett asked about the potential financial and resource implications for Sutton Parish Council and the District Council. The Strategic Planning Manager stated that these would be dependent on the size and complexity of the Neighbourhood Plan produced by the Parish Council, and could vary from between £5K to £100K. Small grants were available from Central Government to Parish Councils to undertake the work of up to £5K. With regard to assistance from the District Council to the Parish Council, a small Parish would present less of a burden than a larger area such as Ely. Again, Central Government grants were available to Districts of up to £30K on completion of a Plan, which was considered sufficient to reflect the costs of producing an average Neighbourhood Plan. The Strategic Planning Manager stated that the Parish Council was not committed at this stage to actually produce a Plan and could decide not to proceed during the progress of the process.

Councillor Allen referred to the fact that a Neighbourhood Plan could not conflict with District Council Planning policies and queried whether a Neighbourhood Plan could conflict with County Council policies such as a Minerals Strategy. Councillor Allen also queried if the whole of the Sutton Neighbourhood Area was within this District. The Strategic Planning Manager confirmed that the whole of the Sutton Neighbourhood Area was within this District and that a Neighbourhood Plan also must comply with County Council policies such as a Minerals strategy.

Councillor Gareth Wilson referred to the fact that a Parish with a Neighbourhood Plan would receive a greater proportion of CIL of 25% rather than 15%.

Councillor Dupré, as a local Ward Member, gave her wholehearted support to the Sutton application, and congratulated the Parish Council on being the first to submit an application. She highlighted the fact that the application was only for designation at this stage, so the Parish had yet to determine the financial and resource implications of proceeding further.

Councillor Brown stated that the District Council should support Parishes that wished to go down this route.

It was resolved:

- i. That approval be given to the application by Sutton Parish Council to designate Sutton Parish as a Neighbourhood Area without amendment.
- ii. That Council do not designate the Neighbourhood Area as also being a Business Area.

68. **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING: ESTABLISHING GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

Council considered a report, P157 previously circulated, detailing a proposed Guidance Note and Service Standards and governance arrangements for all aspects of Neighbourhood Planning, to establish robust and clear process for dealing with Neighbourhood Planning matters. The Strategic Planning Manager explained the content of the two documents and their intention to give a 'Plain English' summary of what Parishes needed to do and how the District Council would assist them in this.

Councillor Beckett referred to bullet point 1 of paragraph 4.1 of the report and queried how the proposed Guidance Note and Service Standards would commit the Council to go beyond the strictly required minimum standards. The Strategic Planning Manager explained that the Guidance Note and Service Standards would require the District Council to provide reasonable support and advice to the Parish concerned, but would not require them to prepare a Plan for the Parish. The Strategic Planning Manager considered that the requirements on the District Council in the Guidance Note and Service Standards would be manageable within the resources available in the Strategic Planning Team.

Councillor Bailey commended the Guidance Note and Service Standards which were a clear summary of responsibilities on both parties. However, she proposed two amendments to the governance arrangements at Appendix 2 to reflect the fact that Corporate Governance and Finance Committee was the Committee responsible for Strategic Planning matters and to ensure adequate consultation with the Chair of that Committee in respect of the officer delegations.

Councillor Williams stated that the two documents followed the spirit of what was intended in the legislation in respect of Neighbourhood Planning and would promote good relations with Parishes. Therefore, she supported the recommendations.

It was resolved:

- i. That the Guidance Note and Service Standards in respect of Neighbourhood Planning, as attached at Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved and the Note be placed on the Council's website and a copy sent to each Parish Council.

- ii. That the governance arrangements for dealing with all aspects of Neighbourhood Planning, as set out in Appendix 2 to the submitted report, be approved, subject to the following amendments:

Appendix 2 Page 1 3rd paragraph: delete words 'but only if necessary and the matter is of significance' and amend to Chair of Corporate Governance and Finance Committee instead of Chair of Planning Committee.

69. **AMENDMENT TO COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY ANNUAL DELIVERY PLAN 2014/15**

Council considered a report, P158 previously circulated, proposing an amendment to the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Annual Delivery Plan ('ADP') 2014/15, namely formal allocation of £250,000 towards the Ely Leisure Centre.

The Leader of the Council moved the recommendation in the submitted report, which was seconded by Councillor Schumann. In moving the recommendation, the Leader of the Council highlighted the fact that although the facility would be located in Ely, it would benefit the District as a whole.

Councillor Williams stated that it would be difficult to convince people in her Burwell Ward to travel to use the facility in Ely. Councillor Williams also expressed concern at the timing of the proposal, when an Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy and Action Plan for the District was due to be considered at the meeting of the Commercial Services Committee taking place in the following week. Therefore, this item seemed premature and should await the outcome of the wider review. The Corporate Unit Manager explained that only full Council could take a decision on this matter and the proposal was simply to make an allocation at this stage and not actually a commitment to spending. The Chief Executive further elaborated that this would be one of a series of recommendations to limit the Council's risks associated with the provision of the Leisure Centre and to enable it to prepare a prudential borrowing strategy. This did not give any obligation to spend the money.

