

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOUTH HAMS DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD
AT FOLLATON HOUSE, TOTNES ON THURSDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2010**

MEMBERS

* Cllr M Stone – Chairman

* Cllr J H Baverstock – 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 I G Blackler	* Cllr R M Lawrence
* Cllr J Brazil	* Cllr I Longrigg
* Cllr B F Cane	* Cllr D W May
* Cllr B E Carson	* Cllr D M O’Callaghan
* Cllr R J Carter	* Cllr C M Pannell
* Cllr P H Cook	* Cllr J T Pennington
∅ Cllr S E Cooper	∅ Cllr S L Rankin
* Cllr P Coulson	* Cllr R Rowe
* Cllr R F Croad	* Cllr M F Saltern
* Cllr G J Fielden	* Cllr J W Squire
* Cllr R D Gilbert	* Cllr R C Steer
* Cllr M Hannaford	* Cllr R J Tucker
* Cllr F J Hawke	* Cllr R J Vint
∅ Cllr J D Hawkins	* Cllr A Ward
* Cllr M J Hicks	* Cllr J A Westacott MBE
* Cllr P W Hitchins	

* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apology for absence

Officers in attendance and participating:

For all items: Strategic Management Team, Monitoring Officer, Head of Financial Services, Head of Environment Services and Member Support Services Manager

74/09

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 17 December 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

As a procedural matter, a Member questioned whether the Council minutes should provide an indication on the break down of how each vote was determined. The Chief Executive responded that it was normal practice for such requests to be either by virtue of a recorded vote or the right to require an individual vote to be recorded (Council Procedure Rules 15.5 and 15.6 refer). In addition, the current procedure of recording Council decisions was widely recognised as the established practice.

75/09

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:-

Cllr H D Bastone declared a prejudicial interest in Item 10: 'Budget Proposals 2010/11' (Minute 79/09 below refers) specifically in relation to recommendation 9 part (b) by virtue of his managing of reserved parking spaces and garages. In light of a debate ensuing on this matter, Cllr Bastone proceeded to leave the meeting room during the debate and vote on this part of the item.

Cllr Bastone also declared a personal interest in Item 10: 'Budget Proposals 2010/11' (Minute 79/09 below refers) specifically in relation to the proposed fees and charges for Dartmouth Lower Ferry and the Trade Waste service and remained in the meeting during the discussion and vote on these matters.

Cllr R D Gilbert declared a prejudicial interest in Item 13(j): 'Reports of Bodies – Executive: 21 January 2010' (Minute 82/09(j) below refers), specifically in relation to the East Portlemouth public conveniences which were referred to in the Capital Programme item and proceeded to leave the meeting room during the debate and vote on this item.

76/09

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

In light of the close link between agenda Item 9(a): 'Notice of Motion and Item 11: 'Local Government Review – Oral Update', the Chairman advised that it was his intention for consideration to be given to Item 11 before Item 9(a) (minutes 78/09 and 79/09 below refer).

The Council proceeded to note a list of Civic Engagements attended by the Chairman during which particular reference was made to the pending retirement of Canon Simon Wright. The Chairman expressed his sincere wishes to the Canon and hoped that he would have a long and happy retirement.

77/09

QUESTIONS

It was noted that one question had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8.

From Cllr C Jones to Cllr Carson, lead Executive Member for Distinct Environment

“Following the continued threats made to town and parish councils that they must enter urgently into 'partnership arrangements' with SHDC for the future management of play areas, please will the Executive Member for Distinct Environment inform Council which town and parish councils have now agreed to enter into new financial arrangements for 2010/11, and precisely how much money each will be paying to SHDC in respect of play areas within their town or parish which are: a) owned by SHDC and b) not owned by SHDC.”

