

Cabinet

Wednesday, 07 July 2021

Attendees: Councillor Simon Crow, Councillor Paul Dundas, Councillor Andrew Ellis, Councillor Darius Laws, Councillor Beverley Oxford

Also in attendance: Councillors Colman, Cory, Fox, Goss, Harris, Pearson, Scordis, Warnes and J. Young

No. Publication and Call in Arrangements

Date Published 8 July 2021

Date when decisions may be implemented (unless 'called in') 5pm 15 July 2021.

NB All decisions except urgent decisions, those subject to pre-scrutiny and those recommended to Council may be subject to the Call-in Procedure.

Requests for the scrutiny of relevant decisions by the Scrutiny Panel must be signed by at least ONE Councillor AND FOUR other Councillors to countersign the call-in form OR to indicate support by e-mail. All such requests must be delivered to the Proper Officer by no later than 5pm on 15 July 2021.

575 Attendance

The Chair announced that Councillor Lissimore had sent apologies for the meeting and Councillor B. Oxford was attending remotely as she was currently self-isolating. Although she could take part in the debate and answer questions, under the current legislation she could not vote on any item.

576 Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 26 May 2021 and 9 June 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

577 Have Your Say! (Hybrid meetings)

Councillor Harris attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to express concern about the impact of Covid 19 on the Council's finances over the next two or three years. In respect of Middlewick, would the Cabinet note that residents of Berechurch opposed the sale of the Ministry of Defence land at Middlewick and would the MP would use his ministerial influence to take the sale off the table. Concern was also expressed that the amendments to the Liveable Neighbourhoods programme would take Berechurch and Monkwick out of the plan, which would be to the detriment

of those communities.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, indicated that whilst he regretted the sale of the land at Middlewick by the Ministry of Defence, the sale had been motivated by the fact that the site was included in the Local Plan. Issues around Council finance in the medium term would be dealt with later in the meeting.

Councillor J. Young attended remotely and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to note that the investment in Greenstead was still part of the Town Deal and to express her full support for the Heart of Greenstead project. Concern was expressed about the failure of the Joint Committee of the North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) to appoint a Chair at its meeting on 24 June 2021. This was having an impact on public safety as it meant decisions on schemes which were delegated to the Chair were unable to be taken. This needed to be resolved urgently.

Councillor Crow, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability, explained that he had been unable to attend the Joint Committee meeting. However, an Extraordinary Meeting of the Joint Committee of the NEPP was being called in order that a Chair be appointed.

Councillor Goss attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Committee. In respect of concerns about grass cutting, the recent growth of verges was a result of the recent weather conditions, and it was appreciated contractors were doing their best. However, incorrect information had been put out on social media claiming incorrectly that the number of cuts had been reduced. There had been issues with the quality of the cutting which he had reported, and litter was being mowed up rather than picked beforehand. The Fixing the Link scheme near the Albert Roundabout did not seem to be progressing, even though it would fit in well with the strategic work that Essex County Council was currently undertaking. It was noted that locality budgets had been reinstated to £2000 per Councillor. It was surprising that this funding had not been allocated to the River Colne, given previous concerns expressed on the issue.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, indicated that if locality budgets were not spent, the funding could be reallocated to different priorities. It was indicated that a written response would be sent on the issues relating to grass cutting and the Fixing the Link project.

A written statement from Councillor G. Oxford was read to the Cabinet suggesting that each ward should produce its own list of sites that would be planted with wildflowers and plug plants, with each ward list ratified by the Environment and Sustainability Panel. Concerns were expressed about the grass cutting service which needed to radically improve. The reinstatement of locality budgets was supported. Given that Colchester was already a city, there was no need to apply for City Status. Commercial bollards needed to be installed to protect Council sites. Holy Trinity Church needed to be protected. Concerns were also expressed about kerbless streets and whilst support was expressed for the concept of the Youth Zone, no suitable site had yet been identified. In respect of St Marks Community Centre, this was welcome and it was hoped the scheme would proceed quickly. The support of

the new administration for the scheme was welcomed.

