

SOUTH HAMS COUNCIL



Minutes of a meeting of the **South Hams Council** held on
**Thursday, 15th December, 2016 at 2.00 pm at the Council Chamber -
Follaton House**

Present: **Councillors:**

Chairman Cllr Smerdon
Vice Chairman Cllr Cuthbert

Cllr Baldry
Cllr Blackler
Cllr Brazil
Cllr Cane
Cllr Gilbert
Cllr Hitchins
Cllr Holway
Cllr May
Cllr Pennington
Cllr Rowe
Cllr Steer
Cllr Vint
Cllr Wright

Cllr Birch
Cllr Bramble
Cllr Brown
Cllr Foss
Cllr Green
Cllr Hodgson
Cllr Hopwood
Cllr Pearce
Cllr Pringle
Cllr Saltern
Cllr Tucker
Cllr Wingate

In attendance:

Officers:

Catherine Bowen
Sophie Hosking
Steve Jordan

Executive Director
Executive Director Head of Paid Service

53. **Petition - Salcombe Road Sweeper**

53/16

Upon the commencement of the meeting, the Chairman received a petition from Salcombe residents calling for the return of Mr Chad Benson to the role of road sweeper for the town of Salcombe.

The Chairman proceeded to exercise his discretion to permit the petition organiser to make a short representation to the Council. In so doing, the representative paid tribute to Mr Benson and urged Council officers to reconsider their decision and to reinstate him to the position of road sweeper for Salcombe.

54. Minutes

54/16

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 29 September 2016 and the Special Council meeting held on 27 October 2016 were both confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

55. Declarations of Interest

55/16

Members and officers were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting, but there was none made.

56. Business Brought Forward by the Chairman

56/16

The Chairman made reference to the following announcements:-

- his wish to thank Members for their support with his Christmas Raffle Draw, which had raised £300 for his chosen charity (South Brent Caring);
- his Christmas refreshments. The Chairman proceeded to invite all Members to his office (upon the rising of this meeting) for light refreshments.

57. Questions

57/16

It was noted that six questions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8.

The Chairman advised that, since Cllr Hicks had forwarded his apologies to this meeting, he would respond to question (a); Cllr Tucker would reply to question (b); and Cllr Pearce would respond to questions (c), (d), (e) and (f)

From Cllr Hodgson to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

- (a) 'Can the controversial proposed development site T3 in the centre of Totnes be removed from the Joint Local Plan with the provision that Totnes Neighbourhood Plan group is allowed to propose how appropriate areas or zones of this site should be redeveloped?'*

At this point, the Chairman informed that, since this question would potentially pre-empt the debate on the motion submitted by Cllrs Rowe and Holway later in the meeting, he had been advised that it would be inappropriate for a response to be given to this question at this time.

From Cllr Baldry to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

- (b) *'You are quoted in the Press as saying "Sherford is about building local homes for local people". Is this an accurate report? If it is in what legal way do you see it possible to enforce that Sherford dwellings are occupied/owned by local people?'*

In response, Cllr Tucker advised that a minimum of 1,000 affordable and rental houses would be built at Sherford. However, those properties that were ultimately sold on the open market could be purchased by anyone.

In his supplementary question, Cllr Baldry stated that this was clearly an incorrect statement drafted by the Communications Team and he urged Executive Members to ensure that comments that were attributed to them were factually correct.

From Cllr Birch to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

- (c) *'What situation is envisaged whereby the T3 Area becomes 'vulnerable to approach by any developer' bearing in mind the fact that the area is owned by SHDC?'*

In response, Cllr Pearce advised that, as Cllr Birch would no doubt be aware, any developer could apply for permission on any land regardless of whether they owned it or not. It was necessary only to serve a Certificate B on the registered owner before submitting. Having said that, Cllr Pearce did assure Cllr Birch that the Council had no intention of acceding to any approach by any developer on this site.

In reply to a supplementary question regarding any such future plans for this Area, Cllr Pearce reiterated that she was personally not aware of any future intention to accede to any approach from any developer on this site.

