



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Email corporatesupport@rutland.gov.uk
DX28340 Oakham

Minutes of the **TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY EIGHTH MEETING of the COUNCIL**
held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP on Monday,
15th January, 2018 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:

Mr I Arnold
Mr N Begy
Mr K Bool
Miss R Burkitt
Mr R Clifton
Mr W Cross
Mr R Foster
Mr O Hemsley
Mr A Mann
Mr M Oxley
Mrs L Stephenson
Miss G Waller
Mr D Wilby

Mr E Baines
Mr O Bird
Mr G Brown
Mr B Callaghan
Mr G Conde
Mr J Dale
Mr R Gale
Mr J Lammie
Mr T Mathias
Mr C Parsons
Mr A Stewart
Mr A Walters

APOLOGIES: Mrs J Fox

OFFICERS

PRESENT:

Mrs H Briggs
Mr Dave Brown

Mrs G Curtis
Mr A Edwards
Mr J Frieland

Debbie Mogg

Dr Tim O'Neill

Mr M Waik

Mrs A Wylie

Mrs Natasha Taylor

Chief Executive
Director for Places –
Environment, Planning and
Transport
Head of Learning and Skills
Head of Property Services
Economic Development and
Tourism Manager
Director for Resources
(Monitoring Officer)
Director for People and Deputy
Chief Executive
Strategic Communications
Advisor
Head of Legal and Corporate
Governance
Governance Manager

496 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mrs Fox.

The Chairman had been notified that Mr Arnold would arrive late to the meeting due to travel arrangements.

497 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that the list of engagements had been circulated.

498 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

Mr Hemsley, Acting Leader, made the following announcement:

As you will be aware, following the resignation of Tony Mathias, I decided to remove Oakham Town Centre from the Forward Plan. It is not however the intention of the Council that we do not look at how we can improve Oakham Town Centre.

With this in mind, I have spoken to the Chairs of Scrutiny and in particular, Cllr Lammie who is Chair of the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel and have agreed that the way forward with the Oakham Town Centre regeneration scheme will be to refer the matter to the appropriate Scrutiny Panel which is Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel. They will be able to convene a Task and Finish Group which will include members of the community and relevant stakeholders to look at the future regeneration of Oakham Town Centre.

499 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare any disclosable interests under the Code of Conduct and the nature of those interests and/or indicate if Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applied to them.

Mr Bird declared a pecuniary interest in item 10 of the agenda as his daughter had a business on Oakham Enterprise Park. It was his intention to leave the meeting during debate and voting on this item.

Mr Bird also declared an interest in item 6 of the agenda in respect of any debate on Oakham Town Centre as he was Chairman of Oakham Town Partnership, but this would not prevent him taking part on debate on this item.

Mrs Stephenson declared an interest in item 14 of the agenda as she was employed as a teacher at Leighfield Academy.

Mr Oxley requested confirmation that members of the Planning and Licensing Committee were not prevented from taking part in debate and voting on item 10 of the agenda in respect of Oakham Enterprise Park, this was confirmed by the Monitoring Officer.

500 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the 267th meeting of the Rutland County Council District Council held on 13 November 2018 were confirmed by the Council and signed by the Chairman.

501 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were no deputations or questions from members of the public.

Following verification of the petition entitled “Local Referendum on Oakham One-Way Scheme”, the Council had received notice from the petition organiser that the petition would be presented to the Council meeting by Mr G Robinson.

Mr E Baines indicated his intention to propose a motion without notice under Procedure Rule 36 of the RCC Constitution. The wording of the motion was:

That Council set up a task group to research and evaluate proposals to enhance and improve Oakham Town Centre

Mr Gale confirmed that he would second this motion with the slight amendment to the wording to remove the word “Centre”. Mr Baines agreed to this change.

Mr Hemsley proposed an amendment to the motion. Mr Hemsley referenced his announcement made at Item 3) and requested that Council support the following amendment to the motion put forward by Mr Baines:

That Council ask Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel to convene a Task and Finish Group to consider the future of Oakham Town

This amendment was seconded by Mr Foster.