In response, Cllr Carson made the following points:-

- The need for the Council to make difficult decisions about funding discretionary services, at a time when it was anticipated that the availability of public finance would significantly reduce was highlighted;
- The success of partnership initiatives, such as shared contributions to play areas, could be one way that the Council could continue to provide facilities that were important to local residents;
- The Council had for many years provided a service to town and parishes free of charge;
- The Council wished to continue to provide this service through a partnership arrangement, whereby town and parish councils contributed £100 per play area during 2010/11;
- To date, virtually all parishes and groups who owned their own facilities had agreed to contribute, which would provide £3,900 income. Those that had not responded were currently being asked to confirm whether they wished for the service to continue;
- With regard to those town and parish councils who had been asked to make a contribution towards the service on Council owned sites, the response had been mixed. The majority of councils sought further information on the devolvement of open space assets, including play areas and it was, therefore, too early to be precise about the level of funds to be raised.

In asking a supplementary question, Cllr Jones referred to the lack of contributions being made to date from any town councils. In contrast, a large number of parish councils had made contributions and the Member therefore questioned how these trends could amount to a 'deep commitment to the rural parishes of the South Hams in the allocation of Council resources on a fair and equitable basis' as per the Council resolution on 29 October 2009 (Minute 54/09(b) refers). In reply, Cllr Carson reiterated the budgetary pressures facing the Council and whilst negotiations were still ongoing, the Council was looking at such options as a means of funding discretionary services.

78/09

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW – ORAL UPDATE

The Leader of Council advised that the Prime Minister was due to visit Exeter on Friday, 5 February 2010. Rumours were circulating that during this visit, the Government was going to announce its intention to create a unitary authority for Exeter on its existing boundaries and leave the rest of Devon unchanged. However, the Leader stated that these rumours were currently without evidence and until any formal clarification was given, he could not comment any further.

79/09

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

It was noted that one motion had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10.1.

(a) By Cllrs Brazil and Baldry

'Following the disgraceful attempts by the Government to force local government reorganisation upon Devon, this Council gives notice that it will refuse to co-operate in any way with further interference. We will write to the other Devon District Councils and Devon County Council to support this action of non-cooperation. We also invite the Secretary of State to come and see how SHDC has made real savings and efficiencies with our program of shared services at no cost to the taxpayers of Devon.'

Having been **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**, the proposer of the motion made particular reference to:-

- the whole sorry process being a disaster, which had resulted in extensive time and financial cost to the Council Taxpayer;
- a separate Unitary authority for Exeter being the worst possible option;
- the fact that the vast majority of residents and stakeholders were against any changes or upheaval to the existing local government structure in Devon;
- independent analysis and viability studies concluding that an Exeter Unitary option was not viable;
- the motion seeking for Devon County Council and all other district councils to refuse to co-operate any further in the process;
- the proposals being rushed through before the next parliamentary elections. The proposer stated that there would be no time to debate the proposals and the way in which the process had been managed was totally contradictory to democracy and natural justice;
- the Shared Services program being the most effective method of generating efficiencies in local government; and
- the problems being experienced in Cornwall since the county reverted to a one unitary authority system.

In discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (a) When questioned, the Monitoring Officer advised that the legality of the motion was dependant upon the definition of 'further interference'. However, if the motion was approved and was deemed unlawful or could be classified as maladministration, then it would be necessary for the Monitoring Officer to submit a report back to the Council. For clarity, the proposer stated that the wording of his motion was deliberately general and it was his intention that the Council should refuse to be involved in the furthering of any proposals to create any new Unitary authority;
- (b) In sympathising with the motion, some Members stated that they were unable to support it, as it would potentially disadvantage and send the wrong message to the residents of the South Hams. For example, approval of this motion would prevent any Member from representing the residents of the South Hams on an Executive Implementation Board and, therefore, the area would potentially be at a disadvantage to the rest of the county;
- (c) The seconder advised that in light of any creation of a new unitary authority being to the disadvantage of South Hams residents, he was supporting this motion. If a decision to change the governance arrangements in the county was agreed, then the views of the Council and its residents would have been totally ignored. Therefore, the seconder felt that the Council should not spend any more Member or Officer time on this process and should send a firm message to Central Government that it was not willing to partake any further;
- (d) In stating his strong disapproval with the process, a Member **PROPOSED** an amendment to the motion (as outlined below):