Councillor Crow, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability, expressed his enthusiasm for the policy of wilding. It was important to review and learn from what had been achieved so far. There were several pilot sites from which important information on management techniques were being gathered. It was also important not to over promise or overstretch resources, and whilst the idea of a wish list of sites was attractive, it was important to take time to get the policy right. It was the intention to consult with ward councillors about their respective wards.

Councillor Fox attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet to ask the Leader of the Council where was the twenty point plan for the new administration he had promised to publish.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, indicated that a twenty point plan had not been promised, but that the budget report before the Cabinet set out the administration's priorities.

A written statement from Councillor Goacher was read to the Cabinet stressing the need to continue to support the Woodland and Diversity Project and expressing alarm about comments from a Cabinet member calling for increased mowing. There was a catastrophic decline in UK wildlife, some of which was due to increased development and intensive farming methods. Leaving some areas for wildflowers would create oases for wildlife. The Council needed to be clear that for most areas mowing patterns had not changed, and where it had it was for the benefit of nature. Some residents appreciated the benefits of leaving areas unmowed. The Council needed to set an example and lead on this issue.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, and Councillor Crow, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability, emphasised the administration's support for the policy of wilding and the Woodland and Diversity Project. The comments referred to were not made by a Cabinet member and referred to the mowing of areas that were not being left wild.

Councillor Scordis attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet about the Hythe. Since the 1990s, industry had left the area and been replaced by housing. However, despite the house building, the area had seen little investment. The Quay had been neglected by both Essex County Council and Colchester Borough Council with no real plan in place. Much of the housing had been taken over by student landlords, leading to a transient population. Crime and graffiti were issues that blighted the area. There were few amenities. Where had the section 106 money from the housing developments been invested? The Council could look to regenerate the area by turning the Moors into a nature reserve. The section of the river flowing through the Hythe was also neglected. The creation of the Hythe Task force was a positive step, but it was important that the Council had a vision for the future of the Hythe. Cabinet should work with ward councillors for the area to look at future plans for the Hythe to help transform the area.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, indicated that he supported the suggestion that the Hythe should be a high priority for the

Council. Councillor Ellis , Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning explained that he would be happy to work with the Hythe ward councillors on these issues. He would look into the allocation of section 106 funding in the Hythe.

578 Budget Strategy 2022-23 and Transformation

The Chief Operating Officer submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor King attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet to welcome the report which showed the stability of the Council's finances. He did not support increasing locality budgets as it was the only saving which members could collectively agree upon and make themselves. There had been an under lying improvement in the finances and it had not been necessary to draw down £1 million of reserves.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, thanked Councillor King for his positive comments. Locality budgets were a means of getting investment directly into the heart of local communities. In terms of the overall budgetary position, this had been helped by significant support from central government. The position would be improved following 19 July as leisure facilities would begin to generate profit.

Councillor Fox attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet, to ask what consultation had been undertaken on proposals to bid for City Status and how much would be spent on the bid. Some residents and groups identified Colchester as a town and any bid needed support across the community. Neighbourhood Plans had also been identified as a priority for the new administration, but no funding had been allocated to support this.

Councillor Dundas explained that the administration was looking at developing a package of support for those areas seeking to develop Neighbourhood Plans. In respect of City Status, Councillor Laws, Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage, explained that soundings had been undertaken on support for a bid for City Status. Much of the work on the previous bid was still relevant. It was prudent to set aside some funding in the budget to support a bid, although it was not anticipated that it would all be needed. It was also prudent to set aside funding for events to mark the Platinum Jubilee.

Councillor Warnes attended and with consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet to welcome the reinstatement of Councillor locality budgets to the original £2000. Could the Portfolio Holder confirm if the allocation of genuinely affordable social housing would continue to reflect the needs-based banding as set out in the Council's current choice-based allocation policy? Could it also be confirmed that the Council's commitment, agreed by the previous administration on the recommendation from the Alternative Methods of Service Delivery Task and Finish Group, to actively promote community transport to serve destinations not reached by private bus companies. Support was expressed for the views of Councillor Harris on the withdrawal of Berechurch and Monkwick from the Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme.

