

FAREHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Council

Date: Thursday, 11 December 2014

Venue: Council Chamber - Civic Offices

PRESENT:

D J Norris
(Mayor)

M J Ford, JP
(Deputy Mayor)

Councillors: B Bayford, Mrs S M Bayford, Miss S M Bell, J V Bryant, Mrs P M Bryant, T M Cartwright, MBE, P J Davies, Mrs M E Ellerton, K D Evans, G Fazackarley, N R Gregory, Miss T G Harper, Mrs C L A Hockley, T J Howard, L Keeble, T G Knight, A Mandry, Mrs K Mandry, Mrs S Pankhurst, R H Price, JP, D L Steadman, D C S Swanbrow, Mrs K K Trott, N J Walker, D M Whittingham, P W Whittle, JP, C J Wood and S D T Woodward



1. PRAYERS

The meeting opened with prayers led by the Mayor's Chaplain Reverend Dr Ian Meredith from St Mary's Church in Portchester.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J M Englefield.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Mayor be authorised to sign as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 9 October 2014.

4. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor advised Members that the next charity event would be the Quiz Night at Palmerston Indoor Bowls Club on Saturday 7 February from 7pm. Tickets on sale at £15 per head, which includes a 2 course meal.

The next charity tea party would be on Thursday 5 February with the second part of a talk by Ray Gibson on Glenn Miller's time with the Army Air Force Band. Tickets for the Tea Parties are £4.00 on the door.

5. EXECUTIVE LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Executive Leader made two announcements regarding the Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus. The first was to advise Members that the topping out ceremony for the new innovation centre, Merlin House, was held last week. The Mayor performed the ceremony by tacking up the last piece of plasterboard to the wall.

The Executive Leader also confirmed the completion and re-opening of runway 05-23 at Daedalus, following the investment of £1.5 million by Fareham Borough Council. He reported that the site now has one of the best general aviation runways in the country which is fantastic news and is part of the Council's attempts to help create and enable more jobs at Daedalus. The innovation centre will create approximately 150 new jobs and there will also be a number of jobs created by having a resurfaced runway.

6. EXECUTIVE MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Police and Crime Panel

The Executive Member for Public Protection advised Members that he had attended a briefing held by the Police Crime Commissioner and Hampshire Constabulary on the Operational Change Programme. During the

presentation it was announced that all police officers and staff had been posted, and the statistics confirmed that 85% of officers obtained their preferences, and 85% remained in their geographic location. These figures look quite impressive, but it should be remembered that officers were asked to put down three preferences, and it was seen as a success if they only got their third preference.

Regarding the geographic location, this was purely assigning officers to the area in which they lived. Of the 15% who did not achieve their preferences (which consists of nearly 300 officers) they had the opportunity to appeal. Now this procedure has been completed, there will be an assessment to see if there is any effect on crime figures within Hampshire.

The Police and Crime Panel were also briefed on the newly formed Resolution Centre which, in its first few weeks, has seen a reduction in demand at the front end of Police business. It was explained that the Police are now only dealing with Police business – and not any other areas. The Executive Member for Public Protection was somewhat concerned with this statement, and asked whether other local authorities and agencies had been briefed on this new initiative, as it will obviously increase their workload. The reply was that, if the call was not Police business, then the Resolution Centre would give out the numbers of who should be contacted. This could obviously have an effect on Fareham Borough Council.

At the briefing, the Executive member also met the new Deputy Chief Constable, who had been in post for one week and is responsible for this Programme. He discussed the poor communication with the public, both on the Operational Change Programme and the Estates Plan. He agreed that this needed to be dealt with as a matter of urgency, and has requested a meeting with the Executive member for Public Protection to move it forward.

Community Safety Partnership

In his role as Chairman of Fareham's Community Safety Partnership, the Executive member for Public Protection advised that the Council has received an invitation from the Police Crime Commissioner to join the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Community Safety Alliance. The invitation has been accepted and the quarterly meetings will be attended by the Community Safety Manager and the Executive Member for Public Protection. This Alliance enables the Commissioner to hear first-hand the risks, priorities and emerging issues being faced by Community Safety Partnerships.