From Cllr Birch to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

- (d) *'Has the District Council's officers held any discussions with developers and/or their agents concerning:*

- (i) the possible future development of the T3 area or any parts of it? and
(ii) the possible future sale of the T3 area or parts of it?'*

In reply, Cllr Pearce informed that there had been no discussions between officers and any prospective purchasers. The Council presently had no intention of selling any part of this land nor for the moment did it envisage any such sale.

In reply to a supplementary question regarding the future plans for this Area, Cllr Pearce reiterated that she was personally not aware of any future intention to hold any such discussions.

From Cllr Birch to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

(e) *'Has the District Council's officers held any discussions with commercial property agents and/or residential estate agents concerning:*

- (i) the possible future sale of the T3 area or any parts of it? and*
- (ii) the valuation of the T3 area or parts of it?'*

In reply, Cllr Pearce informed that there had been no discussions between officers and any prospective purchasers. The Council presently had no intention of selling any part of this land nor for the moment did it envisage any such sale.

In reply to a supplementary question regarding any future proposals for this Area, Cllr Pearce reiterated that she was personally not aware of any future intention to hold any such discussions.

From Cllr Birch to Cllr Hicks, lead Executive Member for the Joint Local Plan

(f) *'Are there any internal council reports prepared by officers dealing with the possible future sale of the T3 area or part of it?'*

In response, Cllr Pearce confirmed that, to the knowledge of the officers presently working for the Council, there had been no such reports. In addition, no such reports had been able to be traced.

Cllr Birch proceeded to ask a supplementary question regarding whether or not there was a likelihood of any such internal reports being produced in the future. In reply, Cllr Pearce advised that, at this time, she was not aware of any intention for any such reports to be prepared.

58. Notices of Motions

58/16

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

(a) By Cllrs Green and Hodgson

"In response to rising concerns regarding the role of the Local Enterprise Partnership in participating in the bid for public funding to finance the HOSW Devolution bid, this Council calls for LEP Board Members to be bound by the same code of conduct as Publicly Elected Representatives."

In introducing the motion, the proposer made reference to:-

- a recent national media report that had claimed that over 250 payments had been made (amounting to over £100 million) by LEP Board Members that involved obvious conflicts of interest;
- his motion both seeking to protect LEP Board Members and encourage transparency;
- his general view that, across the country, the local government overview and scrutiny function had not been sufficiently scrutinising LEP's. When

considering the huge sums of public expenditure involved, the Proposer felt this to be regrettable.

In the ensuing debate, the following points were raised:-

- (a) Some Members informed that LEP Board Members were subject to the same rules and guidance in respect of registering and declaring their interests. Furthermore, a Member had reviewed the South West LEP website and found that most Board Members had declared their respective interests. However, it was also acknowledged that not all Board Members appeared to have complied with this requirement;
- (b) With regard to the overview and scrutiny of the LEP, the view was expressed that the County Council would probably be taking a lead in this regard. As a consequence, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel requested that the Head of Paid Service check whether this was the case and, if it was not, he would be more than happy for this Council's Panel to take on ownership of this matter;
- (c) Whilst supporting the sentiments of the motion, a Member did highlight the importance of the most appropriate industry representatives being involved on LEP Boards;
- (d) A Member stressed his total opposition to the principle of LEP Boards and felt it to be regrettable that such emphasis, responsibility and power was being given to these unelected bodies.

It was then:

RESOLVED

In response to rising concerns regarding the role of the Local Enterprise Partnership in participating in the bid for public funding to finance the HOSW Devolution bid, this Council calls for LEP Board Members to be bound by the same code of conduct as Publicly Elected Representatives.

(b) By Cllrs Hodgson and Green

"In the light of the proposed NHS cuts and the likely impact on local care services, the HOSW Devolution Bid should include a request for funding to secure a health service which looks after the needs of all those living in Devon and Somerset."

In her introduction, the proposer highlighted that:

- there was a huge amount of community concern regarding these cuts, which were becoming an even bigger issue in light of the aging population;
- Health and Wellbeing was an important component of the Devolution Bid;
- a similar motion had been approved by Devon County Council at its meeting on 8 December 2016.

