



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in Committee Room 2 at East Pallant House Chichester on Tuesday 4 October 2016 at 09:30

Members Present	Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr B Finch and Mrs S Taylor
Members Absent	Mrs P Hardwick and Mrs G Keegan
Officers Present	Mr M Allgrove (Planning Policy Conservation and Design Service Manager), Mr J Bacon (Building and Facility Services Manager), Mrs H Belenger (Accountancy Services Manager), Mr N Bennett (Legal and Democratic Services Manager), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Mr R Dunmall (Housing Operations Manager), Mrs T Flitcroft (Principal Planning Policy Officer (Local Planning)), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Mr S Hansford (Head of Community Services), Mr D Hyland (Community and Partnerships Support Manager), Miss A Loaring (Partnerships Officer), Miss L Le Vay (Design and Implementation Manager), Mr S Oates (Economic Development Manager), Mr P E Over (Executive Director), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer) and Mr J Ward (Head of Finance and Governance Services)

258 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mr Dignum welcomed everyone present to the meeting.

He had no specific announcements to make.

Apologies for absence had been received from Mrs Hardwick and Mrs Keegan. All other members of the Cabinet were present.

There were no late items which due to special circumstances required urgent consideration under agenda item 13.

259 **Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of its ordinary meeting on Tuesday 6 September 2016 and its special meeting on Tuesday 20 September 2016.

There were no proposed changes to those two sets of minutes.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday 6 September 2016 and the special meeting of the Cabinet on Tuesday 20 September 2016 each be signed and dated as a correct record without amendment.

Mr Dignum then duly signed and dated the final (eleventh) page of the official version of the minutes of the meeting on 6 September 2016 and the final (eighth) page of the official version of the minutes of the meeting on 20 September 2016 as a correct record.

260 Declarations of Interests

Mr Carvell, Mr Over and Mr Ward each declared a personal interest in agenda item 15 (Succession Planning) within Part II of the agenda and stated that they would withdraw from the meeting when that item came to be considered by the Cabinet.

261 Public Question Time

There had been no public questions submitted for this meeting.

[**Note** Minute paras 262 to 271 below summarise the consideration of and conclusion to agenda items 5 to 14 inclusive (but not the exempt agenda item 15) but for full details please refer to the audio recording facility via this link:

<http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=135&MId=749&Ver=4>]

[**Note** In the remainder of these minutes CDC denotes Chichester District Council]

262 Appointment of External Auditors

The Cabinet considered the agenda report (copy attached to the official minutes).

In Mrs Hardwick's absence Mr Dignum presented the report.

With reference to sections 3, 5 and 8 of the agenda report Mr Dignum explained the background to the need for CDC to make an appointment of external auditors, reviewed the available options and articulated the case for the preference recommended by officers for opting into a sector-led procurement undertaken by Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA).

In reply to a question by Mrs Taylor, Mr Ward explained that (a) the speed of the process was dictated by the PSAA and CDC needed to give the PSAA an early indication of its preferred option and (b) it was hoped that the housing benefit audit could be included in the contract (it was a decision for the Department of

Communities and Local Government) but if that could not be achieved then a separate procurement for that aspect would be necessary.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the recommendation in para 3.1 of the report.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council approves the opting by Chichester District Council into sector-led procurement of external audit services by the appointed person, Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd (PSAA).

263 Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan – Modification for the Purpose of Correcting an Error

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its two appendices; colour versions of the plans on pages 30 and 33 were circulated at the meeting (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove and Ms Flitcroft were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor summarised sections 3 and 5 of the report to explain the need for the modification.

The officers did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's presentation.

There were no questions or comments by members of the Cabinet.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the recommendation in para 2.1 of the report.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council approves the modification of the Fishbourne Neighbourhood Plan for the purpose of correcting an error and the publication of the modification document in appendix 2 to the agenda report.

264 Chichester in Partnership - ChooseWork Project

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its three appendices (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was introduced by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Oates and Miss Loaring were in attendance.