Environmental Health Vanguard Intervention

The Executive Member for Public Protection announced that the Environmental Health Vanguard intervention is progressing well, having looked initially at noise issues, it is now being expanded across the rest of Environmental Health. Notably, the noise service has moved away from a regulatory and enforcement type attitude, to serve a new purpose of "helping neighbours live peacefully with each other". This has resulted in issues being resolved within a much shorter time period and with much improved customer and neighbour satisfaction. This is being achieved by serving the better purpose and by staff adopting a face to face conversation and mediation type approach rather than the reliance on formal letters and emails. The knock on effect has been to save time and improve job satisfaction for staff.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

8. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

A petition of approximately 86 signatures was presented by Councillor G Fazackarley entitled: "We, the undersigned, are concerned residents of Kelvin Grove who urge our leaders to act now to prevent 40 Kelvin Grove becoming a Foster Unit".

The Mayor advised that the petition would be dealt with in accordance with Fareham Borough Council's petition scheme.

9. DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations given at this meeting.

10. REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE

- (1) Minutes of meeting Monday, 6 October 2014 of Executive

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 6 October 2014 be received.

- (2) Minutes of meeting Monday, 3 November 2014 of Executive

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 3 November 2014 be received.

- (3) Minutes of meeting Monday, 1 December 2014 of Executive

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 1 December 2014 be received.

- (4) Schedule of Individual Executive Member Decisions and Officer Delegated Decisions

RESOLVED that the Schedule of Individual Executive Member Decisions and Officer Delegated Decisions be received.

11. REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY BOARD

- (1) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 20 November 2014 of Scrutiny Board

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Scrutiny Board held on 20 November 2014 be received.

12. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

- (1) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 24 September 2014 of Planning Committee

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 24 September 2014 be received.

- (2) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 22 October 2014 of Planning Committee

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 22 October 2014 be received.

- (3) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 19 November 2014 of Planning Committee

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 19 November 2014 be received; and
- (b) the recommendations contained in minute 6 regarding the Spending Plans 2015/16 be agreed.

- (4) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 23 October 2014 of Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Streetscene Policy Development and Review Panel held on 23 October 2014 be received.

- (5) Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 4 November 2014 of Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel held on 4 November 2014 be received.

- (6) Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 5 November 2014 of Leisure and Community Policy Development and Review Panel

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Leisure and Community Policy Development and Review Panel held on 5 November 2014 be received.

- (7) Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 11 November 2014 of Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel held on 11 November 2014 be received.

- (8) Minutes of meeting Thursday, 13 November 2014 of Health and Housing Policy Development and Review Panel

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Health and Housing Policy Development and Review Panel held on 13 November 2014 be received.

- (9) Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 18 November 2014 of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee held on 18 November 2014 be received;
- (b) the recommendations contained in minute 6 regarding the Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places be agreed; and
- (c) the recommendations contained in minute 8 regarding the Spending Plans 2015-16 be agreed.

13. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 17.2

There were nine sets of questions submitted for this meeting:

Question by Councillor N R Gregory:

1. "Would the Leader, on behalf of the Conservative group, give the rationale of their decision when allocating positions on decision making committees for independent Councillors, why two of us have three positions on working decision making committees when Councillor Wood has only one?"

I have spoken to Councillor Wood and I would like to request your consideration to swapping my position on Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Committee for his position on Appeals.

I feel this would stop the perception of discrimination of a Councillor or his party from being actively involved in decision making process within this Council and the Committees of this Council.

Furthermore, I feel this move would positively demonstrate a move for more diplomacy to the democratic process of this Council. Also giving each Independent Councillors a fair share of committees whom have the powers to make decision that affect the residents of this Borough. However, if you can explain why this decision of yours is sound and should stay the way it is, I would be happy to listen?"