Councillor Ellis, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning confirmed that allocation of social housing would continue to reflect the needs-based banding in the current allocations policy. He would look at the issues raised about community transport. Councillor Dundas stressed the difficulty for non-transport authorities in dealing with issues relating to bus services and he hoped the forthcoming Bus Strategy would make issues clearer.

Councillor Pearson attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed Cabinet. The recommendation to use £500K of New Homes Bonus to support Covid impacts and recovery was noted. The Conservative group had previously opposed the use of New Homes Bonus to support the budget.

Councillor Dundas explained that this funding had been allocated in the budget in previous years as Covid recovery support. He supported the principle that New Homes Bonus should be spent on mitigating the impact of new homes, but there was not the flexibility in the budget process to suddenly remove this element and reallocate it now.

Councillor Dundas then introduced the report. The proposals in the report were aimed at using a relatively small amount of money and using it to boost the local economy and support Covid recovery. Locality budgets were spent quickly and directly in local communities. It also provided a commitment to wilding and the Woodland and Diversity Programme, and there was also support for core services, such as extra funding for Neighbourhoods Services and the upgrade of the Shrub End depot. There was also support for the Stanway and St Marks Community Centres. Budget workshops would continue and all Councillors were urged to attend.

Councillor Laws emphasised the importance of the funding to improve the condition of the public realm, which was crucial as the Council built back from Covid. Councillor Ellis highlighted the additional resources that were being put into planning enforcement, and Councillor Crow, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability, stressed the support for policies which would contribute to addressing climate change.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The budget strategy and timetable as set out in the Chief Operating Officer's report be approved.
- (b) The use of £500k of New Homes Bonus carried forward into 2021/22 as set out in Section 6 of Chief Operating Officer's report be approved.
- (c) The proposed programme to transform Council Services be approved.

REASONS

It is a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2022/23.

To agree a transformation approach to the 2022/23 budget strategy.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

None, because it is a legal requirement to balance the budget. Also, failing to transform would not result in the positive lessons learned during the Pandemic being harnessed and could put core services at risk.

579

Colchester Town Deal

The Assistant Director, Place and Client Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Nick Chilvers addressed Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5(1) of the Meetings General Procedure Rules in respect of Holy Trinity Church, in particular how the £517,000 allocated would be spent. Clarity on the definition of Trinity Square and what the funding allocated for that would be spent on was also requested. The church had been neglected and the grounds needed maintenance, which it was anticipated could be provided relatively cheaply and be funded from the revenue budget. It should be the central focus for Christmas lighting and art could be hung on the railings. The Council often concentrated on major projects, but the public would welcome a number of smaller improvements.

Councillor Laws, Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage thanked Mr Chilvers for his comments, which he supported. He was aiming to make the most of Holy Trinity Church and was excited by the Town Deal funding. The funding would be used to lever in further funding. The suggestion of using the railings to hang artwork was welcomed. There was an aim to reinstall lighting so it could be lit at night, and the long term aim was for Community 360 to occupy the building.

Councillor Coleman attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet in respect of Youth Zones. He had introduced the concept of Youth Zones to the Council after visiting a Youth Zone in Barking, and the previous administration had supported the inclusion of the Youth Zone in the Town Deal bid. Youth Zones brought many benefits to young people including physical and mental health and academic and careers support. They gave access to a wide range of sports and other pursuits and helped improve self-esteem. They also brought wider community benefits such as reduced anti-social behaviour and crime, improved academic and health outcomes and increased town centre footfall. Other towns had made the provision of a Youth Zone an absolute top priority. A site and funding were available but a car park was being prioritised instead. It was a concern that schemes that were the responsibility of Essex County Council Highways were being prioritised at the expense of the Youth Zone.