*“Following the disgraceful attempts by the Government to force local government reorganisation upon Devon, this Council gives notice that it will refuse to co-operate in any way with further interference. We will write to the other Devon District Councils and Devon County Council to support this action of non-cooperation, **provided that it does not include any illegal activity on the part of the Council, as advised on a case by case basis by the Council’s Monitoring Officer.** We also invite the Secretary of State to come and see how SHDC has made real savings and efficiencies with our program of shared services at no cost to the taxpayers of Devon. **In addition, this Council will support Devon County Council and any other district councils in Devon should they wish to pursue a Judicial Review of the process.**”*

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12.7, both the proposer and seconder of the original motion were content to accept this amendment as an alteration and it therefore became the substantive motion.

In discussion on the substantive motion, the following points were raised:-

- some Members felt that this was even more restrictive than the original motion and would have extensive time and resource implications upon the legal service;
- a wish to know the definite outcome of the process before reaching any view;
- the need for the Council to make a stance and pursue the support of other authorities with vigour;
- that Council should be re-convened soon after any announcement had been made. In reply, the Leader advised that he would ensure that an urgent Council meeting was convened if it was deemed necessary after the announcement had been disclosed.

When put to the vote, the motion was declared **LOST**.

80/09

BUDGET PROPOSALS 2010/11

A report was considered which set out the Executive's formal proposals for the Budget 2010/11, as had been agreed at its meeting on 21 January 2010 (E.95/09 refers).

The nine recommendations, as set out on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the report (as presented to the meeting), were **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED**. The Leader of Council was invited to introduce the item.

In his introduction, the Leader made particular reference to:-

- the Budget for 2010/11 being the most difficult to balance in recent history, with both Members and officers having to work even harder to deliver a satisfactory outcome;
- the success of the Council Tax and Car Parking Charges freeze for 2009/10;
- the derisory Revenue Support Grant increase of only £69,000;
- the significant downturn in both income streams and interest received from investments during 2009/10;
- the additional £30,000 funding shortfall towards the Concessionary Bus Scheme, which had been announced since the Executive meeting. As a consequence, the Leader wished to recommend that the Strategic Management Team be tasked with finding a solution to address this shortfall;
- the wish to retain support for front line services, which was also reflected in the Bid for four electric powered vacuum cleaners for the removal of litter and detritus from the highway;
- the outcome of the consultation events and the Budget meetings of Scrutiny and the Policy Development Groups;
- his gratitude for the year on year savings identified by officers. However, the Leader did recognise that this trend was not sustainable;
- the savings arising from shared services. The Leader felt that improvements and efficiencies were being achieved whilst the democratic face was still being retained;
- the retention and maintenance of robust reserves; and

- the proposed increase amounting to £3.86 on a Band D Council Tax property. If these proposals were accepted, the Council would still retain the third lowest Council Tax in Devon and be well below the 2009/10 average Council Tax in Devon and the national average for all district councils.

Members were then invited to ask the Leader questions on the presented report during which, the following points were raised:-

- (a) It was clarified that the reversal of capital and pension (FRS17) charges was a national accounting standard and a requirement for public and large private sector organisations. The sum amounted to an assessment of the total pension liabilities at any given time;
- (b) In respect of the General Reserve Balance, Members were informed that it currently stood at £1.7million.

The Council then proceeded to debate and take a separate vote on each recommendation individually.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (i) recommendation 2. Some Members stated their regret at the proposal to delete the Community Grant Fund of £30,000 and an amendment to recommendation 2 was therefore **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and read as follows:-

“In order to allow for the re-instatement of the Community Grant fund, the amount for other savings be set at £130,000 and the level of contributions to reserves to be included within the Authority’s budget be £987,900.”

In support of this amendment, some Members highlighted the:-

- importance of the fund, which had supported a number of rural projects. It was felt that since the Capital Programme had an urban focus, deletion of this fund would amount to a further discrepancy between rural and urban areas;
- fund helping to attract over £1million in external funding towards project delivery;
- Member Locality Fund often not being of a sufficient amount for relevant projects; and
- intention of the amendment to retain the £30,000 Community Grant Fund and offset this by reducing the contribution to the Vehicles and Plant Renewals Reserve by £30,000.