During a summary of sections 4, 5 and 6 of the report and the case studies on pages 48 and 49 (appendix 3) Mrs Lintill commended the comprehensive report and the very positive success story which it described. The views recently expressed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were set out in para 8.4 of the report.

Mrs Lintill announced a proposed resolution that varied from the officers' recommendation in para 3.1 of the report as follows:

'That the Cabinet approves the continuation of the ChooseWork project for a further three years from March 2017 and Chichester District Council continues to support the project by hosting it and part funding it at £25,000 per annum from the remaining unspent allocation of £10,000 from the New Homes Bonus and the remainder to be included in the draft base budget from 2017-2108.'

Mr Oates drew attention to the summary of the successful outputs in appendix 1 and commented on how the project had a beneficial impact on the business community.

Mr Dignum stated the importance of this project for CDC and he also referred to the very pleasing outcomes set out in appendix 1. He emphasised the importance of being able to gain employment: it brought dignity to people and where someone needed help to obtain a job this project would be very beneficial. It was hoped that other organisations would follow CDC's lead and contribute financially to enable the programme to its current level.

Mr Finch concurred with Mr Dignum; he praised the report and the very important work being done by this project to help people find work. He enquired if it would be possible for the project to measure the results required by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) in order to be sure to secure funding. Miss Loaring advised that CDC officers were already discussing that with the DWP and once it was known what was required CDC officers would endeavour to ensure compliance.

Mr Barrow commended this superb scheme, which demonstrated that CDC was a caring council. He was moved by some of the case studies in appendix 2. He asked what progress had been made in securing partners, what would happen if they were not forthcoming and whether any larger private businesses in the area had been approached. Miss Loaring briefly outlined the present or prospective conversations with CDC officers. Mr Oates explained that although so far no private firms had been approached, a sponsorship scheme was being prepared in some detail in order to discuss contributions of what would amount to relatively small sums for a very important project. Mr Over pointed out that the outcome of an application by CDC to the National Lottery Fund was awaited.

Decision

The Cabinet resolved unanimously by a show of hands to make the following resolution, which included the alternative version of the recommendation in para 3.1 of the report.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the continuation of the ChooseWork project for a further three years from March 2017 and that Chichester District Council continues to support the project by hosting it and part funding it at £25,000 per annum from the remaining unspent allocation of £10,000 from the New Homes Bonus and the remainder to be included in the draft base budget from 2017-2018 be approved.
- (2) That the Economic Development Manager and Partnerships Officer seek and agree partnership contributions and match-funding towards the balance of the cost of the ChooseWork Project be approved.
- (3) That if there is a shortfall in funding secured from partners then a further report be submitted to the Cabinet to consider the future of the ChooseWork programme.
- (4) That having considered the recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as set out in para 8.4 of the agenda report the same be duly noted.

265 **Post Project Evaluation of the Multi-Agency Agreement for the Management of Encampments Across West Sussex and the Provision of a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site at Chichester West Sussex**

The Cabinet considered the report and its two appendices circulated with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Hansford and Mr Bacon were in attendance.

Mrs Lintill alluded to sections 3, 5 and 8 of the report, which reviewed the successful first 12 months since the completion of the Gypsy Traveller Transit Site at Westhampnett, its management and the management of unauthorised encampments on a multi-agency basis. The Post Project Evaluation was in appendix 2 to the report.

Mr Bacon referred to para 8.2 of the report and provided a technical assessment of the feasibility of making a connection to the main foul water drainage system (para 8.2 of the report).

In response to Mr Bacon's advice, Mr Dignum felt that the Cabinet's response to the recommendation in para 2.2 ought to enable officers to investigate the matter further. Mr Over suggested that the Cabinet should ask officers to assess the costs including the payback period of connecting to the mains.

