

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD  
AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES ON THURSDAY 15 NOVEMBER 2007**

**MEMBERS**

\* Cllr R J Carter – Chairman

\* Cllr B F Cane – Vice-Chairman

* Cllr K J Baldry	* Cllr M J Howarth
* Cllr N A Barnes	* Cllr C W Jones
* Cllr H D Bastone	* Cllr L P Jones
* Cllr J H Baverstock	* Cllr R M Lawrence
* Cllr J I G Blackler	∅ Cllr I Longrigg
* Cllr J Brazil	* Cllr D W May
* Cllr B E Carson	* Cllr D M O'Callaghan
* Cllr P H Cook	* Cllr C M Pannell
* Cllr S E Cooper	* Cllr J T Pennington
* Cllr P Coulson	∅ Cllr S L Rankin
* Cllr R F Croad	* Cllr R Rowe
* Cllr G Date	* Cllr M F Saltern
* Cllr G J Fielden	* Cllr J W Squire
* Cllr R D Gilbert	* Cllr R C Steer
* Cllr F J Hawke	* Cllr M Stone
* Cllr J D Hawkins	* Cllr R J Tucker
* Cllr T J Hewitt	* Cllr R J Vint
* Cllr M J Hicks	* Cllr A Ward
* Cllr P W Hitchins	* Cllr J A Westacott

\* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apology for absence

Officers in attendance:

For all items: Chief Executive, Strategic Director (Community), Strategic Director (Operations), Strategic Director (Resources), Deputy Monitoring Officer and Member Support Services Manager.

50/07      **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 13 September 2007 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

51/07      **URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chairman announced that there were two items of urgent business which required consideration.

The first item related to the recent Queen's Speech in which the Government announced plans for a Planning Reform Bill. This item was considered urgent due to the need to make representations before the next Council meeting on 20 December 2007 and would be considered as Item 7(a) (Minute 54/07(a) below refers).

The second item related to the annual review of rates and charges at Salcombe Harbour. This item was considered urgent due to the urgent need to confirm the Salcombe Harbour Fees and Charges 2008/09 and would be considered as Item 7(b) (Minute 54/07(b) below refers).

52/07

### **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Council noted a list of civic engagements attended by the Chairman.

The Chairman wished to make particular reference to his pride at representing the Council at the Remembrance Service at 42 Commando, Bickleigh Barracks, Plymouth on Sunday, 11 November 2007.

53/07

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting. These were recorded as follows:-

Cllrs P H Cook and P Coulson declared prejudicial interests in Item 7(b): 'Review of Charges – Harbour Rates and Charges 2008/2009' (Minute 54/07(b)) below refers). Cllr Cook declared her interest by virtue of her husband renting a mooring at Salcombe Harbour. Cllr Coulson declared his interest by virtue of his renting of a mooring. Both Members proceeded to leave the meeting during consideration of this item;

Cllr F J Hawke declared a personal interest in Item 12(f) 'Reports of Bodies – Prosperity Policy Development Group: 25 October 2007' (Minute 59/07(f) below refers) by virtue of both his involvement as a local league football referee and his occasional use of the Dartmouth Lower Ferry (Minute PPDG.05/07 also refers) and remained in the meeting during consideration of this item;

Cllr F J Hawke also declared a personal interest in Item 12(i) 'Reports of Bodies – Licensing Committee: 17 October 2007' (Minute 59/07(i) below refers) by virtue of his ownership of a taxi company and remained in the meeting during consideration of this item;

Cllr F J Hawke also declared a personal interest in Item 12(l) 'Reports of Bodies – Standards Committee: 24 October 2007' (Minute 59/07(l) below refers) by virtue of both parties involved in the hearing of the complaint being fellow Dartmouth Town Councillors and remained in the meeting during consideration of this item.

54/07

**BUSINESS BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE CHAIRMAN****a) The Planning Reform Bill**

The Leader of Council advised that it had become apparent during the current consultation stage on the Totnes and Dartington Development Plan Document (DPD) – Preferred Options that the response forms issued by Government were highly complicated. As a consequence, the Leader wished to recommend that a letter be sent to central government (and copied to the Local Government Association) on behalf of the Council and signed by the Leader of the Minority Groups and himself. The letter would outline the concerns of the Council about the difficulties facing members of the public who were, he felt, being discouraged from submitting their views.

