

## **CABINET**

**WEDNESDAY, 17 AUGUST 2016**

**PRESENT:-** Councillors David Renard (Chair), Oliver Donachie, Toby Elliott, Fionuala Foley, Brian Ford, Dale Heenan, Mary Martin and Garry Perkins.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Russell Holland and Keith Williams.

Councillors Jim Grant, Ray Ballman, Des Moffatt, Bob Wright, Chris Watts, Wayne Crabbe and Jane Milner-Barry attended the meeting in respect of Minute 37.

### **32. Declarations of Interest**

The Chair reminded members of the need to declare known interests in any matters to be considered at the meeting.

Councillor Dale Heenan declared a personal, but not prejudicial interest, in respect of agenda item 5 (Community Governance Review) as he is chair of Nythe Parish Council.

### **33. Minutes**

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **34. Section 100B(4)(b), Local Government Act 1972**

The Chair advised the meeting that, in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, he intended that a report relating to Agenda Item No. 6 “Seqol – Update”, be received at the meeting as a matter of urgency to allow Cabinet to be briefed on the current position.

### **35. Exempt Items - Exclusion of Press and Public**

Resolved – That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the discussion of the matters referred to in the item listed below, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in the respective paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Item No.	Paragraph No.	Minute No.
6	3	37

### **36. Public Question Time**

Mr Brian Cockbill, a local resident, had submitted a written question regarding the

anticipated new income as a result of proposed changed governance arrangements. The Chair thanked Mr Cockbill for his question and advised that a written answer had been provided and that this had been circulated at the meeting.

Mr Cockbill asked a supplementary question regarding the calculations that supported the estimate of anticipated new income resulting from the proposed changed governance arrangements. Councillor Martin, the Cabinet Member for Communities, agreed to provide a written response in 10 working days.

Ms Helen Jackson, a local resident, had submitted a written question about the effects of changes to the Dial A Ride Service. As Ms Jackson was not present, the Chair requested that a copy of the written answer circulated at the meeting be sent to her.

Ms Bridget Coady, a local resident, had submitted a written question about the effects of changes to the Dial A Ride Service. As Ms Coady was not present, the Chair requested that a copy of the written answer circulated at the meeting be sent to her.

Mr Martin Newman, a local resident, asked a question about the costs and budget provision for the Community Governance Review. The Chair thanked Mr Newman for his question and advised that a written answer had been provided, which was circulated at the meeting.

Mr Newman asked a supplementary question about the Council's project management and allocation of costs. Councillor Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities responded at the meeting.

Mrs Anne Richards, Wroughton Parish Council, asked two questions relating to the proposed changes to the Wroughton parish boundary affecting Middle and West Wichel and a supplementary question concerning the distribution of the proposed leaflet. The Chair thanked Mrs Richards for her questions and Councillor Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities., responded at the meeting.

Mr Colin Doubleday, a local resident, asked a question about the statistical analysis used to define the proposed parish boundaries and a supplementary question about how any boundaries in this review might be further adjusted in future. The Chair thanked Mr Doubleday for his questions. Councillor Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities, and the Director of Law and Democratic Services, responded at the meeting.

Mr Roy Worman, Haydon View Residents' Association, asked a question about the arrangements to distribute an information leaflet about the next stage of the Community Governance Review and a supplementary question about the costs of any consultants used to advise the Council about the Review. The Chair thanked Mr Doubleday for his questions. Councillor Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities, and the Director of Law and Democratic Services, responded at the meeting.

### **37. Community Governance Review**

Councillor David Renard, the Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet, Councillor Russell Holland, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance

and Corporate Services, Councillor Keith Williams, Cabinet Member for Streetsmart, Councillor Mary Martin, Cabinet Member for Communities, and the Corporate Director Resources and Director of Law and Democratic Services, submitted a joint report on the outcomes of Stage 2 of the Community Governance Review (CGR) and seeking Cabinet's approval to take the draft proposal to formal public consultation in Stage 3 of the Review.

Councillor Martin introduced the report and explained how the recommendations had been developed from the responses to the illustrative maps. She drew members' attention to paragraph 3.12 of the report, which set out the arguments against a single town council as well as referring to the two opposing views over the future of Blunsdon St Andrew Parish. Councillor Martin encouraged members and residents to respond to the consultation and stated that she would offer to convene a meeting at which those who made submissions would have an opportunity to talk with her about them.

Following her presentation of the report, Councillor Martin responded to questions put by Councillors Jim Grant (JG), Ray Ballman (RB), Des Moffatt (DM), Bob Wright (BW), Chris Watts (CW), Wayne Crabbe (WC) and Jane Milner-Barry (JM-B) on the following issues:

- The view that the introduction of new parishes was a means of raising additional revenue (JG).
- The potentially adverse effects of any parish precept on the borough's lowest income households (JG).
- Community engagement with the CGR process and concerns about the consultation process utilised by the Council.
  - the opportunity for cross-party input to the content of the information leaflet to be submitted to all households (JG).
- The method of distribution of the information leaflet to households and concerns that previous leaflet drops had omitted some areas of the borough (RB).
- The potentially misleading information in the report regarding the potential precept yield (DM).
- The judgement remaining to be made by the Council with regard to the transfer of parish specific and/or general reserves (DM).
- The commitment of local businesses to meet costs associated with streetsmart services on industrial estates (DM).
- The suggestion that Councillors should be excluded from involvement in the determination of new Parish boundaries (DM).
- Concerns that the proposals would result in the establishment of poorer inner city areas surrounded by richer suburbs (DM and BW).
- The potential conflict of interest arising where Borough Councillors were voting on matters that might be perceived as benefitting them in their additional capacity, or future capacity, as Parish Councillors (BW).
- The process by which the CGR was "triggered"(BW).
- The suggestion that the CGR might be delayed to allow members to be better informed about the process and in order that they might better articulate the detail of that process to the public (BW).
- Possible mechanisms by which the Council might ensure there is sufficient revenue to maintain effective Streetsmart services in the town centre (CW).
- The effectiveness of parish councils and the relative perceived advantages of

a single large parish or a larger number of smaller, community-based parishes (WC, CW, JM-B).

Resolved – (1) That the feedback received from stage two of the Community Governance Review, summarised in the report, be noted.

(2) That it be agreed that there should be parishes across the entire Borough in order that the identities and interests of communities are reflected and to enable effective and convenient means to provide options for local service provision.

(3) That the draft proposal map, at Appendix Four to the report, showing proposed boundaries of existing and new parishes, be agreed for consultation as Stage 3 of the CGR.

(4) That the Director of Law and Democratic Services be authorised to:

1. Prepare all materials, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities, for the proposed consultation.
2. Undertake consultation on the draft proposal and report the results back to Cabinet and Council.

(5) That it be noted that Council will be asked to consider the consultation feedback and agree the final recommendations of the CGR process at its meeting on 10th November 2016.

(6) That it be noted that discussions are on-going with the business community around making a contribution to the cost of street cleaning services in commercial areas of the Borough.

(7) That it be noted that, as areas become developed, there may be requests for a community governance review in a few years to reflect more accurately the new community identity interests and to enable effective and convenient means to provide options for local service provision.

(8) That, with reference to concerns that previous leaflet drops had omitted some areas of the borough, the Chief Executive be asked to review the method proposed to be utilised in relation to the distribution of the next CGR information leaflet to all households.

The reasons for the decision and alternative options are as set out in the report to the meeting.

**38.**

### **SEQOL - Update**

This Item was withdrawn.