Mr Hansford commented on how it had been critical to deliver the project on time in order to access the significant amount of Homes and Community Agency funds that would thereby be available. The project management required for this scheme was significant and its success since its inception was self-evident from the summary in para 5.3 of the report.

Importantly the project had led to an enhanced ability to deal with unauthorised encampments and had also achieved both a consistency of approach across Chichester District and West Sussex and provided stopping facilities for the Gypsy and Traveller community.

Mr Dignum acceded to a request by Mr M N Hall, the CDC ward member for Boxgrove, to address the Cabinet. Mr Hall said that he was involved with a local liaison group for the Transit Site and he was pleased to report that many problems had been successfully addressed. Good communication, control and management were important to the success of the project.

At Mr Dignum's request Mr Over had drafted an alternative form of words for the resolution in response to the recommendation in para 2.2, the text of which appears below in the resolution.

Decision

The Cabinet resolved unanimously by a show of hands to make the following resolution, which included the alternative form of wording for the recommendation in para 2.2.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the findings of the Post Project Evaluation be noted and that there are no comments and recommendations to be made to the Council.
- (2) That officers be authorised to investigate further alternative methods of foul water disposal and in liaison with West Sussex County Council and district and borough partners to proceed with an appropriate solution if it provides the appropriate level of payback.

266 Review of Character Appraisal and Management Proposals for Selsey Conservation Area and Implementation of Associated Recommendations Including Designation of a New Conservation Area in East Selsey to be Named Old Selsey

The Cabinet considered (a) the agenda report, its six appendices and the second of three background papers (copies attached to the official minutes). The other two background papers had been published on CDC's website by way of an agenda supplement (copy attached to the official minutes).

The agenda papers had been published in black and white and so in order to assist in understanding the two maps on pages 160 and 161 (Selsey Conservation Area and Old Selsey Conservation Area respectively) were shown in colour on the screen in the meeting room during this item.

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Miss Le Vay, Mr Allgrove and Mr Frost were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor summarised the report with reference to Selsey's distinctive history and the chronology of the conservation area designations for the town. She described the bi-partite

nature of the existing Selsey Conservation Area and also the boundaries of the proposed Old Selsey Conservation Area *vis-à-vis* the extant designation. She referred to the appraisal document in appendix 1 and the responses received to the public consultation in appendix 5 (save for Selsey Town Council's (STC) submission these were generally in favour). STC's view that the current Conservation Area designation should be revoked was set out in its letter dated 14 September 2016 (the second background paper, pages 226 to 227) and in para 10.3 of the report. Officers' response to the consultation representations (in particular to STC) were summarised in paras 10.4 and 10.5. Section 7 of the report addressed the proposed making of immediate and non-immediate Article 4 Directions.

Miss Le Vay elaborated on the reasons why officers did not agree with STC's contention that the existing Conservation Area designation should be revoked. She advised that in appendix 4 to the Selsey Conservation Area review document (page 158) the reference to 'a Supplementary Planning Document in the emerging Local Plan for Chichester District' (second para) required amending to refer to the emerging Chichester Local Plan Review. She also intimated the need for a further recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning to make typographical changes and other minor amendments.

Mr Dignum said that he had acceded to a request by Mr J C P Connor, one of the three CDC Selsey North ward members to read out a statement on the STC proposal. This statement set out Mr Connor's opinion that the northern section of the High Street should remain designated and that the southern half should be the subject of further discussion between CDC officers and STC members as to how to resolve the impasse (Mr Connor's position was not shared by STC).

As Mr Connor was indisposed and unable to attend this meeting, at Mr Dignum's request Mr Connor's three-page statement (copy attached to the official minutes) was read out in full by the Democratic Services representative present.