In support of this proposal, a Member stated that a number of local residents in the Totnes area were reiterating this concern and felt the complexities of the process were obstructing many from submitting representations on the DPD. The Member felt that this issue was likely to be a recurring problem when consulting upon other Local Development Framework related Documents. This issue was also felt to be particularly pertinent when bearing in mind the Statement of Community Involvement committed the Council to involving everyone in the consultation process.

**RESOLVED**

That a letter be sent to Government by the Leader of Council and the Leader of the Minority Groups, outlining the Council's concerns, with regard to the present Government Regulations on consultation.

**b) Review of Charges – Harbour Rates and Charges 2008/2009**

Council considered a report from the Salcombe Harbour Master which requested Members to set the Harbour rates and charges for 2008/2009.

The report made reference to the proposed fees and charges, following the guidelines set out in the Harbour Board's Strategic Business Plan. The proposals were felt to go some way to redressing the imbalance in the fees and charges between resident and visiting yachtsmen.

The report stated that the proposals to freeze the fees and charges for visiting yachtsmen for a second year and the introduction of a range of promotions was designed to halt the trend of reducing visitor numbers and re-establish Salcombe as a destination of choice.

### **RESOLVED**

That Council approve the proposed charges (as outlined in the presented Annex A to the report), for implementation from 1 April 2008, on the recommendation of the Harbour Master and the Executive Member with responsibility for Salcombe Harbour.

55/07

### **QUESTIONS**

It was noted that the following questions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8:-

#### **From Cllr Ward to Cllr Tucker, Leader of Council**

- (i) *Can the Council guarantee that there will be no threat to the continued operation of pannier markets, or loss of the current amount of market trading space in the market square in Totnes, as a result of proposals in the Totnes DPD?*

In response, Cllr Tucker advised that assurances could be found in proposal 3 for the Market Square and Civic Hall area of the DPD, which he was committed to achieving.

#### **From Cllr Ward to Cllr Hitchins, Deputy Leader of Council**

- (ii) *Given the scale of the challenge we are facing with climate change, why is this Council not consulting and involving the community on its climate change strategy and action plan given that we have committed 'to prepare a plan with our local communities, including key stakeholders within the health and business sectors to mitigate the causes of climate change and fuel poverty' and 'encourage all sectors in the local community to take the opportunity to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions and to make public their commitment to action' (Devon declaration on climate change and fuel poverty)?*

In response, Cllr Hitchins stated that the Council acknowledged that it had signed the Devon Declaration on Climate Change and Fuel Poverty and, in line with the Climate Change Action Plan, was working towards meeting the obligations by 2011.

The Council had now adopted the Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan following consultation with key stakeholders from the South Hams Strategic Partnership, which included representatives of the health, business and voluntary sectors. The current strategy largely focused on the Council role, rather than the role of the wider community. This was because in December 2005, the Council determined that it would seek to address Climate Change issues as a cross cutting theme underpinning the Council's corporate priorities.

The strategy was in the public domain, and a draft was first considered in open session by the Environment Policy Development Group in September 2006. Whilst the Council could undertake wider consultation, for such consultation to be meaningful, it would require significant staff time. There would need to be a value for money assessment on whether such an exercise would add significant benefit to the Council's proposed actions. Furthermore, the Council would need to decide what area of other activity it would wish to delay to enable wider consultation to take place.

Cllr Ward asked as a supplementary question querying how the community could prepare for climate change and adapt to risks if it was not involved in the strategy and action plan. In response, Cllr Hitchins stated that such issues could be considered during the Council budget setting process for 2008/09 and the imminent review of the Corporate Priorities of the Council.

*(iii) Why is this Council not making a commitment to a yearly target for reducing its carbon emissions, given that the council has committed to 'publicly declare, within the plan, a commitment to achieving a significant reduction in greenhouse gases' (Devon declaration on climate change and fuel poverty)?*

In response, Cllr Hitchins advised that the adopted strategy included an action plan which would help the Council reduce its carbon footprint. Where possible, sustainability targets were included, for example in relation to Home Energy Conservation Act work; by ensuring that the development of publicly funded housing schemes and employment units met sustainability standards; the proportion of 'green' electricity purchased to serve Council buildings; and our waste recycling and composting targets. Future work could enable us to set a yearly target for reducing carbon emissions across all the Council's activities.

In asking a supplementary, Cllr Ward questioned whether the Council was actually serious about tackling climate change, when comparing the work being undertaken by Teignbridge District Council which she felt was facing similar financial constraints. In response, Cllr Hitchins emphasised that the Council was committed to climate change, but had to prioritise its resources.