In contrast, other Members commented that:-

- there was greater provision in the Member Locality Fund to disperse monies across an increased number of projects and areas;
- officer support was still available to utilise any external funding sources;

- the Council had allocated £1million towards projects through the Investment in the Community Initiative;
- the contribution to the Vehicles and Plant Renewals Reserve had already been reduced during the Budget setting process. In addition, reference was also made to the significant cost of maintaining the vehicle fleet;
- the Community Loans scheme would still exist as an alternative funding stream;
- each Devon County Council Member received an annual £10,000 grant to put towards local projects; and
- in some instances, organisations should be more self sufficient and not so reliant upon the receipt of grant funding.

When put to the vote, the amendment was declared **LOST**.

In respect of the Affordable Housing reserve, the Leader confirmed that the same amount of monies remained, but were now accounted for in a different manner.

- (ii) recommendation 3. A Member highlighted that the Prosperity Policy Development Group had not supported the Bid for the Anti-Social Behaviour Officer, as it believed that such duties were a Police responsibility;
- (iii) recommendation 5. An amendment to this recommendation was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** which sought to include an additional bullet point as follows:-

That an 'off-peak shopping' permit be introduced to cover the hours 8.00am – 10.00am and 4.00pm – 6.00pm, with one to be sent to all households with their Council Tax documents, with the objective of assisting our local towns and residents. The cost of £3,000 and estimated loss of ticket sales of less than £25,000 should be funded from the Vehicles and Plant Renewals Reserve.

In support of this amendment, the proposer stated that:-

- Weymouth and Portland Borough Council had recently adopted a similar scheme;
- the proposal (which would not replace the overnight scheme) had been supported by representatives from the Business Forum;
- there were counter arguments regarding the scheme unfairly penalising non car users. The proposer cited examples that this argument could equally be applied to Council Tax being used towards education despite having no children and those living in the western end of the South Hams obtaining no benefits from the concessionary tickets offered on the Dartmouth Lower Ferry;
- there was scope within the contributions towards the Vehicles and Plant Reserve to offset the maximum cost of this scheme.

When put to the vote, this amendment was declared **LOST**.

A number of Members proceeded to advise of their objections to the proposed car parking increases and, in particular, highlighted the direct economic impact upon the market towns. A Member felt that the Council over estimated the revenue which it would receive through this source and should support its residents, visitors and employees who work in the towns by freezing car parking charges. In disagreement, other Members referred to the charges being frozen for 2009/10 and questioned how the alternative funding would be generated in order to meet the Budget shortfall.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.5, a recorded vote was demanded on recommendation 5 specifically. The voting on the motion was recorded as follows:-

For the motion (20):- Cllrs Barnes, Bastone, Baverstock, Cane, Carson, Cook, Coulson, Croad, Fielden, Hicks, Hitchins, Howarth, Longrigg, May, Pennington, Rowe, Saltern, Steer, Stone and Tucker.

Against the motion (12):- Cllrs Baldry, Brazil, Hannaford, Hawke, C.Jones, L.Jones, Lawrence, O'Callaghan, Pannell, Vint, Ward and Westacott.

Abstentions (3):- Cllrs Carter, Gilbert and Squire.

Absent (4):- Cllrs Blackler, Cooper, Hawkins and Rankin.

and the motion was therefore declared **CARRIED**.

(iv) recommendation 9. In particular, some Members felt that each part of this recommendation signified a substantial percentage increase and questioned whether these were sustainable. In addition, a Member felt that the annual reserved permit was vital in towns such as Salcombe and Dartmouth and in light of the economic downturn and the increase in business rates, the Member was appalled at the proposed increase. In reply, a Member informed that permits had been misused over a number of years. In addition, it would be necessary for the Council to become more commercially minded to increase revenue. Therefore, it was noted that if permit holders no longer wished to purchase such a ticket, then the spaces could become available for the more profitable pay and display usage.

