

Council

Wednesday, 31 October 2018

Attendees:

Councillor Christopher Arnold, Councillor Lewis Barber, Councillor Nick Barlow, Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Tina Bourne, Councillor Roger Buston, Councillor Nigel Chapman, Councillor Peter Chillingworth, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Phil Coleman, Councillor Nick Cope, Councillor Simon Crow, Councillor Robert Davidson, Councillor Beverly Davies, Councillor Paul Dundas, Councillor John Elliott, Councillor Andrew Ellis, Councillor Vic Flores, Councillor Adam Fox, Councillor Martin Goss, Councillor Dave Harris, Councillor Chris Hayter, Councillor Pauline Hazell, Councillor Theresa Higgins, Councillor Mike Hogg, Councillor Brian Jarvis, Councillor John Jowers, Councillor David King, Councillor Darius Laws, Councillor Cyril Liddy, Councillor Michael Lilley, Councillor Sue Lissimore, Councillor Derek Loveland, Councillor Andrea Luxford Vaughan, Councillor Fiona Maclean, Councillor Jackie Maclean, Councillor Patricia Moore, Councillor Beverley Oxford, Councillor Gerard Oxford, Councillor Philip Oxford, Councillor Chris Pearson, Councillor Lee Scordis, Councillor Lesley Scott-Boutell, Councillor Martyn Warnes, Councillor Lorcan Whitehead, Councillor Dennis Willetts, Councillor Barbara Wood, Councillor Julie Young, Councillor Tim Young

278 Prayers

The meeting was opened with prayers by the Mayors Chaplain, the Reverend John Richardson.

279 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Bentley and Cory.

280 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Council)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

281 Have Your Say! (Council)

Nick Chilvers addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) to express his concerns about the Painters Yard planning application. The public

wanted to see more public space, better design and less density and mass. Whilst objectors had been told to look at the bigger picture, the Planning Committee could not abandon scrutiny and needed to look at the detail of the application. The Committee had a duty to consider the comments of the consultees, which included a number of objections from a number of reputable organisations. The Planning Committee hearing would be watched carefully to ensure members considered the application in a fair and objective manner. The adverse impact of the scheme significantly outweighed the benefits. The Council should consult seriously on the future of the site and put Colchester in control. A further years delay in order to get the scheme right would not matter.

Councillor Barlow, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, explained that the Planning Committee would be free to determine the planning application as it saw fit on the basis of the evidence before it.

Asa Aldis addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) about the Local Plan. A new option for the Local Plan had been agreed by the Local Plan Committee, which included the provision of a Sustainability Appraisal. LUC Associates had been chosen to deliver this. This had now been completed and it contained an extension to the garden community on land between the University of Essex and Wivenhoe. This was part of Wivenhoe's green belt and helped Wivenhoe maintain its status as a separate settlement. This site was protected by the Wivenhoe Neighbourhood Plan. It could set a national precedent by making national plans redundant. The site should be removed and alternatives considered. The sustainability appraisal contained no new garden community sites as was requested by the Inspector, nor did it include proportionate growth or neighbourhood extensions. There were a number of other issues with the Plan, for instance the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders, which did not work. In order to reduce the impact on Colchester, the OAN needed to be reduced to take account of the revised ONS population figures. The Plan should only consider the current plan period. There were real alternatives to the course proposed and this opportunity needed to be taken to ensure all other options were fully considered.

Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Business and Culture, stressed that it was vital for a Local Plan to be in place in order to control development. The Plan did not fail: more evidence had been requested and the Council was currently gathering this. A further letter had been sent to the Inspector and his response was awaited. The Sustainability Appraisal was being looked at, and officers were currently working to ensure that the Local Plan Committee had all the evidence it needed for a full Sustainability Appraisal. As part of this new Garden Community locations would be looked at. The Local Plan Committee had accepted the housing figure of 920: if the Council sought to review this, it was likely that the government would seek to revise it upwards. Other alternatives and options would be looked at over the coming months before the Local Plan Committee was invited to consider the matter further.

Trevor Orton addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) about the work he had undertaken to improve Colchester town centre. He thanked Councillors Goss, Laws and Higgins for their support. The Council needed to address a number of eyesores and issues in the town centre, which would help encourage tourists to return to Colchester.

Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation thanked Trevor Orton for his comments, and for his honesty and tenacity in raising issues. The town centre was improving as a result of the programme the administration had instituted, and there were more improvements to come. For example the old Odeon site would be cleaned up, and remedial works to Jumbo had been identified. There was considerable cross party work underway to address the issues that had been highlighted.

Katie Francis addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) to object to some of the supporting comments about the Painters Yard planning application. The limited Have Your Say provisions at Planning Committee, were insufficient to address the concerns raised by this application. It was claimed that the scheme would relieve pressure on HMOs in the vicinity of the University. This was not reflected by the experience in other locations. Whilst the University was looking to expand, it was seeking to support this through accommodation on campus. If the number of HMOs was a concern there were other methods of addressing this, such as through an appropriate policy in the Local Plan. The development also offered only one wheelchair accessible room. As the development was on public land, the Council should do more to promote equal access for all. It was also suggested that the development would have a positive economic impact on the area. However, the developers had overestimated the likely disposable income of students, and tourism could be adversely affected by the development. The proposal failed to make the most of the site history, and the developers had not taken account of advice from Historic England to move the western block, as this would affect the viability of the scheme.

Councillor Barlow, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services, explained that Planning Committee speaking provisions could be amended at the Chairman's discretion. Councillor Hazell, Chairman of the Planning Committee, stressed that the Committee was independent and would consider the matter within the framework of planning law and local and national planning policies. It would seek to consider the application fairly and objectively.

The Mayor announced that the Council's Revenues Teams had been awarded a Revenues Team of the Year Highly Commended Award by the Institute of Rating, Revenue and Valuation (IRRV). This was a national award and was for the general work of the team who have achieved some of their best ever results whilst finding efficiencies and better ways of working. The judges had been really impressed with all of the improvements made over the last couple of years, and particularly at the commitment and enthusiasm of officers.

The Mayor expressed Council's thanks to the team and presented Samantha Preston, Customer Business Manager, Megan Shedd and Rhiannon Archer, Business Rates Officers, with the award.

Councillor Higgins presented the Mayor with 100 embroidered hearts made by the Embroidery Guild for display as part of the events to mark the 100th anniversary of the end of the First World War.

Councillor Higgins announced that Colchester had won a silver gilt in the Small City category in the Britain in Bloom awards and the Mayor thanked Pam Schomberg and her team for her hard work in securing this award.

The Mayor thanked all those who had attended and supported the Oyster Feast. There was a full programme of civic events coming up, including a performance of a Christmas Carol, and he hoped Councillors would be able to support these. He thanked those who had joined him on the Colchester Orbital walk. A successful curry quiz evening had also been held.

283 2017/18 Year End Review of Risk Management

RESOLVED that the recommendation contained in minute 295 of the Cabinet meeting of 10 October 2018 be approved and adopted.

284 IHRA Definition of Anti-Semitism

Alan Short addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5). He stressed that he was appalled by the rise in racism and anti-semitism, which needed to be opposed wherever it occurred. He had a number of links to Israel. However he was concerned by the proposed motion and asked whether members had read all the illustrative examples that accompanied the definition. Some of the examples had been criticised by leading international lawyers who claimed that it would restrict free speech and circumvent the actual definition of anti-semitism. Would his opposition to certain policies or actions of the Israeli government lead to him being defined as anti-semitic? The motion did not make it clear what the Council would do as a consequence

of adopting the definition or how it would be applied.

Mark Bygrave addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5). He had experienced racism all his life. He recognised that anti-semitism existed and he was fiercely opposed to all forms of racism. He was not convinced that anti-semitism was the greatest issue of racism facing Colchester. Islamophobia and racism against non-whites went unabated and unchallenged. The IHRA definition was a poor tool to tackle anti-semitism. He had written to all Councillors with details of the opinion of Hugh Tomlinson QC that the definition lacked clarity and comprehensiveness. The Council could find itself in legal difficulties should it use it to bar activities. If Council adopted the definition it should not adopt the examples, and it should also adopt a declaration of free speech alongside it.