*(iv) How is the Council going to measure its progress on carbon reduction when the climate change action plan has no targets or actions which are precise and measurable and set within a defined time frame?*

Cllr Hitchins highlighted that, as stated in response to the second question, the adopted strategy included targets where possible. At this stage, the Council was not in a position to identify specific targets across all areas of its activities. The strategy provided the Council with a direction of travel and for some areas the strategy indicated that policy development or further research was required to enable meaningful targets to be set.

For example, in relation to identifying the Council's base line carbon footprint, investigation of vehicle fleet management to reduce fuel use, and increase the use of greener fuels, and developing a staff and Member travel plan which would be linked to the promotion of home working to reduce the need for travel. In the absence of the research and related policy development, it would not be realistic to establish targets.

The Council also acknowledged that the requirements on local authorities may increase as a result of anticipated Climate Change legislation. The Council would expect any additional responsibilities imposed on it to be supported by appropriate resourcing from the Government.

In her supplementary question, Cllr Ward enquired as to why the Council appeared to be waiting for the government to impose legislation, rather than simply making progress in this area. Cllr Hitchins responded by stating that the Council would take a measured and responsive approach.

#### **From Cllr Baldry to Cllr May, Executive Member for Financial Affairs**

*(v) What is the total annual postage expenditure of South Hams District Council? Who makes the decision on the class of service and size of envelope used for items put into the post and on what basis?*

In response, Cllr May stated that the Council's total expenditure on postage for the financial year 2006/07 was £156,393. The Council had a policy to send all items of post by 2nd class if possible, with the decision on this matter and the size of envelope used ultimately being determined by the manager in each service area.

Cllr Baldry asked a supplementary question regarding his belief that far too much correspondence was sent in the first class post, which in fact he felt should be sent second class. Cllr May responded by advising that he would investigate the matter further.

## **From Cllr Baldry to Cllr Carson, Executive Member for Clean Environment**

*(vi) At the Meeting of the Council Executive held on 30 January 2003, in reply to a public question, the Vice Chairman of the Executive said: ".....the increasing cost of maintaining all of our toilets is not sustainable in the longer term for this Council....."*

*At the Meeting of the Full Council on 29 March 2007 in answer to a question from Cllr Brazil about how many public lavatories are to be closed in the near future, the Executive Member for the Clean Environment said: "a further 4 may be closed for operational reasons in the future". The Executive's policy for maintaining and providing public lavatories is unclear. What is the current policy on closure?*

In response, Cllr Carson stated that Members had been asked to consider a range of potential toilet closures in recent years, but had chosen not to undertake these on a large scale. However, where there had been opportunities or requirements to rationalise the current provision or transfer facilities to other organisations, this had taken place. For example, Dartington toilets were closed and demolished following local concerns about anti-social behaviour, Leechwell toilets (Totnes) had been demolished as part of the Southern Area re-development, Vennford toilets had been transferred to Dartmoor National Park Authority, Mothecombe toilets had been transferred to the owners of the café - Flete Estates and he believed that Yealmpton toilets had been converted into a house.

Any proposals for future changes in management arrangements or retention of facilities would be considered against a number of issues including:

- Opportunities to transfer management to other organisations;
- Structural defects or major refurbishment costs;
- Anti-social behaviour;
- Low levels of usage;
- Proximity of other facilities.

Where closure was being considered this would involve local consultation before any decisions were taken.

In his supplementary question, Cllr Baldry highlighted inconsistencies in responsibility for maintenance costs across the South Hams. In response, Cllr Carson reiterated that any opportunities which may arise with regard to public conveniences, would be considered in accordance with the five-point criteria as outlined above.

### **From Cllr Baldry to Cllr Tucker, Leader of Council**

*(vii) A number of parish councils are receiving requests from the necessary number of parishioners for a local referendum on whether the European Reform Treaty should be signed. These referenda are paid for by the local parish taxpayers. In the case of my parish, Yealmpton, I have been quoted a cost of £1,000. Would the District Council organise a District wide referendum, in order to let the government know the views of the entire District, rather than just those of a few parishes?*

In response, Cllr Tucker stated that he did not believe that such a Poll would be appropriate or necessary. Members would recall that at its meeting on 13 September, the Council resolved to urge the Prime Minister to call a National Referendum on the proposed European Union Reform Treaty. The views of the district were conveyed and made clear to the Prime Minister. Consequently the view was expressed that it would not be a prudent use of the Council Taxpayers money to hold such a referendum. Moreover, the legislation relating to District Polls was different to that relating to Parish Polls. A District Poll must relate to the services provided by the Council or the financing of those services. Therefore, Cllr Tucker did not believe that such a Poll would fall within the legislative powers available to the Council.