It was then:

RESOLVED

That:-

1. savings of £664,500, as identified by the Corporate Management Team, that are already achieved or can be implemented by managers be approved;

2. the amount for other savings be set at £160,000 and the level of contributions to reserves to be included within the Authority's budget be £1,017,900;
3. the amounts for Bid items to be included within the Authority's budget was £20,000 to be funded from Council Tax and £17,000 to be funded from reserves;
4. the following sums be included in the overall budget:

	£
External interest receivable	375,000
Reversal of Capital and Pension (FRS17) Charges	1,928,000
Provision for inflation	120,000
Collection Fund Surplus	30,000

5. for car parking:-
 - the proposed increase in pay and display charges for 2010/11 should be set out as in Appendix J, with the exception of the half hour charge for Standard 1 and 2 car parks remaining at 30p, with Day charge (e.g. parking for over six hours) for all car parks being increased by a further 10p (making a 20p increase overall); and
 - the charges for the concessionary resident car parking permit should be set at £20 (including VAT) for 2010/11; and
 - officers be authorised to give due notice of the variation of the relevant Off-Street Parking Places Orders to accommodate the new charges in accordance with statutory requirements;
6. the minimum level of the General Reserve Balance be maintained to at least £1.5 Million;
7. the level of reserves, as set out within Appendix F of the presented report and the assessment of their adequacy and the robustness of budget estimates be noted. (This is a requirement of Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003);
8. the Council should set its total net expenditure for 2010/11 at £10,690,500, subject to final confirmation of Government Grant. If the Government changes the Grant, then delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director (Resources) to make a corresponding amendment to the contributions to Reserves to bring the total net expenditure back to that agreed by the Executive; and

9. the currently outstanding recommendations of the Prosperity Policy Development Group meeting of 21 October 2009 (Minute PPDG.12/09 refers), be determined as outlined below:
- (i) That car parking permits be increased by 25% to be in line with other authorities in South Devon;
 - (ii) That all other chargeable services within Car and Boat Parking together with Pannier Markets should be in line with the detail contained in Appendix C of the report as presented to the Prosperity Policy Development Group, with the exception of the Annual Reserved Permit being increased by a further £210 to £1,350 per annum; and
 - (iii) That annual parking permits, with no vehicle registration mark be charged at a rate 50% above a normal permit charge.

81/09

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL BODIES

A report was presented which sought to make appointments to Council Bodies. These were deemed necessary at this time due to the potential quorum implications of leaving these positions vacant.

RESOLVED

That, with immediate effect for the remainder of the 2009/10 Municipal Year:-

- (a) Cllr M J Howarth be appointed to serve on the Personnel Panel; and
- (b) Cllr B F Cane be appointed to serve on the Audit Committee.

82/09

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 | 9 December 2009 |
| (b) | Standards Committee | 15 December 2009 |
| (c) | Environment PDG | 15 December 2009 |
| (d) | Scrutiny | 16 December 2009 |
| (e) | Community PDG | 5 January 2010 |

CPDG.27/09: Affordable Housing Beacon Research – Final Reports

When considering that Council Corporate Priority 1 was affordable housing, a Member expressed his grave disappointment that it took over two years for the reports in relation to: Land Leasing, Second Homes and Community Land Trusts to be considered. In reply, it was confirmed that these reports had been work in progress for a considerable time, but the Council had benefited from the contents of these documents. Officers also stated that these reports would be made publicly available on the Council website as soon as was practically possible.

(f) Executive 7 January 2010

E.83/09: Potential Future Arrangements for the Delivery of Property Services

RESOLVED

That Cllr Hitchins be nominated to be part of the Steering Group to oversee the potential future arrangements for the delivery of Property Services.

E.85/09: Treasury Management Update Report 2009/10

RESOLVED

That the terms of reference for the Audit Committee be amended to allow for scrutiny of the effectiveness of the Treasury Management function.

(g) Prosperity PDG 7 January 2010

PPDG.28/09: Budget Proposals 2010/11

In introducing the minutes, the Chairman clarified that the Bid and saving recommendations which related to the Crime and Disorder activity were not unanimously agreed, but were declared carried by a majority. It was therefore stated that these matters should be rectified before the minutes were signed off as a true and correct record at the next Group meeting.