Barry Gilheany addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5). Anti-semitism was the oldest form of hatred in the world, and it had assumed many forms throughout history, including lately a more insidious form of anti-semitism relating to Zionism and the state of Israel. There was nothing in the definition or the examples which would restrict debate or free speech or silence academic discussion. The definition was signed by 34 countries, the Scottish, Welsh and UK governments, and all major political parties in the UK. It was racist to suggest that the foundation of the state of Israel was a racist endeavour. The Council should support the motion on the basis of anti-racist principles.

It was proposed by Councillor T. Young, on behalf of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Cory, and the other Group Leaders, Councillor Goss, Councillor Laws and Councillor G. Oxford, that:-

1. This Council believes that we are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Racism, xenophobia and hate crimes have no place in our country. Colchester Borough Council condemns racism, xenophobia and hate crimes unequivocally. We will not allow hate to become acceptable. We are pleased to note the strong stance that Essex Police have taken against these issues. Colchester Borough Council will work to ensure local bodies and programmes have support and resources needed to fight and prevent all these anti-social acts, and reassures all people living in Colchester borough that they are valued and welcome members of our community."
2. As reflected in our Equality and Diversity Policies, the Council will continue to:
 - (a) ensure that unfair discrimination does not arise by promoting equality of opportunity, valuing diversity and promoting good relations between the diverse members of our community, as well as tolerance and understanding of the needs of others; and
 - (b) recognise that people need protection from unfair discrimination, as set out in the

Equalities legislation;

3. The Council notes:

(a) that, in December 2016, the UK Government became the first European Union country to formally adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition of Anti-Semitism; and

(b) the letter from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, dated 30 January 2017, strongly encouraging councils to adopt the definition of Anti-Semitism.

4. The Council adopts the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition of Anti-Semitism, as set out below:

"Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of Anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

(5) The definition of Anti-Semitism, together with the accompanying illustrative examples, be used to guide the Council in the delivery of its equalities duties in relevant circumstances.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried (forty eight voted for, none voted against and one abstained from voting).

A named vote having been requested pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 15(2) the voting was as follows:-

FOR: Councillors Arnold, Barber, Barlow, Barton, Bourne, Buston, Chapman, Chuah, Coleman, Crow, Davidson, Davies, Dundas, Elliott, Ellis, Flores, Fox, Goss, Harris, Hayter, Hazell, Higgins, Hogg, Jarvis, Jowers, King, Laws, Liddy, Lilley, Lissimore, Loveland, Luxford Vaughan, F. Maclean, J. Maclean, Moore, B. Oxford, G. Oxford, P. Oxford, Pearson, Scordis, Scott-Boutell, Warnes, Willetts, Wood, J Young, T. Young, the Mayor (Chillingworth) and the Deputy Mayor (Cope).

AGAINST: None

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: Councillor Whitehead

285 **Breaking Point**

John Akker addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) and urged Council to concentrate on what united them rather than what divided them and not to consider the motion in a party political manner. Residents believed that there was an emergency situation in respect of Council services. There had been unprecedented cuts in public services. For example the school in Mersea had shortfalls in equipment and staff, with the effect that it did not meet the aspirations of pupils and parents. Council should take account of the recent report by the Institute of Fiscal Studies which showed that most government departments had suffered real cuts in funding for years to come. Council was urged to consider a joint resolution supported by all groups setting out what action the Council would take to deal with this situation. It should take into account the new funding formulas which would have such a devastating impact on public services in the UK.

Mark Goacher addressed Council pursuant to the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 6(5) to support the motion and echoed the comments of Mr Akker. All residents were affected by the reduction in central government funding. By 2020 a high percentage of Councils would not receive any core funding, and the impact of this on local government services had been highlighted by the Conservative Chairman of the Local Government Association. It affected Councils of all political persuasions. The National Audit Office had estimated that one million residents were missing out on social care to which they were entitled.