In stating his belief that residents would be bitterly disappointed at this response, Cllr Baldry asked a supplementary question regarding whether the Council would be willing to bear the cost of such a Poll. In response, Cllr Tucker advised that the Council would be unwilling to bear such a cost.

### **From Cllr Brazil to Cllr Saltern, Executive Member for Housing**

*(viii) Given that we have torn up our Special Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing. Given that officers stick rigidly to thresholds specified by government and perhaps most relevant given that we build less affordable houses than neighbouring local authorities, why are we a Beacon Council for Affordable Housing?*

In response, Cllr Saltern thanked Cllr Brazil for submitting the question and was grateful for the opportunity to put the record straight in light of recent reports in the media. Cllr Saltern stressed that the Council had not 'torn up' its Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on affordable housing, it had been overtaken by events largely outside of the Council's control. However, the Council now had a new LDF coming in to place, and our updated SPG for affordable housing would shortly be out for consultation.

The Beacon Council award for our work on affordable housing was made in 2005-2006. The Council was one of only four Beacons in the country and one of two rural authorities. The reason that our efforts were still recognised by external bodies was as follows:

- We had a cross-Council corporate commitment to supporting affordable housing, shared by Members and staff;

- We worked with and engaged local communities to address their concerns about development e.g. Sherford, Totnes Southern Area, and St. Barnabas in Dartmouth;
- We used funding to support our Registered Social Landlord partners e.g. East Allington and Bonfire Hill;
- We provided discounted land to support affordable housing schemes e.g. the depot site in Kingsbridge, and land at Townstal;
- We were encouraging our Local Strategic Partners to use their assets in a similar way to us, to enable the development of affordable housing schemes, by disposing of land at below market price;
- We were investing so that we could make early progress with the LDF, and our documents had been some of the first adopted in the Country. The identification of sites in each LDF document would help affordable housing delivery. Our new rural affordable housing team were also identifying sites which we could bring forward in advance of the LDF;
- We were piloting new ideas such as the role of Community Land Trusts using Beacon money;
- We currently had 125 affordable dwellings under construction.

In asking a supplementary, Cllr Brazil questioned whether Cllr Saltern shared the frustrations at the perceived lack of housing being built and felt that the Council had fallen behind other local authorities in terms of the numbers of dwellings being built. In response, Cllr Saltern acknowledged that residents were frustrated but emphasised that the beacon award was given as recognition of the direction of travel which the Council was taking and assured those present that the Council was held in the very highest regard nationally on affordable housing matters. Cllr Saltern also made reference to the comments published in the Housing and Market Needs Assessment regarding the extreme combination of related factors facing the Council.

**From Cllr O’Callaghan to Cllr May, Executive Member for Financial Affairs**

*(ix) In view of the recent permanent closure of the Totnes Pavilion café, and the sudden reduction in opening hours of the café at Quayside Leisure Centre, Kingsbridge, during the half-term holiday, will the Executive Member explain what conditions exist in the Council’s contract with Tone Leisure to protect the interests of customers in respect of catering facilities, and why these are failing to do so?*

In response, Cllr May advised that the provision of catering was not a core leisure function, but an additional service provided for the benefit of customers. It was not covered as a performance indicator for Tone Leisure.

The situation at Totnes was that new catering arrangements were being discussed and we hoped would be introduced in the near future.

Cllr O'Callaghan asked a supplementary question regarding whether the opening hours were specified in the original contract. In response, Cllr May stated that he would report back to the Member at the earliest possible opportunity.

**From Cllr O'Callaghan to Cllr Carson, Executive Member for Clean Environment**

*(x) In Kingsbridge, we are making it a priority to look for a permanent site for a skatepark, after the previous one was dismantled more than three years ago because of noise issues. Why then are we being told that a possible site currently used by Western Power does not meet with favour within the District Council because of the need for long-stay car parking? Since when was car parking a corporate priority of the Council, or even a cross-cutting theme as youth provision is?*

In response, Cllr Carson stated that whilst the efforts to identify an alternative site for a skateboard park were to be commended, the Western Power site was not a viable option. It was directly linked with the proposed supermarket development at Cookworthy Road which would be displacing the existing public car parking at that location. The planning consent for the supermarket specifically included provision of public car parking at the Western Power site, and when the development goes ahead, the land would be transferred to the Council for that specific purpose.