During the subsequent discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (i) Some Members were of the view that, when considering the aging population and the rural nature of Devon, the NHS changes were wholly unsuitable to this area. To mitigate against the impact, it was felt that this motion was suggesting a potential solution;
- (ii) It was noted that central government had indicated that it would not devolve such powers as part of any Devolution Bid;
- (iii) Some Members supported the thrust of the motion, but were of the view that there may be better means of attracting appropriate funding. Furthermore, it was confirmed that extensive lobbying to central government was currently taking place and an announcement regarding social care funding was anticipated imminently.

It was then:

RESOLVED

In the light of the proposed NHS cuts and the likely impact on local care services, the HOSW Devolution Bid should include a request for funding to secure a health service which looks after the needs of all those living in Devon and Somerset.

(c) By Cllrs Green and Hodgson

“The Council will consider allowing Neighbourhood Plan groups to decide to develop recommendations for specific sites and remove these sites from the JLP on condition that the estimated number of dwellings included in the JLP for that Neighbourhood Plan area is not reduced.”

In his introduction, the proposer was of the view that the Council should create the provision (where there was good reason) for certain areas to be removed from the Joint Local Plan (JLP) and into Neighbourhood Plans. In addition, he considered this motion to be timely in advance of the Special Council meeting on 2 March 2017 to consider the next stage of the JLP process.

In the ensuing discussion, the point was made that the prescribed legal process should be allowed to run its course and approval of this motion at this time would make the whole JLP process somewhat vulnerable. Whilst the Council would aspire to achieve the intention of this motion, it was currently considered to be too early in the process, with it being more appropriate for Neighbourhood Plan groups to influence the programme at the March 2017 consultation stage.

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

(d) By Cllrs Vint and Birch

“That this Council:

notes the ruling of the High Court (Case No: CO/2241/2016) in support of a housing policy known as ‘H2. Full Time Principal Residence Requirement’ as set out in St Ives Area Neighbourhood Development Plan and which

provides that: 'New second homes and holiday lets will not be permitted at any time..' and

supports and encourages *Town and Parish Councils within the South Hams District to adopt similar policies in their own Neighbourhood Development Plans."*

The proposer introduced the motion and highlighted the implications of the high court decision whereby town and parish councils now had the power to specify the types of homes that were permitted to be built.

In discussion, reference was made to:

- (i) a suggested amendment to the motion. Since it was considered to be the Council's role to be in a neutral position regarding the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan, a Member suggested that the words '*and encourages*' should be deleted from the motion. The proposer and seconder of the motion confirmed their willingness to accept this suggestion and the substantive motion was updated accordingly;
- (ii) support for the motion. Some Members commented that the Council should do everything it could to take advantage of this landmark ruling;
- (iii) reference to 'holiday lets'. Whilst there was confusion regarding whether or not reference was included to 'holiday lets' in the policy, since the motion included the words '*to adopt similar policies*', then there was considered to be sufficient flexibility to enable Members to support its approval;

It was then:

RESOLVED

That this Council:

notes the ruling of the High Court (Case No: CO/2241/2016) in support of a housing policy known as 'H2. Full Time Principal Residence Requirement' as set out in St Ives Area Neighbourhood Development Plan and which provides that: 'New second homes and holiday lets will not be permitted at any time..' and

supports Town and Parish Councils within the South Hams District to adopt similar policies in their own Neighbourhood Development Plans.

(e) By Cllrs Ward and Holway

"The Council develops a plan to become more dementia aware, particularly for customer facing staff and to support the development of dementia awareness in the community."

(NOTE: in the absence of Cllr Ward, Cllr Holway proposed the motion, which was then seconded by Cllr Cuthbert.)

In his introduction, the proposer stated that there was scope for the Council to set more of an example in this respect. Furthermore, the proposer felt that there was the need for emphasis to be given to Dementia Awareness in the Member Learning and Development Plan.

In discussion, the seconder highlighted that awareness of dementia was as important as actual funding provision.

It was then:

RESOLVED

The Council develops a plan to become more dementia aware, particularly for customer facing staff and to support the development of dementia awareness in the community.

(f) By Cllrs Rowe and Holway

“We propose that the area known as T3 should be removed from the Joint Local Plan.”

In her introduction, the proposer provided an extensive history of the area known as T3 and emphasised the importance of this site to the town of Totnes. In her conclusion, the proposer stressed her wish for the T3 area to be left alone and she therefore did not wish to see the site remain in the Joint Local Plan (JLP).