It was proposed by Councillor T. Young that:-

“This Council notes that many council budgets are now at Breaking Point. Austerity has caused huge damage to communities up and down the UK, with devastating effects on key public services that protect the most defenceless in society – children at risk, disabled adults and vulnerable older people – and the services we all rely on, like clean streets, libraries, and children’s centres;

- Conservative cuts mean councils have lost 60p out of every £1 that the last Labour Government was spending on local government in 2010;
- Councils had to spend an extra £800m last year to meet the demand on vital services to protect children;
- With an aging population and growing demand adult social care faces a gap of £3.5 billion – with only 14% of council workers now confident that vulnerable local residents are safe and cared for
- Government cuts have seen over 500 children’s centres and 475 libraries close, potholes are left unfilled, and 80% of councils workers now say have no confidence in the future of local services
- Northamptonshire County Council has already gone bust due to Conservative incompetence at both national and local level, and more councils are predicted to

collapse without immediate emergency funding

- Councils now face a further funding gap of £7.8 billion by 2025 just to keep services 'standing still' and meeting additional demand. Even Lord Gary Porter, the Conservative Chair of the Local Government Association, has said 'Councils can no longer be expected to run our vital local services on a shoestring'

This Council condemns Chief Secretary to the Treasury Liz Truss for stating on BBC Newsnight on 1st October 2018 that the government is "not making cuts to local authorities", when all independent assessments of government spending show that this is entirely false; and that this Council further notes that Prime Minister Theresa May has also claimed that "austerity is over" despite planning a further £1.3bn of cuts to council budgets over the next year;

This Council agrees with the aims of the 'Breaking Point' petition signed by Labour councillors across the country, in calling for the Prime Minister and Chancellor to truly end austerity in local government by:

- Using the Budget to reverse next years planned £1.3bn cut to council budgets;
- Immediately investing £2bn in children's services and £2bn in adult social care to stop these vital emergency services from collapsing;
- Pledging to use the Spending Review to restore council funding to 2010 levels over the next four years.

This Council resolves to:

- Support the 'Breaking Point' campaign, recognising the devastating impact that austerity has had on our local community
- Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Prime Minister, and the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government setting out the funding pressures faced by our local council, and calling on the Government to truly end austerity in local government."

A main amendment was proposed by Councillor King as that the motion be approved and adopted subject to the following amendments:-

- In the first paragraph, after the words "devastating effects" the deletion of the word "on" and the insertion of the words "for many Councils, their residents and the";
- In the third paragraph the deletion of the word "Labour";
- In the fourth paragraph, first bullet point, the deletion of the word "devastating" and its replacement with following words "huge impact austerity cuts have had on Colchester Borough Council's budgets and the wider";

Councillor T. Young indicated that the main amendment was accepted and the motion was deemed amended accordingly.

On being put to the vote the motion was approved and adopted (twenty four in favour, twenty three against and two abstained from voting).

286 Questions to Cabinet Members and Chairmen pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10

Questioner	Subject	Response
Pre-notified questions		
Councillor Barber	Can the Portfolio Holder for Resources inform Council of the latest update for the Axial Way Pumping Station and overall Northern Gateway Project? Please can you state what the anticipated budget for both originally agreed was, what is now the current expected budget for both, in particular the Axial Way Pumping Station, and where the money for any over-budget spends will come from?	Councillor King, Portfolio Holder for Resources, explained that Axial Way pumping station was a key part of the drainage strategy at Northern Gateway. Once works commenced, the conditions underground proved more challenging than had been anticipated, including more water and a huge block of concrete. The scope and costs of the work therefore had to increase from £425,000 to approximately £900,000. It was appreciated that this was a significant increase but needed to be seen as part and parcel of project management. Some capital projects did exceed the initial estimate. A number of others, such as Amphora 1, had come in substantially under budget. Cabinet continued to monitor risk carefully and to guard against optimism bias. He been provided

with reassurance from officers that due diligence had been undertaken and that the contractors claims had been rigorously assessed. Independent engineering advice had been sought test boreholes had been drilled. The settlement with the contractor was well below the value of the initial claim. Officers had considered whether there was any lessons to be learnt, including whether more test boreholes should be dug, but there was a balance to be struck between due diligence and the resulting time and cost. Additional funding had been made available and this shortfall would be met by reallocation of funds within the Northern Gateway project.