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

1. The allocation of seats to committees is not the Conservative Group's decision – it is for the Council to determine and this was done at the Annual meeting in May. Each of the political groups is entitled to a certain number of seats on committees. This is based upon their percentage representation on the Council as a whole and is in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

To assist the Council in this matter and in exercise of powers delegated to him, the Chief Executive Officer consults the leaders of the political groups prior to the meeting, with a view to agreeing the allocation of seats for the municipal year. Group Leaders are requested to provide nominations to the places on committees to which their respective groups are entitled. The nominations of political groups to seats on committees are set out in a tabled paper at the meeting and the Council is invited to confirm the allocation of seats for the next municipal year. However, if the Council is asked to consider alternative arrangements in appointing the committees and those arrangements do not comply with the provisions requiring political balance, members are reminded that such alternative arrangements would require the support of the Council with no member voting against.

There are three independent councillors in this Council who are not members of any political group. There is no legal entitlement calculation to committee places for an independent member however, following the calculations and allocation of seats to political groups, the Council may if it chooses appoint the non-group members to any seats not otherwise allocated. In doing this, the Council may allocate seats from those committees requiring a balancing adjustment. Therefore, the allocation of seats to independent Councillors is at the gift of the Council and is not an automatic allocation.

Question by Councillor N R Gregory:

2. “Will the Executive Leader please tell us what is the correct amount of savings achieved by Vanguard per annum and for this year?
At the Scrutiny Board meeting on the 25th September 2014 members are informed through the report that the amount was £168,000 per annum, however you stated recently in local media the actual figure is around £300,000 per year.
To make another £132,000 in just a few months is most remarkable, or are the printed figures incorrect (if this is the case should we not request a correction in the local press to avoid misleading the public)?
Councillor Woodward, can you also explain how these saving are calculated, and where they are recorded for the general public to view?”

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

2. Contrary to Councillor Gregory’s insinuations throughout the Vanguard process, we have been clear and transparent to both Councillors and the public, regarding the substantial savings made from redesigning our services through the eyes of the customer.

Progress reports presented to both the Scrutiny Board and the Executive first identified savings of £59,000 in December 2013 and a further £109,000 in October 2014. Both these reports were public. We also issued a press release at the time of the second report to help ensure residents were kept up date with progress and the savings made.

Since then, further savings have been identified as a result of more Vanguard interventions. A public report to this Full Council clearly

outlines how a restructure of the Building Services team will provide savings of £88,000 per annum, whilst a restructure of the Parking team will provide £75,000 per annum. Plans are currently being put together for a restructure of the Benefits team which should generate at least £50,000 in savings.

The combined total of savings made since starting the Vanguard method therefore stands at £381,000 per annum. We will continue to keep Councillors and the public informed about further savings made as we undertake more Vanguard interventions.

Question by Councillor N R Gregory:

3. "Would the Executive Leader please explain the details behind the decision for this Council to form a partnership with a private limited company and Eastleigh Council without the involvement of any decision making committees?
- (a) Why was this partnership not raised within any decision making committee like Audit and Governance, Scrutiny and Health and Housing before Executive made their decision, I fully understand it is the right of the Executive to make this decision within this. However, common courtesy and respect of other elected Councillors do you not feel it would have been the correct thing to do?
- (b) Is it correct that this Council's involvement in creating a new private development company will open up the possibility of developing housing outside of the Affordable housing system, and outside of the Right to buy system for this Council?
- (c) Why was there no consultation with the public on this matter? Especially given that public money will be used to fund some of the projects that this company gets involved in, also considering the Regulation stated below?