At Mr Dignum's invitation Miss Le Vay responded to Mr Connor's views and proposal. With reference to the map shown on the screen she pointed out both the number of listed buildings and the number of buildings which made a positive contribution to the extant Conservation Area. She acknowledged the existence of a cluster of buildings which had a negative impact on the street-scene/area and were in need of improvement. The purpose of the Conservation Area was in part to secure (and not to stifle) better quality development (which did not have to mean a replication of old styles). The aim should be to achieve a step-change in development but avoiding mediocre, average design. In the officers' professional judgment the area had not deteriorated to such an extent that de-designation of the conservation area status could be justified. A partial revocation would not be easily achieved and would necessitate a complete rewriting of the review appraisal document. Nonetheless she was open to discuss these issues with STC.

During the debate Mr Finch made two contributions in which he thanked Miss Le Vay for her report, acknowledged with interest Mr Connor's view that total de-designation was a step too far and emphasised the need to accord respect to STC's views because STC had a democratic mandate on behalf of its residents and the democratic principle should not be overlooked. He urged caution against disregarding another local authority's views on a matter such as this.

While noting Mr Finch's point about local democracy, Mrs Taylor pointed out that the majority of the consultation responses were in favour of the proposals in the draft appraisal document.

Miss Le Vay referred to CDC's statutory duty to assess areas which needed the protection afforded by conservation area status. She said that there were five consultees in favour of the proposals; only STC objected to them.

At Mr Dignum's invitation Mr A Brown, the vice-chairman of STC, who was present as an observer, addressed the meeting. He said that the majority of STC members had been unhappy with the way in which the appraisal had been undertaken: there had been an inadequate level of publicity and engagement with the public. The five positive consultee responses were less representative of local opinion than that canvassed by STC in its own research. Whilst the East Beach area of the town supported the appraisal document for the proposed new conservation area, the same was not the case with those who lived and worked in and around the High Street; the Medmerry Academy for example felt that conservation area status could hamper design. The High Street contained some vacant buildings eg the former National Westminster bank building. STC had tried to support the use of that building for commercial purposes but the planning application had been refused and its attempts to redevelop and improve this part of the town were being hampered by the conservation area designation. The High Street had a 1960s/1970s feel and the mix of development made it difficult to see how it warranted being protected in this way (as opposed to an assessment being undertaken in the usual way within the development management process when a planning application was considered on its own merits). There was anger in STC in that it felt it was not being heard by CDC; of the CDC ward members only Mr Connor indicated support for STC's views. STC had been democratically elected unlike CDC officers and its views should carry weight but instead it felt that in this matter CDC was acting contrary to the democratic process.

In response Mr Frost said that whilst it was difficult to comment on some of the site specific matters, as a general proposition he was not convinced that conservation area status *per se* suppressed development. He referred to the map shown on the screen and remarked that most of the listed and positive contribution buildings were in the northern half of the High Street but nevertheless there was a smattering of both types in the southern half too. De-designation would deprive those buildings (particularly those in the positive contribution category) of protection and put the High Street and its quality in further jeopardy, which was a serious matter for the Cabinet to consider.

Mr Allgrove commented that de-designation would mean that the opportunity to improve negative buildings would be reduced.

Mr Barrow said that he found the issues being debated had created for him a dilemma in terms of the positive and potentially negative effects on development of conservation area status. He echoed Mr Finch's point about local democracy, which warranted careful consideration. Although he did not support de-designation, he felt it was important for CDC and STC to work with each other to achieve a mutually acceptable outcome and accordingly he favoured a deferral of this item for that purpose.

Miss Le Vay said that in conservation areas the local planning authority specifically encouraged development of some sites in order to enhance and preserve the character of the area.

At the end of the discussion Mr Dignum stated that it was clear that further dialogue was required between CDC officers and Selsey ward members and STC. Mr Frost would examine how conservation area status might have influenced the determination of relevant Selsey planning applications. Accordingly he proposed the deferral of this agenda item to enable that dialogue to take place before the Cabinet considered this matter further.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of a deferral of this item.

RESOLVED

That this item be deferred in its entirety to enable officers to enter into further dialogue with Selsey Town Council and Chichester District Council ward members for Selsey with regard to whether or not Selsey High Street should retain its designation status as a Conservation Area and that a further report be submitted to the Cabinet in due course.