In the ensuing debate, reference was made to:-

(a) an amendment. The following amendment was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** as follows:

“This Council appreciates support from the Council’s officers to consider the Market Square in Totnes as a non-designated heritage asset and further the Council supports the work being done to designate Leechwell Gardens as a public open space. For this reason, the two areas will remain in the Local Plan. Further, the Grove School site and all the remaining sites in the Totnes Central Area will be removed from the Joint Local Plan.”

In support of her amendment, the proposer informed that:

- the Market Square was in the Conservation Area;
- the Grove School would not be relocating;
- the parking area would remain as a parking area;
- the amendment would have no overall effect on the JLP and the lead officer had been consulted and was content with this wording; and
- there would be a further opportunity for views to be expressed during the March 2017 consultation stage.

In contrast, other Members felt that this amendment presented a number of potential loopholes and it did not go far enough to reassure the local community. In particular, the lack of reference to removal of the proposed 70 dwellings was felt to be a real cause for concern.

Whilst the point was made on a number of occasions that professional officer advice had advised that removal at this time of the area known as T3 would seriously jeopardise the entire JLP process, several other Members wished to refute this claim and highlighted that areas T5, T6 and T8 had already been removed.

When put to the vote, the amendment was declared **CARRIED** and therefore became the substantive motion;

- (b) a further amendment. A further amendment was **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** as follows:

*“This Council appreciates support from the Council’s officers to consider the Market Square in Totnes as a non-designated heritage asset and further the Council supports the work being done to designate Leechwell Gardens as a public open space. For this reason, the two areas will remain in the Local Plan. Further, the Grove School site and all the remaining sites in the Totnes Central Area **together with the allocation of 70 dwellings** will be removed from the Joint Local Plan.”*

In support of the motion, some Members felt that the amendment would provide clear guidance to officers before the JLP was next presented to the Special Council meeting on 2 March 2017 for consideration. Officers again emphasised their advice that the removal of the 70 dwellings at this stage would jeopardise the entire JLP process. This point was again disputed by some Members.

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

It was then:

RESOLVED

This Council appreciates support from the Council’s officers to consider the Market Square in Totnes as a non-designated heritage asset and further the Council supports the work being done to designate Leechwell Gardens as a public open space. For this reason, the two areas will remain in the Local Plan. Further, the Grove School site and all the remaining sites in the Totnes Central Area will be removed from the Joint Local Plan.

- (g) **By Cllrs Hodgson and Green**

“In the event that SHDC approves the Local Authority Controlled Company to deliver services on behalf of this Council, then a local referendum to ascertain public support would be held. (This could be held as part of the proposed referendum next March on a Combined Authority of Devon and Somerset).”

The proposer introduced her motion and emphasised how strongly she felt about the methods by which the Council undertook its consultation exercises. Whilst she acknowledged that there were cost implications, a decision on the Local Authority Controlled Company (LACC) was so significant that she considered that it merited a local referendum.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (a) referendums. Whilst some Members stated their support for the principle of a referendum, other Members were of the view that elected representatives were in place to represent their local communities;
- (b) an operational decision. Since a decision on whether or not to establish a LACC would be an operational matter for the Council to ultimately determine, a Member advised that he could not support this motion.

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

59. Appointment of Salcombe Harbour Board Co-Opted Member

59/16

Members considered a report that sought to approve the appointment of a Co-Opted Member to the Salcombe Harbour Board.

In discussion, both the Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Board confirmed that the recommended candidate had been subject to the normal recruitment and selection process.

It was then:

RESOLVED

That, with immediate effect, Ali Jones be appointed to the Salcombe Harbour Board as a Co-Opted Member for the period to the date of the Annual Council meeting in May 2020.

60. Reports of Bodies

60/16

(a) Salcombe Harbour Board – 26 September 2016

SH.17/16: Strategic Business Plan 2017/22

RESOLVED

That the Salcombe Harbour Board's Strategic Business Plan 2017/22 be adopted.

SH.18/16: 2017/18 Budget

RESOLVED

That the proposed 2017/18 budget (as set out in the agenda report presented to the Board) be approved.