Current; Regulation 21: External Arrangements; States 21.1.7 Significant Partnerships: Any partnership assessed as "Significant" In accordance with FBC Framework for Partnership Working must also demonstrate the following arrangements;

- Procedures for dealing with Conflicts of interest
 - Annual review of membership and opportunity to select Chairman
 - Risk Management Arrangements
 - Performance framework with measureable outcomes
 - Consultation with Local Community and Complaints Procedures
- (d) In what way will this new company be involved in Welborne and the construction of housing on this site if it is found Sound?
- (e) How will the residents of this Borough and this Council see a return on any investment of public monies through this company? Considering that any assets or profit this company achieves through properties built or rent charged will be held on the company "Balance Sheet and HMRC returns"

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

3. Clearly it has escaped Councillor Gregory that the Executive is a decision making committee. It considered two reports on this subject; firstly at its meeting in July 2013, then a further, detailed report, was considered at its meeting in November 2013. This explained clearly the reasons why the Council were considering being part of a joint venture company to facilitate housing and economic development in the borough.

The stated objectives are to:-

- meet housing need in its core areas of operation in partnership with other organisations
- bring forward housing developments that may otherwise stall due to economic conditions.
- increase housing supply in order to meet local housing needs.
- increase the supply of market rented housing to overcome local shortages.
- provide housing accessible to those in receipt of welfare benefits.
- boost the local economy through development, creating work in construction and a range of other industries.
- develop projects aimed at reducing carbon emissions and/ or increasing renewable energy usage.

The decision was made by the appropriate decision-making body, in public session, and was not raised by the Scrutiny Board, of which Councillor Gregory was a member, as an item of Executive Business that it wanted to consider further.

The housing joint venture provides the Council with another vehicle to deliver much needed affordable housing in the borough which any reasonable councillor would welcome but not it seems Councillor Gregory. At the moment, the option to develop new council housing is severely constrained by central government rules around borrowing. The Council is actively building new sheltered accommodation within the limited capacity it does have available, and we are making use of Right to Buy receipts to acquire general needs housing off-the-shelf. But until the rules change and in the absence of the Joint Venture company, the Council could only develop more homes by waiting until sufficient money had accumulated in the Housing Revenue Account. The Joint Venture (registered as "Aspect Building Communities Ltd") allows the Council to respond promptly and still retain some control over affordable housing delivery.

The primary purpose is to deliver affordable housing. These properties would not be "Council housing", and are not therefore subject to the same legislation (such as the right to buy); but they would be owned by the joint venture and managed by a registered provider (such as a housing association or the Council) and the Council would have an equity stake in them. Affordable housing developed by the JV would also be allocated to those in need, on the waiting list.

The creation of the company did not warrant a public consultation exercise, as it is effectively a shell company with very limited assets or

liabilities. However, as with any development proposals, there will be the appropriate level of public consultation as schemes are worked up and brought forward. The public funding involved in the joint venture was set out in the Executive reports and is extremely limited (to minimal running costs only). There is no commitment to invest significant amounts of capital in the joint venture, and any such plans would need formal approval by the Executive.

Every development scheme that comes forward will require a separate, individual set of approvals by the Housing Company Board and by the Council (if it is a funder or “share-holder” in the development subsidiary of the Joint Venture).

Of course Welborne will have a large quantum of affordable housing, but as previously stated, there are no commitments to invest in specific development schemes.

Any “return on investment”, whether financial or otherwise, will be clearly documented when an investment decision is being considered by the Executive.

Question by Councillor N R Gregory:

4. “Would the Executive Leader agree with me that the rule under the Local Government Act on proportional representation within our Scrutiny Board is failing the democratic process when there is only one sitting Councillor on the Board from the opposition?
How can true debate and diplomacy be up held in this Committee with only one opposition Councillor, when consideration is given to party whipping of other Councillors of the same party?
For accountability, transparency and to promote true diplomacy would you not agree with me, our Authority (FBC) should be putting pressure of the Government to have this rule changed for committee’s like Scrutiny?
Current position of the Scrutiny Board is 9 elected members of which 8 members belong to the Conservative Party, of which controls all the Executive seats.
This is the only decision making Board / Committee which can hold the Executive members or any other decision within this Council to account.
- Please don’t say that Party whipping doesn’t go on within your party, and yes I fully understand that any Councillor can address the Board with their views or opinions but this is not the same as a seat in the decision making process.”