Councillor King attended and with the consent of the Chair, addressed the Cabinet to highlight the issues around the financing of a Youth Zone. The projected capital costs for a Youth Zone were £8.4 million of which half would be raised by Onsite. The Council's commitment could be reduced through external funding such as the Town Deal, Youth Investment Fund or the Levelling Up fund. £1 million was already set aside in the capital programme. Therefore, the capital commitment was small

compared to the Council's overall borrowing. The revenue costs after taking account of Onsite's contribution through fundraising was about £400K per annum. Therefore, a Youth Zone was affordable. The Youth Zone model had proved robust and sustainable through the pandemic.

Councillor Cory attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet and stressed the Council's ability to lead and deliver ambitious policies and projects and that the Council should not be deterred from pursuing a Youth Zone because it was a Tier 2 authority. For too long there had been reduced investment in youth services and the consequences of this had been exacerbated by the Covid 19 pandemic. Key health partners supported the concept. If the Council did not go back to the Town Deal board to retain the £2.1 million allocation for a Youth Zone an opportunity to deliver the Youth Zone would be lost. He had outlined how he and partners would be prepared to support him on this issue.

Councillor Fox attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to express concern about the allocation by the Town Deal Board of £500,000 for the former Essex County Hospital site. This site had received planning permission for redevelopment of 120 units of which only 4 were affordable, which was way below the Council's policy. There was concern that this funding would just be absorbed by Essex County Council with no real benefit to Colchester.

Councillor Ellis, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning, responded that he shared the concerns and highlighted that this had been a complicated scheme on which there had been viability issues. He would be looking at the process of negotiations with developers and how this impacted on compliance with Council policies on affordable housing

Councillor Person attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to welcome the statement that the aim of the Town Deal was to create safe and healthy communities. However, there was nothing in the Town Deal funding for Berechurch, although indicators showed it was an area of high deprivation. Could the Leader of the Council explain how he intended to level up this deserving part of the town?

Councillor Dundas explained that there had been geographic criteria around the Town Deal funding. There would be further opportunities to secure external funding. The Council could bid through the Levelling Up fund. A bid had not been submitted this year as it was likely to be unsuccessful as Colchester had not identified as a Tier One Authority, and those were likely to be favoured in the first round. He would be happy to help areas that were not included in the Town Deal and to look at specific projects.

Councillor Scordis attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Cabinet to express concern about the amount of funding given the Town Deal Board to Essex County Council projects. It was disappointing that St Botolph's was losing funding for regeneration. The area was very run down and in need of regeneration, and for those arriving at Colchester Town station it was the first area of Colchester they saw. The loss of funding for Livable Neighbourhoods for New Town was also regretted and it was a concern that £1million had identified for Jumbo, which was in private

ownership. Safeguards needed to be put in place to protect any public investment in Jumbo. The Town Deal Board should be encouraged to reconsider their decisions on the funding allocations.

Councillor Dundas explained that Essex County Council had made a key contribution to the Town Deal bid, including considerable officer support. It was anticipated that section 106 funding would be made available to help fund regeneration of St Botolph's. Councillor Laws explained that the funding for Jumbo would not be given to the private owner. Discussions had begun on the terms on which the owner may be prepared to sell. However, the funding was allocated in order to lever in further funding. This was a once in generation opportunity to secure and protect Jumbo and to find a way of securing public access to it.

Councillor Dundas introduced the report and responded to the Have Your Say comments raised about the Youth Zone. The Cabinet had had a tour of a Youth Zone and were very impressed by the concept and the administration had not abandoned the idea of securing a Youth Zone in Colchester. The Council needed to take into account the cost of the land to build a Youth zone. The ongoing revenue costs were significant. Most authorities which had built Youth Zones were tier one authorities, which meant it was a different magnitude of challenge for the Council to fund a Youth Zone. In reaching its decision the Town Deal Board had looked at the deliverability of the projects. There was concern that if funding was allocated to projects that could not be delivered quickly, then the funding would be lost. The previous administration had not found a site. Britannia car park had initially been identified and then withdrawn to secure car parking income and for heritage issues. Other sites were being looked at but Onsite did not feel they were optimum. There was no identified, secured site enabling the project to proceed quickly if funding was available. Significant capital and revenue funding needed to be found. If the revenue funding allocated in the MTFF was proceeded with, other services would need to be cut. Youth provision was a County Council function and not a core Borough Council function, and any expenditure by the Council on a Youth Zone would need to be justified to residents on that basis. Also, existing youth services outside the town centre also needed funding and the diversion of funds to the town centre would need to be justified. If the Council were to proceed with a Youth Zone it would require cross party support and an understanding that it would require some difficult choices.