During debate on the amended motion, the following points were raised:

- i. Mr Begy noted that a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group appeared to be the most appropriate way to take this forward;
- ii. Mr Baines confirmed that his intention was to ensure that any review/further proposals were subject to a proper democratic process and enabled, rather than restricted, by the Council and that a Scrutiny Task and finish Group would satisfy this;
- iii. The Scrutiny Panel would decide on the membership, scope and terms of reference of the task and finish group, as well as membership.
- iv. Membership would not be restricted to members of the Scrutiny Panel and would include external stakeholders;
- v. Mr Lammie, Chair of Growth Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel, welcomed the opportunity for the panel to agree the terms of reference and membership of the task and finish group and confirmed that membership would be wider than the Panel itself;
- vi. Mr Walters suggested that it would be more appropriate to establish membership of the task and finish group and then that group could decide on the terms of reference. These terms of reference could then be ratified by the Scrutiny Panel;
- vii. Confirmation was provided to Miss Waller that the usual process would be followed and the task and finish group would be expected to provide regular

- updates to the Scrutiny Panel. The final recommendations of the group would be compiled in a report to Cabinet and/or Council;
- viii. Mr Bird expressed that it would be unfortunate to lose the momentum that had been gained on the need to improve the town and that any task and finish group should be representative of those living and working in Rutland; and
- ix. Mr Baines highlighted the importance of the role of elected members in representing the wishes of the community they serve. He had proposed the motion to demonstrate the commitment of the whole council to take the improvements to Oakham Town forward and was satisfied that the amendment achieved this aim. Elected members must continue to maintain the trust and support of the public to ensure Rutland continues to be a County to be proud of.

The **AMENDMENT** was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED**:

That Council ask Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel to convene a Task and Finish Group to consider the future of Oakham Town.

Mr Robinson was invited to present the petition “Local Referendum on Oakham One-Way Scheme” to the Council. A summary of his presentation is included below:

- Consideration had been given to withdrawing the petition following the announcement last week that work on the Oakham Town Centre Scheme had been halted until further notice, but Mr Robinson felt he had a duty to the signatories of the petition to put the view forward;
- The responses from the consultation carried out by the Council published in Report No. 142/2017 were not considered to be representative of the Rutland Electorate;
- The petition organisers felt that everyone living, working or socialising in Rutland should have the opportunity to be consulted on such an important decision;
- The petition had 3135 signatures to date and continued to collect signatures;
- There was a significant amount of opposition to a one-way system;
- It was hoped that traders would be more heavily involved in any future proposals;
- A referendum was still seen as the appropriate method of gauging public opinion on such an important decision.

During discussion and debate on the petition the following points and questions to Mr Robinson were noted:

- i. Mr Oxley wanted to highlight that although a paper had been presented to Cabinet, the Council as a whole had not yet had the opportunity to debate and decide on the proposal;
- ii. Mr Oxley asked whether Mr Robinson envisaged that any future consultation include the whole of Rutland and not just the Town of Oakham? Mr Robinson felt that everyone in Rutland should be included in the consultation and that a good scheme would get the support of the Rutland population;
- iii. Miss Waller asked Mr Robinson whether now was the right time to consult with the public and whether it would be more appropriate to wait for the findings of the Task and Finish Group? Mr Robinson replied that it now may be better to wait, but then the public should be asked to vote in favour or against any scheme put forward through a referendum;

- iv. Miss Waller requested the cost of holding a referendum, this was estimate to be approximately £60-£80k;
- v. Mr Baines asked whether Mr Robinson felt the motion to create a task and finish group met the concerns of the petition organisers? Mr Robinson stated that he would like to see how progress was made, but that it was an improvement, he would still like to see it put to the vote before the end of the year;
- vi. Mr Lammie emphasised that the cost of a referendum would mean spending a large amount of public money and that any decision on a referendum should wait until the work had been done by the task and finish group. Should a referendum still be required other stakeholders should contribute to the costs;
- vii. Mr Clifton emphasised that the decision at Cabinet had been to look at a final design, the final design would have been included in a report to Council for debate and decision. The task and finish group would provide the opportunity for all groups to be represented and come up with a joint decision, the group could also decide what would be the best way to ensure there is a full and proper consultation;
- viii. Mr Bird accepted that the referendum would give a very clear mandate, but also felt there were elements of the petition which were unclear with regard to the area covered by the referendum and also highlighted that the number of signatories to the petition requesting a referendum did not represent the majority of the Rutland population. All these factors would need to be clarified by the task and finish group;

--o0o--

Mr Arnold joined the meeting.