It was also important to note that while car parking in itself was not a corporate priority, the Council did have a priority to support economic development and jobs. The lack of adequate car parking for visitors, and shoppers in Kingsbridge could undermine the long term viability of the town centre and consequently affect jobs in local offices, other employment units, and shops.

In response to a supplementary question, Cllr Carson highlighted that the Council was very keen to support skateboarding and the series of events which caused the closure of the skatepark in Kingsbridge were unfortunate. Whilst the Council would do all that it could to find a suitable site, any such loss of car parking could have a disastrous effect on the viability of Kingsbridge town centre.

**From Cllr O'Callaghan to Cllr Tucker, Leader of Council**

*(xi) What happened to the thousands of pounds raised by Kingsbridge youngsters for the initial skatepark? Is it gaining interest for them, and under what circumstances will it be released?*

In response, Cllr Tucker stated that the original sum raised by young people (£10,875) towards the recreation ground skate park was spent in constructing the original facility and so no sum of money remained to gain interest. The Council had been actively seeking a new permanent site for a skate park with the Police, Town Council and Youth Service, but no site had been identified that would meet all the necessary criteria.

The Council was an active partner in the current initiative to hire and manage equipment, making space available on the Quay Car Park and by contributing £5,000 secured through a planning agreement to support recreation for young people. We would continue to serve on the skate park working group looking for the permanent site.

For clarity, Cllr O'Callaghan asked a supplementary question regarding the remaining funds raised initially by the youngsters towards a skatepark. Cllr Tucker responded by informing that all of the monies raised by the youngsters had been spent on the original skatepark facility.

#### 56/07 **NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

The Chairman advised that no motions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1.

#### 57/07 **AMENDMENT TO COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**

A report was considered which informed the Council of a proposed change in the Scheme of Delegation relating to the cautioning of offenders for benefit fraud. With a view to working more efficiently, the report proposed that the Head of Corporate Services be authorised to delegate to the Head of Customer Services the power to administer formal cautions.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Head of Corporate Services be authorised to delegate to the Head of Customer Services the power to administer formal cautions in relation to overpayments of housing benefit and/or council tax benefit.

#### 58/07 **APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL BODIES**

Consideration was given to a report which sought to make appointments to Council Bodies.

In addition to those nominations in the report presented to the Council, Cllr Ward was also **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** to fill the position of Vice-Chairman of the Environment Policy Development Group. The Chairman advised that this position would be determined by a show of hands.

**RESOLVED**

That with immediate effect for the remainder of the 2007/2008 municipal year:-

- a) Cllr Hewitt be appointed to serve on the Executive;
- b) Cllr Hicks be confirmed as Vice-Chairman of the Environment Policy Development Group; and
- c) Cllr Rankin be appointed to serve on the Environment Policy Development Group.

59/07

**REPORTS OF BODIES****RESOLVED**

That the minutes and recommendations of the undermentioned bodies be received and approved subject to any amendments listed below:-

- (a) Development Control Committee 10 October 2007
- (b) Scrutiny 20 September 2007
- (c) Scrutiny 18 October 2007

**SC.28/07 Agenda Items for Future Meetings of Scrutiny**

A Member expressed his deep concern at the disbandment of the Patients Forum and advised that it was his wish for such bodies to be re-constructed.

- (d) Personnel Panel 6 September 2007
- (e) Personnel Panel 18 October 2007
- (f) Prosperity Policy Development Group 25 October 2007

**PPDG.08/07 Review of Car Parking and Pannier Market Charges 2008/09**

Members stressed that all Pay and Display charging options would be re-considered after the consultation period had expired.

For clarity, Members were requested to read the Bulletin article relating to option (c), which outlined how the proposals could work.

- (g) Community Policy Development Group 27 September 2007

In presenting the minutes of the Group, the Chairman praised the expertise of the officers in the Forward Planning service and reminded Members to contact officers if they were aware of any potential sites suitable for affordable housing development.

- (h) Environment Policy Development Group 31 October 2007

### **EPDG.6/07 Climate Change Policy and Strategy**

A Member wished for it to be recorded that the Council's Liberal Democrat Group not only disapproved of the proposed Climate Change Policy but also felt it to be incoherent and ineffectual. In addition, the Group believed that approval should have been delayed until the document had been properly drafted.

The Member was also of the belief that, in light of the intention for the proposed Climate Change Officer post to be self-financing, the recruitment process should commence at the earliest opportunity.