(h) Development Control Committee 13 January 2010

DC.48/09: Planning Applications

With regard to the development site at Lee Mill, Ivybridge (application no. 49/1162/08/F refers), a Member queried whether by granting conditional approval for a proposal which only included provision for 25% affordable housing, the Council policy for 60% affordable housing in villages still applied. In reply, the lead Executive Member for Housing stated that subject to viability, the Council policy did still remain at 60%.

(i) Scrutiny 14 January 2010

SC.50/09: Future Agenda Items

The Chairman of the Group assured the Council that it remained her intention for a joint informal meeting to be held with the Members of the Development Control Committee. The purpose of this joint meeting was for a debate to take place on a number of issues which had become apparent following the Development Control Committee meeting held on 13 January 2010.

(j) Executive 21 January 2010

E.92/09: Capital Programme

In discussion on this item, reference was made to:-

- (a) the proposed new swimming pool in Ivybridge. It was confirmed that £1 million had been set aside in the Programme towards a new pool, however the project would still require external funding and more detailed works before it could be progressed any further;
- (b) the public conveniences at East Portlemouth. The local Ward Member expressed his dismay that the Council had neglected this facility over a period of time and was now faced with having to close it due to the requirement for a significant budget outlay to rectify the sewerage system. He felt that this reflected poorly on the Asset Management Group and highlighted the importance of maintaining the facility for both local residents and the benefit of the tourism industry. In reply, the lead Executive Member for Asset Management reiterated the budgetary pressures facing the Council, but stated that there was still potential to retain this facility and gave assurances that closure was by no means inevitable at this stage;

- (c) Jubilee Pier, Salcombe. A local Ward Member stated his concerns in respect of the removal of the Pier from the Capital Programme and was appalled that the Council had neither protected nor restored this asset. Since Salcombe was heavily reliant upon pedestrian footfall, the Member emphasised the importance of retention of the Pier to the local economy. In agreement, the Chairman of the Harbour Board felt that the Pier should be a top priority for the Council and a failure to retain this asset would be a catastrophe for the Harbour. The Executive Member for Asset Management informed Members that it was hoped that works could take place to ensure that the Pier was fit for purpose in the short term. In addition, the Member also referred to the potential for funding to be obtained from the Environment Agency in accordance with coastal protection requirements;
- (d) the extensive works and investigations which had been undertaken on the Capital Programme by three Executive Members.

RESOLVED

1. That the Capital Programme be approved, subject to satisfactory completion of appraisals for each project to demonstrate value for money;
2. That delegated authority be given to the Council's Strategic Management Team to deliver the Capital Programme, including the procurement of appropriately skilled resources and expenditure of the contingency budget, to support delivery within the required timeframe, in consultation with the Leader of Council and the appropriate Executive Member;
3. That the Strategic Management Team report progress of the Programme to the Executive at least four times per annum; and
4. That the outdoor pool at Ivybridge remain closed.

E.93/09: Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy 2010/11

RESOLVED

1. That the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2010/11 be approved; and
2. That the revised CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice 2009 be adopted.

E.94/09: Reports of Other Bodies

b) Community Policy Development Group – 5 January 2010

CPDG.26/09: Empty Homes Strategy

RESOLVED

That the Empty Homes Strategy (as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report presented to the Group) be adopted.

c) Prosperity Policy Development Group – 7 January 2010

PPDG.27/09: Oral Update on the Lower Ferry

RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Head of Environment Services, in consultation with the lead Executive Member for a Clean Environment, to be able to vary all pricing charges on the Lower Ferry as and when deemed necessary.

PPDG.29/09: Amendments to the Off-Street Parking Order

RESOLVED

That the amendments as identified in the report presented to the Group be advertised for inclusion in the Off Street Parking Order 2010.

d) Scrutiny Group – 14 January 2010

RESOLVED

That a letter be sent to local MPs to:

- express concern about the shortfall in the level of funding received to meet the Housing and Council Tax benefit administration costs; and
- urge Central Government to reduce the administration burden upon local authorities.

(Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and concluded at 4.35 pm).

Chairman