Continuing progress was being made on the wider Northern Gateway project. A fresh review of the whole programme was currently being undertaken and an update would be provided to Cabinet soon. The vision for Northern Gateway remain unchanged: to provide a new high quality regional centre space to help visitors and local

		residents lead healthy and active lifestyles.
Councillor Chapman	<p>Could the Portfolio Holder explain how the recent review of the way our Zone Teams operate will improve the collection of litter on the A12? I receive frequent complaints about the state of this major East Anglian thoroughfare, which, for part of its journey, crosses the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty a national designation that I spend so much of my time, as a representative of this Council, sustaining.</p>	<p>Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation, explained that the Zones Review had been town centre centric, but it had also looked at issues relating to the A12. The A12 had been included in the new 7 day rota, and parts of the A12 would be litter picked one day per week. It needed to be borne in mind that this was dangerous work and some parts were unreachable. It was ultimately the responsibility of Highways England to provide funding but this had been cut many years ago.</p>
Councillor Cope	<p>Can there be an explanation please for the great delay in the opening of the child's play area adjacent to Cavalry Road and Circular Road North in the Quadriga estate behind Garland Road? It has now been several years since the estate opened; many representation have been made by councillors for the necessary action to be taken but the result has been disappointing. Can the official side give an estimate of the time when the play area will be opened? Would</p>	<p>Councillor Lilley, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Public Safety and Licensing responded. The chain of events relating to this development demonstrated why infrastructure should be put in first, as was planned with garden communities. The play equipment had been installed 7 years ago but not completed, and the developer was not obliged to hand it to the Council until 75% of the units had been occupied. Other infrastructure was awaiting</p>

	<p>the Portfolio Holder consider imposing longstop dates on developers to ensure the delivery of section 106 obligations?</p>	<p>completion also, such as the adoption of the roads. Legal advice was being sought from officers to see if the developers could be compelled to finish the necessary works or to hand it over to the Council. He would look into the issue of longstop dates.</p>
<p>Councillor Barton</p>	<p>The recent Streetweek in St Michael's was a welcome initiative and a successful way to engage with residents. Can the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Public Safety and Licensing give us a flavour of the event and outline some of the outcomes?</p>	<p>Councillor Lilley, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Public Safety and Licensing explained that a Streetweek was a multi-agency initiative involving the Zones Teams, Neighbourhood Watch, the Army and the Police, aimed at tackling issues such as fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. The army had requested this particular Streetweek and it had been led by the police who had done an excellent job. The initiative would be rolled out in other areas. Detailed statistics would be circulated when available.</p>
<p>Councillor Warnes</p>	<p>Given the Government's sudden turning point in housing policy and the promised new borrowing freedoms recently announced by the new disciples from Westminster, can the Portfolio holder tell me if there now exists a real opportunity to provide truly affordable housing at scale here in Colchester for those</p>	<p>Councillor Bourne, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities, explained that the Council had built 34 houses on under used garage sites, but that the 1% rent reduction had removed the borrowing headroom on the Housing Revenue Account. The aspiration to build more house remained. The</p>

	<p>currently locked out of the local housing market. Furthermore given that the Local Government Association is committed to campaigning to ensure that Councils such as Colchester can borrow to build free from restrictions and that recent history has shown us that past Government promises of a new Nirvana can be stymied by the dead hand of Whitehall, would she be willing to request officers take a serious look at working cooperatively with other Councils to secure loans through Municipal Bonds as a low-cost alternative source of funding so we are not solely dependent upon the public works loan board or commercial alternatives.</p>	<p>Council had bid to the Department of Housing, Communities and Local Government for funding to build low rent housing. Now that the borrowing cap had been abolished, the Council would consider all options available in line with the Treasury Management policy in order to borrow to finance Council house building, and would look to build on a large scale again. Every home the Council built was life changing for the family who lived there. Cabinet was also looking at alternative models of funding, such as municipal bonds, and a report would be brought forward shortly.</p>
Councillor Whitehead	<p>Could an update be provided on the proposals to close the Post Office on Head Street and move the Post Office services to WH Smiths?</p>	<p>Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Business and Culture expressed his concern about the proposal and hoped all groups would oppose them. A similar proposal had been implemented in Chelmsford. The level of service that was currently provided would not be able to be replicated in WH Smiths. Colchester Post Office was well used and a number of residents relied upon it. There would be a six week consultation and</p>