267 Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan

The Cabinet considered the report and its two appendices circulated with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Allgrove, Mr Frost and Miss Le Vay were in attendance.

Mrs Taylor referred to Chichester District's distinctive history and the quality of life it afforded to residents and visitors alike. The Historic Environment Strategy (HES) sought to manage change actively. Although it would not apply to the South Downs National Park (SDNP), the SDNP Authority would work in partnership with CDC to ensure a consistency of approach where appropriate. The wide-ranging ambit of the HES was set out in para 6.2 of the report. With reference to the recommendation in para 3.2 and section 7 of the report, the options for reviving at CDC the role of Heritage Champion(s) were set out in appendix 2 (pages 269 and 270). She said that a third recommendation was required to delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning to make typographical changes and other minor amendments prior to the HES and Action Plan (AP) being published for consultation.

Two points arose in the Cabinet's debate: the feasibility of reintroducing the Heritage Champion(s) role (Mr Finch, Mrs Lintill and Mr Barrow) and whether it would be better to incorporate the HES and AP in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Mr Finch).

Members were not persuaded that the role of Heritage Champion (given the responsibility involved) could be realistically undertaken by one member. It was in fact a matter for each ward member and yet it would require commitment and training. In addition it was doubtful that the role would have any practical significance and what influence it could exert. The views had not yet been sought of CDC members about this, including the previous Heritage Champion Mrs J E Duncton.

Mr Allgrove advised that the purpose of the HES and AP (they were not a statutory requirement) was not the same as an SPD in that they did not seek to shape development or advise planning applicants (CDC had in fact a wide range of such guidance documents) but instead to set out how CDC proposed to manage the Historic Environment. Consideration could be given to the merits of preparing a SPD but Mr Allgrove doubted it would be necessary.

Mr Allgrove and Mr Carvell said that in view of the prominence and scale of heritage in this area it was very desirable for heritage issues to be championed although it was recognised to be a considerable undertaking for one individual. However, if there was not to be a single individual acting as Heritage Champion, officers had in mind to group wards and to train a smaller number of members rather than every member; the alternative was to leave it to each member to cover as part of the full range of ward responsibilities.

Mr Dignum concluded from the debate that the recommendation in para 3.2 was not currently supported. He suggested the officers arrange a training session for members about managing the historic environment and see if one or more members expressed any interest in championing Chichester District's Historic Environment.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the first recommendation and against the second recommendation in section 3 of the report; in addition it was unanimously in favour of a third recommendation giving delegated authority to make appropriate minor editorial amendments prior to consultation.

RESOLVED

- (1) That (a) the principles and approach to achieving protection and conservation of the historic environment within Chichester District as set out in the draft Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan appended to the agenda report and (b) its scope and content for the purposes of public consultation be approved.
- (2) That the revival of the role of Heritage Champion as either a single member Champion or a series of Champions covering a group of wards be not approved.
- (3) That the Head of Planning Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning be given delegated authority to make typographical or other minor amendments to the draft Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan prior to the public consultation.

268 Housing Provision for Care Leavers - Recommendations of the Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

The Cabinet considered the report and its two appendices circulated with the agenda (copies attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Taylor.

Mr Dunmall was in attendance.

Mrs Taylor alluded to sections 3, 5 and 8 of and the two appendices to the agenda report. Insofar as the recommendations made by the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group (JSTFG) related to Chichester District, CDC was already compliant (para 5.3 of the report). The JSTFG expressed concern about the impact of changes to the allocation of housing benefit and universal credit on young people under 21. CDC in its response to the JSTFG recommendations was in favour of West Sussex County Council (WSSC) making representations to the government about extending the statutory duty to provide accommodation for those in care from 18 to 21 ((5) on pages 275 and 285). The implementation of the Joint Protocol for Housing Provision for Care Leavers was supported.