Councillor B. Oxford, Portfolio Holder for Communities, expressed concern about the provision of a Youth Zone in the town centre, rather than supporting youth provision in all wards, and the dangers of proceeding whilst there was still uncertainty over the costs and other sources of funding.

Councillor Ellis highlighted although the previous administration had been working on the Youth Zone, it had not been championed effectively and there was not widespread knowledge of it and the potential benefits. In view of the sums involved, there needed to be some cross-party work in raising the profile before final decisions were made. Councillor Dundas indicated he would also raise the benefits of Youth Zones with Essex County Council again.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The final list of projects and their financial parameters (see paragraph 5.5 of the Assistant Director's report) be noted, including noting those projects which are confirmed within the programme as 'Fast Track', and further noting those projects which will not be funded within the reduced Town Deal funding envelope.
- (b) The approach to retaining all projects within the Town Investment Plan and seeking further future funding opportunities to enable these to progress later be noted.
- (c) The principle that the work in remainder of 2021-2022 financial year to develop business cases for all projects is undertaken 'at risk' i.e., before the first payment from Government which is anticipated April 2022 be agreed; noting that the Council will gain further surety from Government in coming months; reducing risk as this work progresses through business case development.
- (d) Colchester Borough Council's ongoing commitment to the Town Deal Programme in the role of Accountable Body, including contributing to and overseeing the development of a suite of business cases that build on the project concepts that were submitted within the Town Investment Plan; throughout 2021-2022, and its ongoing role as secretariat to Town Deal Board, be agreed

REASONS

Approval to proceed to the next phase of the 'We are Colchester' programme including the development of business cases will enable the programme to draw down the funding from Government and move the projects into delivery. This programme will greatly boost Colchester's opportunities to realise its economic development, place-making, inward investment, and regeneration ambitions now and on a long-term basis, through delivery of a specific programme of coherent, targeted interventions.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options have been presented to Cabinet. Town Deal is recognised as a once in a generation opportunity for Colchester, and there are no other current or anticipated sources of funding and investment of comparable size and scope. Some of the interventions included in the Town Investment Plan see Town Deal as the funder of last resort as they are unlikely to attract suitable investment from other sources; and cannot be funded within the Council's resources, particularly in the light of the current financial situation arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.

580

Renewal of Colchester and Ipswich Museums Services Joint Committee Agreement

The Assistant Director, Communities, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Laws, Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business and Heritage, introduced the report and highlighted that Colchester and Ipswich Museums Service was a unique partnership. It was an excellent example of cross authority working and brought

benefits of economies of scale. It enabled the service to attract high quality and high-profile exhibitions. It also provided a range of services beyond traditional museum services, such as assessing archaeological impacts of planning applications, and its assets made a valuable contribution to the public realm. He paid tribute to the officers working in the service.

RESOLVED that the Colchester and Ipswich Museums (CIMS) Joint Committee Agreement be renewed for the period 1 August 2021 – 31 July 2027.

REASONS

The Colchester and Ipswich Museums Service (CIMS) was formed in 2007 via a Joint Committee Agreement for 2007-2018. The agreement designates Colchester Borough Council as the employing authority for CIMS and empowers CIMS to operate the museums service on Ipswich Borough Council's behalf. The Joint Museums Committee (JMC) is the main governance mechanism for the service. The 2007-2018 agreement was updated and revised in 2015 to cover the period 2015 – 2021.