Councillor Allen endorsed Councillor William's views and queried the implications of the loss of potential CIL/S106 money from the Tesco development on the affordability gap for the Leisure Centre. The Chief Executive stated that there had been no assumption to use Tesco CIL/S106 money in the funding arrangements for the Leisure Centre.

Councillor Stevens stated that the Leisure Centre would not be a benefit for residents in the south of the District. Therefore, he wished to promote the cause of Bottisham Leisure Centre which now had seriously limited public usage due to changes in the funding criteria. Councillor Stevens commented that there were a number of other Leisure facilities in the District which would benefit from CIL/S106 funding which should not be excluded.

Councillor Wright queried if the funding was for a risk assessment. The Chief Executive explained that Corporate Governance and Finance Committee had asked that the Council identify potential funding sources to mitigate the risks associated with the development of the Leisure Centre to inform a prudential borrowing strategy.

Councillor Wright then stated that Littleport Parish Council had written to the Council regarding the detrimental effect of the new Leisure Centre on other existing Leisure facilities in the District. These facilities had been funded by the Council in the past, but were becoming 'old and jaded' and needed funding for updating and upgrading. Therefore, he agreed that the Council should wait for the outcome of the discussions at Community Services Committee on the Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy and Action Plan.

Councillor Gareth Wilson also concurred with this view and suggested that the allocation of £250,000 should be changed so it could be used on District Leisure Centres generally. Councillor Brown queried whether this was possible since it would need to have been included in the Regulation 123 list first. Councillor Wilson questioned why it was necessary to take a decision today, as there was another full Council meeting at the end of February, so it could wait for the discussions at Commercial Services Committee next week.

Councillor Goodge stated that he had sat on the meeting of Governance and Finance Committee when the funding of the Leisure Centre had been discussed and he had been concerned about affordability and the proposed loan over 35 years. There was a £2.5M shortfall in funding for the preferred option and he did not believe that the facility would be a benefit for the whole of the District. It would also have a detrimental impact on the other existing facilities in the District and the Council should be looking after what we already had. The Council also was considering funding for the A14 and Ely Bypass, which was mortgaging the Council for tomorrow.

As Chair of Governance and Finance Committee, Councillor Ellis explained that that, at this stage, Committee and Council were being asked to consider a package of resources to fund the Leisure Centre. Then at a later stage, a decision would be taken as to whether these were all financially viable and the project could proceed.

Councillor Schumann stated that the new Leisure Centre would benefit the whole of the District as it would provide facilities not available in the District at present. The Council was already in discussion with the other Leisure Centres in the District about their needs and the analysis already undertaken showed that the new facility was in the right place for both now and the future. This report was another necessary stage in the process to realise the project which is why it should be supported.

A number of Members queried whether the reference in the Annual Delivery Plan should refer to 'Ely Leisure Centre' or 'District-wide Leisure Centre'. The Chief Executive explained that the implication was clear that this was a District-wide facility and it could be amended in future reports, if necessary.

Upon being put to the vote, a recorded vote was requested on the motion and it was carried with Members voting as follows:

FOR: Councillors Alderson, Christine Ambrose-Smith, David Ambrose-Smith, Bailey, Brown, Cornell, Ellis, Every, Bill Hunt, Kerby, Morris, Palmer, Roberts, Ross, Rouse, Schumann, Willows. (17)

AGAINST: Councillors Allen, Austen, Beckett, Dupré, Jeremy Friend-Smith, Sheila Friend-Smith, Goodge, Harris, Morrison, Stevens, Williams MBE, Gareth Wilson, Pauline Wilson, Wright. (14)

It was resolved:

That the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Annual Delivery Plan ('ADP') 2014/15, as set out in Appendix 1 to the submitted report, be approved.

70. **ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE ON THE GROUNDS OF URGENCY**

Council received a report, P159 previously circulated, regarding action taken by the Chief Executive on the grounds of urgency required to facilitate the change of the Council's Banking provider.

Councillor Beckett queried why this decision had been taken on urgency grounds since the Council had received notice 13 months ago of the termination of the Banking contract with the current provider. The Chief Executive reported that each urgent decision was assessed on a case-by-case basis and asked if the Service Delivery Champion would like to comment. Councillor Gareth Wilson, as Service Delivery Champion, stated that the re-tendering of the Banking contract had been forced on the Council by the current provider, the Co-operative Bank, advising that it was withdrawing from providing Banking services to local authorities. There was currently a period of 3 months parallel running with the new provider and Councillor Wilson commended the large amount of work undertaken by Finance staff to facilitate the transfer. The Chief Executive agreed to provide a written response to Members to clarify the position regarding the November 2013 notice period.

It was resolved:
That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.20pm.

Chairman.....

Date