Mr Dunmall did not wish to add to Mrs Taylor's introduction.

At Mr Dignum's invitation, Mrs Graves, who was CDC's representative on the JSTFG, addressed the Cabinet. She emphasised the importance of the work undertaken by the JSTFG and commended the resultant Joint Protocol document. Mr Dignum thanked Mrs Graves for her contribution to the JSTFG's review of the policy for housing provision for care leavers.

In reply to Mr Barrow, Mr Dunmall explained that WSSC would continue a caring role for young people who formally left the care system at 18 but the funding for that would be assisted if WSSC had a specific statutory duty to do so. Mrs Graves explained the reason for the JSTFG recommendation that WSSC be requested to amend its Young People's Service provision for care leavers to provide support via the Service from 16 rather than 18 ((7) on page 275 and 286).

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands in favour of the following resolution.

RESOLVED

- (1) That the recommendations set out in the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group report in appendix 1 to the agenda report in respect of housing for care leavers be endorsed.
- (2) Chichester District Council's response to the recommendations by the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Task and Finish Group report, as set out in appendix 2 to the agenda report, be approved so that it can be conveyed to the West Sussex Joint Scrutiny Steering Group.

269 New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme - Awards

The Cabinet considered the agenda report and its two appendices, the first of which was exempt from the public domain and was (unlike the agenda and the second appendix) sent only to members and relevant officers) (copies (save for appendix 1) attached to the official minutes).

The report was presented by Mrs Lintill.

Mr Hyland was in attendance.

Mrs Lintill summarised the two recommendations made by the Grants and Concession Panel with respect to the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme: an application by Donnington Parish Council for £28,145 for 2016 and a request for a variation to a previously agreed award to Lynchmere Parish Council for £30,000 in 2013.

Mr Hyland did not wish to add to Mrs Lintill's introduction but in reply to a query she raised he advised that to date the total allocations from the £250,000 New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocation) budget for 2015-2016 amounted to £207,925.

There were no other questions and no comments by the Cabinet members.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously by a show of hands to make the following resolution.

RESOLVED

That the recommendations of the Grants and Concessions Panel in relation to the respective applications made under the New Homes Bonus (Parish Allocations) Scheme by Donnington Parish Council and Lynchmere Parish Council, which exceeded the £25,000 delegation limit for the Cabinet Member for Community Services, be approved.

270 **Late Items**

There were no late items for urgent consideration by the Cabinet at this meeting.

[**Note** At the end of this item and before the resolution for the meeting to move into Part II there was a short adjournment between 11:08 and 11:13]

271 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Decision

The Cabinet determined to exclude the public and press from the meeting in order to consider agenda item 15 as a Part II matter.

RESOLVED

That the public and press be excluded from the consideration of the agenda report and its appendices for agenda item 15 on the grounds that it is likely that there would be a disclosure to the public of 'exempt information' of the description specified in Paragraph 1 (information relating to any individual) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972* and because in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing that information.

272 **Succession Planning**

[**Note** In accordance with their earlier declarations of a personal interest in this agenda item (minute 260) Mr Carvell, Mr Over and Mr Ward had withdrawn from the meeting at the end of agenda item 13, at the start of the short adjournment]

The Cabinet considered the confidential report and its two appendices circulated with the agenda to CDC members and relevant officers only.

The report was introduced by Mrs Shepherd.

Mrs Belenger and Mr Bennett in their capacities as the Deputy Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer were in attendance.

The three aforementioned officers answered members' questions and comments on points of detail.

Members commended the clarity and comprehensiveness of the report.

Decision

The Cabinet voted unanimously on a show of hands in favour of making the following resolution and recommendation.

RESOLVED

That the Succession Plan set out in the confidential agenda report and its appendices be endorsed.

RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL

That the Council approves the recommendations made in paras 3.1 to 3.5 inclusive of the confidential agenda report.

[**Note** The meeting ended at 11:46]

CHAIRMAN

DATE