Since its formation, CIMS has enjoyed significant success in both Ipswich and Colchester and the nature of the combined service is seen in the sector as an exemplar of good practice. The future is anticipated to include the major redevelopment of Ipswich Museum and continued involvement in the Arts Council England National Portfolio Organisation scheme.

The 2015 – 2021 Agreement ends on 31 July 2021 and, following consultation with senior officers and the relevant Portfolio Holders, it is proposed that the agreement be renewed.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

To choose not to renew the Agreement. The resulting uncertainty and impact on staffing, systems, budget, and external funding, notably from Arts Council make this an inadvisable option. Instead, a short-term Agreement could allow the requisite time for consultation and a feasibility study looking at alternative models of operating.

581 St Marks Community Centre, Mill Road

The Assistant Director, Communities submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Jocelyn Laws addressed the Cabinet pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 5(1) of the Meetings General Procedure Rules to welcome the progress on the proposed new St Mark's Community Centre. It would be an important addition in this area of Highwoods and would complement the community facilities in the south of the ward. Clarification was sought on how the Council's involvement in the centre would be managed long-term and if the Council would retain the freehold over the longer term and the length of the lease.

The Centre needed to be fit-for-purpose to meet modern demands, and it was noted

that it would connect to the new Heat Network at the Colchester Northern Gateway. As well as being a sustainable development it was very important that the building was fully accessible for the full range of impairments and to cater for users of all ages. What steps were being taken to ensure that this project met the criteria of a sustainable building that would be fully accessible for all residents? Health and wellbeing needed to be put at the heart of communities, including supporting residents to keep active and tackling issues such as social isolation. To ensure that St Mark's meets the needs of all residents, what measures were being taken to encourage and facilitate inclusive and accessible consultation with residents at all stages of development?

Councillor B. Oxford, Portfolio Holder for Communities, responded and introduced the report to the Cabinet. This was a much-needed facility for this part of Highwoods, which was lacking in amenities, and ward councillors had made significant efforts to secure it. Myland Community Council had been offered the opportunity to manage the building but had declined. The Council would retain the freehold with a long lease of possibly 200 years, but this had not finally agreed. St Lukes Church, in conjunction with the diocese, would be responsible for the day to day running of the community centre. The Trustees had decided that the centre should be a new build facility which would ensure it was both sustainable and fully accessible. There would also be a changing places facility. Trustees and ward Councillors had worked hard to keep residents informed. Architects were working on plans which would be consulted on over the next few months.

RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Communities for the appointment of construction contractors and associated suppliers. This would ensure the efficient and timely appointment of construction contractors and associated suppliers where relevant to ensure procurement and programme timelines are adhered to. This would enable effective delivery of the scheme.

REASONS

To ensure a seamless delivery of the programme in accordance with timelines

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Decisions on the appointment of contractors to be made by Cabinet.

Member Development Group Annual Report 2020-21

The Assistant Director, Corporate and Improvement Services, submitted a report a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Councillor Dundas, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategy, introduced the report. It was noted that moving the training offered to Councillors online because of the pandemic, had increased the take up of training and development. It was noted there was still quite a divergence in the attendance at sessions, and that 10 per cent of Councillors had not attended any sessions.

Attendance at training and development sessions was encouraged, and the value of the budget workshop in particular was stressed.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) The report of the Member Development Group on the work of the Group in the 2020-21 municipal year be received and noted.
- (b) The Council's reassessment for Charter Status should be scheduled for December 2021.

REASONS

The Member Development Group is required to report to Cabinet on an annual basis. This provides Cabinet with an opportunity to review the work of the Group and the provision of member development.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were presented to the Cabinet.

583 Progress of Responses to the Public

The Assistant Director, Policy and Corporate submitted a progress sheet a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

RESOLVED that the contents of the Progress Sheet be noted.

REASONS

The progress sheet was a mechanism by which the Cabinet could ensure that public statements and questions were responded to appropriately and promptly.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

No alternative options were presented to the Cabinet.