		<p>he hoped Council would speak with a unified voice on the issue. The Chief Executive had already written to express the Council's view and to ask for an urgent meeting. Councillors should also lobby the MP for Colchester on the issue.</p>
Councillor Laws	<p>Would the Council be able to obtain a giant poppy to display outside the Town Hall, similar to the one on display outside Ipswich Town Hall?</p>	<p>Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Business and Culture, indicated that he would look into it.</p>
Councillor Laws	<p>Would the Council consider making it mandatory for premises selling food to display hygiene labels in windows?</p>	<p>Councillor Bourne Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities, explained that there was no national legislation requiring the display of food hygiene certificates in particular places. The Council provided considerable training and advice on food hygiene issues and encouraged the prominent display of food hygiene certificates. She would look to see if there was any local instrument that could be used to force the display of food hygiene certificates.</p>
Councillor Laws	<p>Could the Portfolio Holder confirm that Colchester would seek to benefit from the £675 million announced in the budget to help High Streets?</p>	<p>Councillor Barlow, Portfolio Holder for Commercial Services indicated that if such funding sources became available the</p>

		Council would look into them.
Councillor Fox	Could the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Public Safety and Licensing provide information about the work by the Council underway to increase the number of police officers in Colchester?	Councillor Lilley, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Public Safety and Licensing, explained that there was an Action Plan known as Team Ten, which had already had a significant impact. It had looked at a particular hotspots such as the Dutch Quarter and the Priory. The police and Zones teams working well together, but some issues remained. Licensing officers were also looking at licensed premises to ensure that were selling alcohol responsibly.
Councillor Higgins	Could the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities provide information about the rough sleeper initiative?	Councillor Bourne, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities. Two successful bids had been made to government and nearly £400,000 had been received towards rough sleeper initiatives over an 18 month period. The funding was towards a particular initiative, Housing First, in which a number of rough sleepers were housed with 24 hour support. This helped address the complex issues which many rough sleepers had. It was expensive and resource intensive, and was subject to close monitoring from the Department of

		communities, Housing and Local Government.
Councillor Liddy	Would the Portfolio Holder for Waste, Sustainability and Transportation agree that the reconfiguration of bus services had been to the detriment of passengers, especially those travelling to Wivenhoe and Greenstead?	Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation, explained that he had raised this issue with the bus companies and with Essex County Council, and had received conflicting accounts as to who was responsible for these changes. He would look into the matter further, but in a sense it was too late as the changes had now been introduced. The communications around the changes had not customer centric.
Councillor Barber	Would the Portfolio Holder for Business and Culture support a move towards four yearly elections?	Councillor T. Young, Portfolio Holder for Business and Culture, explained that the Labour Group had discussed this and indicated that it wish to stay with a system of election by thirds. However, the issue would be discussed again soon.
Councillor Barber	Would the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities provide further information about the Housing First policy?	Councillor Bourne, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities, indicated that that she would be willing to attend a meeting of the Conservative group to speak about it.
Councillor Scordis	Would the Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation be able to	Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and

	<p>meet with Essex highways to see what could be done to increase the speed of the works on the Ipswich Road roundabout and to promote more sustainable methods of transport?</p>	<p>Transportation, explained that he had raised this matter with the Essex County Council Portfolio Holder. A number of complaints had been raised: the impact on businesses from the congestion, disabled access and access through the works for emergency vehicles. The bus companies were also concerned about the impact on their reliability. He was aware of considerable public concern and a petition was in circulation which had already gained 2000 signatures. The terms of the contract did not provide for 24 hour work on the site. Whilst the scheme would deliver real benefits, work did need to speed up and he would continue to press for this in discussions with Essex County Council.</p>
<p>Councillor Cope</p>	<p>Could the Chairman of the Heritage and Tourism Task and Finish Group give an update on its work?</p>	<p>Councillor Laws, Chairman of the Heritage and Tourism Task and Finish Group, explained that the Group had held its first meeting. Some of the issues that it had identified to look at more details were lighting, signage, the future of Gosbecks and the provision of future events. It would be meeting again on 20 November with Visit</p>

		Colchester and BID invited to attend.
Councillor Chuah	Could the Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation, also take up the impact of the Ipswich Road roadworks on St Johns Road with Essex County Council. The road had a 7 tonne limit but heavy traffic was using the road and there particular concern about the impact of this on the bridge.	Councillor Goss, Portfolio Holder for Waste, Environment and Transportation, indicated that he would raise these concerns with Essex County Council.

287 **Schedule of Portfolio Decisions**

RESOLVED that the schedule of Portfolio Holder decisions covering the period 30 June 2018 - 18 October 2018 be noted.