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

4. No, I do not agree. Each of the political groups is entitled to a certain number of seats on committees and this is based upon their percentage representation on the Council as a whole and is in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
The electorate of Fareham has returned 24 councillors in the Conservative Group of which of course Councillor Gregory was one until he went off to form an Independent Group then to join UKIP then to be an

independent. That is over 77% of the Council, with 4 Liberal Democrats which is 10%. It would therefore be against the wishes of the electorate to change the balance of proportionality. I remind him that there is no entitlement applicable to an independent member.

The issue of whipping is covered by the Council's Constitution which states that: "In the interests of openness and accountability, Members will be expected to disclose, at the commencement of all Scrutiny Board or Policy Development and Review Panel meetings, any advice or directions received from their Group Leader or their Political Group, on the views to be expressed on a particular issue or on the way that they should vote. The Chief Executive Officer will be responsible for ensuring that the minutes of the meetings record all such disclosures".

I can confirm that, counter to Councillor Gregory's assertion there is no whipping of Conservative members on any committee, board or panel of this Council.

Question by Councillor N R Gregory:

5. (a) "Councillor Sean Woodward, would you be considering resigning your position as Leader of this Council, if the two planning policies which are under public scrutiny are found to be Un-Sound?
- (b) It is felt by many, including yourself through statements you have made in Local Media that an Un-Sound Verdict would open Pandora's Box for developers submitting planning applications right across the Borough. Should this happen, would you not agree it could result in a breakdown of confidence from our residents in this Council's ability to run this Borough?
- (c) You have stated in many CAT meetings and through the local media that Welborne would stop all other developments within the Borough which would not be the case. Also stated by you, until all the monies are in place for the infrastructure at Wellbore "Not a brick will be laid". Would you not agree, that these statements are un-sound and not within your power to control?
- (d) Councillor Woodward, do you not feel the WEL5 planning Policy for only a 50m Strategic gap or Settlement Buffer as explained in this policy for Welborne will support the Newlands development between Longfield Avenue and Stubbington? (Page1 Par1)The Welborne Plan Issue 3. Looking at Appendix 1 on Page 6 if 50m is all that is needed for a Strategic Gap I have real concerns over not just Welborne, Newlands Development but many others throughout this Borough?
- (e) Cllr Woodward, why is this Council under your direction going into Partnership to form a Construction Company to build houses within Fareham Borough, when you stated Welborne Development would stop all other developments within Fareham and meet the housing needs of the Borough?

My reasoning for asking this question is that as the Leader, you have put yourself forward as the champion for Welborne, promoting the legacy of this development with the aspiration that this would stop all future development within the Borough. I feel that you have taken this Council forward with no form of contingency plan should an un-sound verdict is given by the Government inspector.

Furthermore, you have expressed your own opinion through Local Media on other Councillors within this Council that you feel they should resign their position for what I consider far lesser failings in carrying out their duties under their roles as Borough Councillors than are stated above."

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

5. (a) No
- (b) No
- (c) No
- (d) No
- (e) The Council has established Aspect Building Communities Limited (a local housing company) in partnership with First Wessex Housing Association, Radian Housing Association and Eastleigh Borough Council for the sole purpose of increasing investment in and delivery of new affordable housing.

The Council's Housing Revenue Account is subject to a borrowing cap imposed by the Government which restricts our ability to fund the delivery of new affordable homes in the borough. The new housing company will have access to alternative sources of funding which will help increase the supply of new affordable homes in the borough. I anticipate this company will play a significant role in the delivery of new affordable homes in Welborne and possibly on some smaller redevelopment sites within Fareham as and when the opportunities present themselves. Any development undertaken by Aspect Building Communities Limited in Fareham will be subject to the normal planning policies and process.