### **EPDG.7/07 Review of Household Waste Collection Services**

In response to a question, officers advised that the figures referred and presented to the Group meeting were actual costs.

- (i) Licensing Committee 17 October 2007

### **L.3/07 Hackney Carriages – Table of Fares 2008/09**

#### **RESOLVED**

1. That in respect of hackney carriages operating within South Hams District Council, the maximum fares which may be charged should be set in accordance with the Table of Fares (as attached to the appendix of the presented agenda report); and
2. That the Table of Fares be advertised and come into effect in accordance with the provisions of Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

### **L.4/07 Draft Statement of Licensing Policy for 2008/11**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Statement of Licensing Policy be approved.

- (j) Salcombe Harbour Board 25 September 2007

**SH.32/07 Moorings Policy**

**RESOLVED**

That the Moorings Policy be adopted.

- |     |                        |                  |
|-----|------------------------|------------------|
| (k) | Salcombe Harbour Board | 12 November 2007 |
| (l) | Standards Committee    | 24 October 2007  |
| (m) | Executive              | 4 October 2007   |

**E.53/07 Adoption of South Hams Public Space Strategy – ‘Special Places and Active Spaces’**

**RESOLVED**

That the Public Space Strategy and Action Plan be adopted.

**E.59/07 Ex Council House Sale – Request by Prospective Buyers for Consent to Purchase Ex Council House Without Compliance with the Three Year Residency / Work in Devon Requirement**

**RESOLVED**

That the Scheme of Delegation be amended to make provision for the Head of Community Regeneration (or such senior advisor with responsibility for the housing function), in consultation with the Leader of Council and Lead Executive Member, to have authority to approve an application for the sale to purchasers who do not meet the usual residence and/or work status criteria, in cases of exceptional circumstances.

**E.60/07 – Reports of Other Bodies**

**b) Community Policy Development Group – 27 September 2007**

**CPDG.12/07 Affordable Housing Delivery and Policy Position**

**RESOLVED**

That officers continue to:

1. work to progress the targets and thresholds set out in the adopted and emerging South Hams Local Development Framework (LDF) documents; and
2. negotiate for departure sites on the basis of obtaining as high a proportion of affordable housing as possible, taking account of the policies set out in the adopted and emerging LDF documents.

(n) Executive

8 November 2007

**E.65/07 Budget Proposals 2008/2009 – Review of Charges**

**RESOLVED**

That the proposed fees and charges, as set out in the report presented to Members, be approved.

**E.69/07 Honorary Aldermen**

**RESOLVED**

That the criteria for appointing Honorary Aldermen of the Council, as set out in the report presented to Members, be approved.

**E.70/07 – Reports of Other Bodies**

**a) Prosperity Policy Development Group – 25 October 2007**

**PPDG.06/07 Review of Charges – Outdoor Recreation 2008/2009**

**RESOLVED**

1. That the level of charging for 2008/2009 be increased by 3%; and
2. That the amended charges for outdoor recreation, as set out in Appendix A of the published report, be agreed.

**PPDG.07/07 Review of Waste Charges 2008/2009**

**RESOLVED**

1. That a rental charge for trade waste containers be introduced as detailed in the published report;
2. That the charges for trade waste services for 2008/09 be increased by a minimum 4% together with the additional cost of landfill tax, dependant on the outcome of the investigation carried out in accordance with the differential charging for trade waste services throughout the district; and
3. That the other waste charges as described in Appendix A of the presented report be introduced for 2008/09.

**PPDG.08/07 Review of Car Parking and Pannier Market Charges 2008/09**

**RESOLVED**

1. That subject to a cost analysis of tabled option (c) (as presented to Members) being undertaken, the proposed increase in Pay and Display charges for 2008/09 be one of the options tabled and duly consulted upon accordingly;
2. That all other chargeable services within Car and Boat Parking, together with Pannier Markets, should be in line with the detail contained in the report presented to Members.

**b) Environment Policy Development Group – 31 October 2007**

**EPDG.7/07 Review of Household Waste Collection Services**

A Member questioned as to why the Executive had approved the recommendation of the Group to oppose weekly collections when a decision was not needed until May 2008 and Scrutiny was still to consider the issue at its 21 February 2008 meeting. In response, the Leader advised that the decision had been taken due to the requirement to commence the budget setting process and the recommendations of the Group being deemed acceptable by the Executive.

(Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 3.15 pm).

---

Chairman