SH.19/16: Proposed Charges 2017/18

Whilst it was regrettable, the Chairman of the Board advised that the recommended increases in security charges were as a consequence of a recent spate of marine related crime on the Estuary.

RESOLVED

That the proposed charges (as set out in the appendix to the published Board minutes) be approved for implementation from 1 April 2017.

(b) Overview & Scrutiny Panel – 6 October 2016

(c) Executive – 20 October 2016

E.33/16: Annual Review of Health and Safety Policy

RESOLVED

That the revised Health and Safety Policy be adopted before it is then signed by the Head of Paid Service and the Leader of the Council.

E.34/16(b): Reports of Other Bodies: Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 4 August 2016

O&S.17/16: Task and Finish Group Updates

(a) Partnerships – Update Report

RESOLVED

1. That the Partnership Policy (as outlined at Appendix 1 of the presented agenda report to the Panel) and Guidance (as outlined at Appendix 2 of the presented agenda report to the Panel) be adopted;
2. That the Partnership Register (as outlined at Appendix 3 of the presented agenda report to the Panel) be adopted;
3. That the review and recommendations of the Task and Finish Group (as outlined at Appendix 4 of the presented agenda report to the Panel) be agreed;
4. That partnerships be retained at current financial levels for 2017/18, subject to any financial modifications (as set out in Appendix 4 of the presented agenda report to the Panel) and/or any changes required pursuant to the ongoing reviews into the partnership arrangements with the CAB and CVS;
5. That new, or updated, Partnership agreements be established for 2017/18 onwards establishing clear outcomes relating to Our Plan themes and, where appropriate, the Locality work to ensure co-ordinated delivery for communities; and
6. That alongside this, a further financial and governance review be undertaken to identify the most appropriate delivery options aligned to financial and procurement procedures once a decision on the LACC is confirmed.

E.36/16: Fleet Replacement

RESOLVED

1. That Option 3(a) be adopted as the Fleet Replacement Programme for the Council (as outlined in paragraph 4.4 of the presented agenda report to the Executive);
2. That the contribution to the vehicle replacement earmarked reserve be re-profiled in accordance with Option 3(a) (as shown in Table 6 of the presented agenda report to the Executive) to ensure the budget is aligned to the timing of the vehicle purchases up to March 2022;
3. That £35,000 be utilised from the 2016/17 Capital Programme Contingency Budget to fund the shortfall in 2016/17 (this recommendation is subject to the Option chosen and is based on Option 3(a) being recommended); and
4. That minor amendments to the Fleet Replacement Programme be delegated to the Waste Manager (Operations) and the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the lead Executive Members for Commercial Services and Support Services.

(d) Development Management Committee – 26 October 2016

(e) Overview & Scrutiny Panel – 3 November 2016

(f) Salcombe Harbour Board – 21 November 2016

SH.27/16: Update on the Local Authority Controlled Company (LACC)

For clarity, Members were advised that the information that had been relayed to the Board in relation to the LACC had been correct at the time of that meeting (21 November 2016).

SH.29/16: Early Repayment of Loans with South Hams District Council

Members noted that the recommended early repayment of loans would equate to a loss of income to the Council of £111,000. Whilst the recommendation was in the best interests of the Harbour Board, it was also noted that the Leader and the lead Executive Member for Support Services had been consulted, and had agreed this approach, prior to the report being prepared.

It was then:

RESOLVED

1. That the early capital repayment of £30,000 of the Residents pontoons loan in 2017/18, to be funded from the Harbour's pontoons Reserve be agreed;
2. That the early capital repayment of £114,000 of the Batson pontoons loan in 2019/20, to be funded from the Harbour's pontoons Reserve be agreed; and

3. That the contribution to the Council's Marine Infrastructure Reserve in 2017/18 be increased from £46,300 to £58,000, to reflect the annual depreciation of the Council's marine assets.

(g) Development Management Committee – 23 November 2016

DM.46/16: Review of Site Inspection Protocol

RESOLVED

1. That the revised Site Inspection Protocol (as presented at Appendix A to the Committee report) be adopted; and
2. That authority to make minor amendments be delegated to the COP Lead Specialist Development Management, in consultation with the Chairman of the Development Management Committee.