Finally Councillor Gregory is disingenuous to claim that I have stated that Welborne would stop all future development in the Borough. I have never stated any such thing and have always pointed out to residents that we have allocated land in the remainder of the Borough outside Welborne for over 3,000 homes of which the great majority are either already built or have planning consent which is why we did not need to allocate sites for many more. Furthermore I have also stated that the land we have allocated for housing including Welborne has meant we have not had to allocate housing in our strategic gaps which most of us want to protect.

Question by Councillor P J Davies:

6. Use of bed and breakfast accommodation by Fareham Borough Council
- (a) Can the Leader advise how many residents, for whom FBC has accepted housing responsibility, were accommodated in bed and breakfast accommodation in the last 12 months?
 - (b) Can the Leader advise the average length of stay in bed and breakfast accommodation?
 - (c) Can the Leader advise of the areas in which the bed and breakfast accommodation is located?
 - (d) Can the Leader advise how many residents, for whom FBC has accepted housing responsibility, will be in bed and breakfast accommodation or temporary private rented accommodation this Christmas?

Response by the Executive Member for Health and Housing:

6. (a) The Housing Options Team took 190 applications between 1 December 2013 and 30 November 2014; of these 63 were accepted and of these, 14 households have spent some time in Bed & Breakfast accommodation.
- (b) Average length of stay is 39 days
- (c) The bed and breakfast accommodation used have been located in three areas:
Titchfield,
Southsea,
Gosport
- (d) There is currently one accepted homeless applicant in bed and breakfast accommodation; two other households are in B&B but a decision on their application has not yet been reached; all three applicants are single people. Whilst we cannot predict the demand on our service we hope to avoid having any families in bed and breakfast over Christmas period.

As at 5 December, 31 accepted homeless households were in private sector leased accommodation and a further 10 are housed in an equivalent scheme run by a local housing association partner. Average length of time in such accommodation is between 6 & 18 months.

All 41 households are expected to be in these least properties over the Christmas period.

Question by Councillor P J Davies:

7. Pedestrian routes within Fareham Town Centre:
 - (a) Is the Leader aware that encouragement of the use of public transport and walking are amongst the corporate priorities of Fareham Borough Council?
 - (b) Can the Leader advise how to walk from Fareham Civic Offices or Ferneham Hall to West Street and to the Bus Station, when Fareham Shopping Centre is closed?

Response by the Executive Member for Planning and Development:

7. (a) Yes
- (b) There are presently four alternative routes. However, it is acknowledged that when the Shopping Centre is closed, the most direct route through the Centre is not available to the public. It is for this reason that there is a specific policy (Policy DSP29: Fareham Shopping Centre Improved Link) proposed in the Development Sites and Policies Plan, that was submitted to the recent examination for consideration by the Inspector, which seeks to address this issue. This proposed Council policy seeks to improve the links between the Henry Cort area and the Civic Area through supporting redevelopment proposals that provide a more readily available and direct route, or routes, between these two areas.

Question by Councillor C J Wood:

8. Could the Executive Member please inform the Chamber how much money Fareham Borough Council has spent on the Christmas decorations in Fareham Town Centre compared to Stubbington Village Centre please?

Verbal Response by the Executive Leader:

8. The Council has spent no money on the Christmas decorations provided in either Fareham town centre or Stubbington village centre; the decorations provided in Fareham are provided by the Fareham Town Centre Management Partnership.

Question by Councillor C J Wood:

9. Could the Executive Member please inform the Chamber how many Traffic Regulation Orders can be implemented each year across the Fareham Borough please?

Response by the Executive Member for Public Protection:

9. Fareham Borough Council deals with Traffic Regulation Orders as part of an agency agreement with Hampshire County Council, who provide funding for the work. In 2013-14, the total allocation from HCC was £15,500. This includes provision for new signage and line markings,

including the marking of disabled bays. The cost of each scheme varies but in a typical year, this funding is sufficient to implement approximately ten schemes.

Each year, a traffic management programme is considered by the Public Protection Policy Development and Review Panel for the Executive to approve.

14. MOTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 15

- (1) Notice of Motion received 27 November 2014 from Councillor Mrs Trott

Motion proposed by Councillor Mrs K K Trott:

“I propose that Fareham Borough Council resolves to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to confirm that the Council believes that the Government’s Right to Buy Policy represents poor value for money and that Local Authorities should be given the option to suspend the Right to Buy Policy in their local areas.”

The Mayor advised that as the subject of the motion comes within the terms of the Executive, then the motion would stand referred without discussion to an appropriate meeting of the Executive.

15. LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2015/16

RESOLVED that the Council approves:

- (a) the Council Tax Support scheme, as recommended by the Executive at the meeting of 1 December 2014; and
- (b) that delegated authority is given to the Director of Community to make any necessary minor amendments and to publish the final scheme prior to 1 April 2015.

16. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

There were no changes to appointments to committees made at this meeting.

17. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

RESOLVED that the Council agrees to appoint Councillors Mrs M Ellerton and Mrs S M Bayford as representatives to the Genesis Advisory Committee.

18. PAY AND GRADING REVIEW

During a debate on the item, Councillor C J Wood proposed the following amendment to recommendation (a):

“The pay award for mainstream employees, as detailed in paragraphs 17 and 18 of this report, and accepts an amendment in place of Paragraph 19 which reads “Then, in order to increase pay equality within Fareham Borough Council, and save money, it is proposed that all mainstream pay-scales would be increased by a further £885. As well as making the Council’s employment

package more competitive, (and just below the median for the South East), this would re-establish a gap between the national minimum wage and the lowest point of the Council's pay structure, as detailed in Appendix 7."

The proposed Appendix 7 calculations were tabled at the meeting.

Having been duly seconded by Councillor P W Whittle, JP and on being put to the meeting following further debate, Councillor C J Wood requested a recorded vote.

The amendment was declared LOST, there being 4 votes in favour (Councillors N R Gregory, Mrs K K Trott, P W Whittle, JP and C J Wood) and 25 votes against (Councillors B Bayford, Mrs S M Bayford, Miss S Bell, J V Bryant, Mrs P Bryant, T M Cartwright, P J Davies, Mrs M Ellerton, K D Evans, G Fazackarley, M Ford, Miss T G Harper, Mrs C L A Hockley, T J Howard, L Keeble, T G Knight, A Mandry, Mrs K Mandry, Mrs S Pankhurst, R H Price, JP, D L Steadman, D C S Swanbrow, N J Walker, D Whittingham, and S D T Woodward), with 1 member abstaining from voting (The Mayor).

On the substantive motion being put to the meeting following further debate, Councillor S D T Woodward requested a recorded vote.

The motion was declared CARRIED, there being 28 votes in favour (Councillors B Bayford, Mrs S M Bayford, Miss S Bell, J V Bryant, Mrs P Bryant, T M Cartwright, P J Davies, Mrs M Ellerton, K D Evans, G Fazackarley, M Ford, N R Gregory, Miss T G Harper, Mrs C L A Hockley, T J Howard, L Keeble, T G Knight, A Mandry, Mrs K Mandry, Mrs S Pankhurst, R H Price, JP, Mrs K K Trott, D L Steadman, D C S Swanbrow, N J Walker, D Whittingham, P W Whittle, JP and S D T Woodward), no members voting against and 2 members abstaining from voting (The Mayor and Councillor C J Wood).

RESOLVED that the Council approves:

- (a) the pay award for mainstream employees, as detailed in paragraphs 17 to 19 of this report;
- (b) the pay award for senior management employees, as detailed in paragraphs 20 to 23 of this report;
- (c) that the senior management pay structure is amended from three grades to four grades, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;
- (d) that the updated Pay Policy statement for 2015/16, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report be agreed; and
- (e) that the costs of the pay awards be funded from the savings accrued through the implementation of the Vanguard Method.

(The meeting started at 6.00 pm
and ended at 8.36 pm).