(h) Overview & Scrutiny Panel – 24 November 2016

O&S.51/16: Latest Published Executive Forward Plan

(b) Allocations Policy and Devon Home Choice Policy Review

Panel Members reiterated the concerns that were raised at this meeting in respect of the service being provided by the Devon Home Choice Partnership.

(i) Licensing Committee – 24 November 2016

L.07/16: Licensing of Taxi Drivers Policy

RESOLVED

That the draft Taxi Driver Licensing Policy (as outlined at Appendix B of the agenda report presented to the Committee) be adopted to come into effect from 1 January 2017.

L.08/16: Taxi Fare Setting Formula and Policy

RESOLVED

1. That the policy and associated formula for setting taxi fares in the South Hams be approved and that approval also be given to the use of the South Hams average annual wage as the basis for this formula;
2. That the draft Maximum Chargeable Fare Setting Policy be adopted; and
3. That the Constitution be amended to delegate to the Community of Practice Lead for Environmental Health authority to use the approved formula to set the cost per mile for taxi fares.

L.09/16: Delegation of Powers for Determinations of Certain Licensing Functions

RESOLVED

That the amendments proposed to the Constitution in relation to the delegation of powers for the determination of licensing decisions, as attached at Appendix A of the report presented to the Committee, subject to inclusion of the following additional responsibility:

'To determine to revoke or suspend a Hackney Carriage / Private Hire Driver or Private Hire Operator Licence.'

L.10/16: Licensing of Pleasure Boats and Pleasure Boatmen

RESOLVED

1. That the South West Regional Ports Association guidelines for the licensing of Pleasure Boats and Pleasure Boatmen licences; and
2. That the Constitution be amended whereby the power to grant, withhold, revoke or suspend Pleasure Boat and Pleasure Boatmen Licences be delegated to the Marine Officer.

(j) Executive – 1 December 2016

E.38/16: Urgent Business

(a) Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 6 October 2016

(ii) O&S.30/16: Parking Arrangements for Vehicle Tax Exempt Motorists

RESOLVED

That the arrangements for disabled vehicle tax-exempt motorists remain unchanged, but that the public consultation in respect of this be repeated.

E.41/16: Council Tax Reduction Scheme

RESOLVED

That no changes be made to the scheme for 2017/18 (i.e. the existing 2016/17 scheme be retained for 2017/18).

E.42/16: Adoption of a UAV/Drone Policy

RESOLVED

1. That the UAV/Drone Policy (as set out in the presented appendix to the Executive meeting) be formally adopted with immediate effect; and
2. That authority be delegated to the COP Lead Assets, in consultation with the lead Executive Member for Customer First to make minor amendments to the Policy as necessary.

E.46/16: Reports of Other Bodies

(b) Overview and Scrutiny Panel – 24 November 2016

**O&S.55/16: Task and Finish Group Updates:
(e) Permits Review**

RESOLVED

That, following the work undertaken by the Permits Task and Finish Group, the parking permits available in the South Hams be amended and that the Off-Street Parking Places Order be amended as follows:

- Full and Commuter permits to be eliminated and replaced with Town Centre, Peripheral and Rural permits which will be limited to specific towns / villages. The cost of permits to be reduced to reflect the new restrictions, with the exception of Business Permits;
- Permits to become 'virtual' (i.e. customers will no longer receive a paper permit), with the exception of Business Permits;
- New permits be limited to one vehicle registration number only, with the exception of Business Permits;
- The availability of permits be limited to 10% of the total number of parking bays available for each category of permit;
- Permits currently issued free of charge to various organisations be ceased;
- Other permits which are not used often will be eliminated (as outlined at Paragraph 5.6 of the presented agenda report to the Panel);
- The Residents' Parking permit to be extended to allow parking from 3.00pm to 10.00am, with an increase in cost to £40, with this amendment being reviewed after one year;
- The cost of permits to be as outlined at Paragraph 5.8 of the presented agenda report to the Panel; and
- All leisure-related permits will be reviewed in partnership with the new leisure contractor, with the exception of permits currently issued to Tone Leisure employees.

The Meeting concluded at 4.40 pm

Signed by:

Chairman