--o0o--

- ix. Mr Gale asked how the Council could improve communication with the public. Mr Robinson felt that the task and finish group through inclusion of traders and members of the public would improve the flow of information. In response to Mr Birds comments, Mr Robinson believed that any consultation should include the views not just of people living in Oakham, it was a County Town and the views of those who worked and shopped in the town should also be considered;
- x. Mr Cross emphasised that the opportunity to debate this issue in a public forum was positive and that elected members were representatives of the community and as such welcomed feedback from the public in order that they could inform the decision making process; and
- xi. Mr Hemsley confirmed that he had been influenced by the discussion and representations that a one-way proposal was not supported and hoped that further work would result in a positive outcome for the town.

In response to the petition Mr Hemsley proposed the following motion:

The formal response to the petition as presented to Council this evening will be that the Council will ask the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel to convene a Task and Finish Group to consider the future of Oakham Town

This motion was seconded by Mr Brown.

RESOLVED

Council **AGREED** that the formal response to the petition as presented to Council this evening will be that the Council will ask the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources

Scrutiny Panel to convene a Task and Finish Group to consider the future of Oakham Town.

--o0o--

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8.09pm to allow those members of the public wishing to leave the meeting the opportunity to do so.

--o0o--

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 8.13pm

--o0o--

502 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

There were no questions from members of the Council.

503 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS FROM CABINET MEETINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM 11 NOVEMBER 2017 TO 12 JANUARY 2018 (INCLUSIVE)

No call-ins were received.

504 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

The Chairman indicated that it was his intention to keep the meeting in public session. Should discussion on the exempt appendices to Report 14/2018 be required, members would be asked to determine whether the public and press be excluded from the meeting.

505 REPORT FROM THE CABINET

Report No. 14/2018 from the Cabinet was received, the purpose of which was to consider the recommendations of Cabinet referred to Council for determination and report the Key Decisions made by Cabinet since the publication of the agenda for the previous ordinary meeting of the Council on 13 November 2017.

- 1) Council **NOTED** the Key Decisions made since the publication of the agenda for the previous ordinary meeting of the Council on 13 November 2017, as detailed in Appendix A to Report No. 14/2018.

2) i) 21 November 2017

Decision No. 401

Report No. 199/2017

CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER AND CARE LEAVERS STRATEGY 2017-2022

Mr Foster introduced and moved the recommendations in the report. Mr Wilby seconded the recommendations.

During his introduction Mr Foster confirmed that the safety and well-being of vulnerable children looked after was a very important topic and re-emphasised the corporate responsibility that Members had to these young people. A number of training sessions had been arranged for members on this topic and Mr Foster asked that members communicate any issues with attending these sessions to him.

During debate of the recommendations, points raised included:

- i. Miss Waller requested that significant notice was given regarding any training/briefing sessions. It would be helpful to resume the practice of holding training sessions on the second Monday monthly where Full Council meetings were not scheduled or no longer required.

RESOLVED

To **APPROVE** the Children Looked After and Care Leavers Strategy 2017-22. (Appendix B Report 14/2018).

--o0o--

Mr Bird left the meeting.

--o0o—

ii) 19 December 2017

Decision No. 476

Report No. 170/2017

OAKHAM ENTERPRISE PARK DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Mr Hemsley introduced and moved the recommendations in the report.
Mr Brown seconded the recommendations.

During debate of the recommendations, points raised included:

- i. The return on investment for the entire site (after the investment) would be 4.03% after borrowing charges;
- ii. There was a need to be able to move quickly in order to meet demand as it arises;
- iii. A contingency had been built into the budget to deal with possible contamination on the site;
- iv. The units would be built in stages, with work commencing on the second unit only when the first unit was fully committed;
- v. Mr Conde requested clarification on why different figures were quoted in the report with regards funding; why Council were not being asked to approve the funding for the road; and whether members would receive regular project updates? Mr Hemsley confirmed that the answers would be provided following the meeting;
- vi. There was a need to encourage growth and employment in the County and development of Oakham Enterprise Park (OEP) was a positive step; and
- vii. The development of OEP was not intended to create competition for other providers, but to meet demand for specific units.

RESOLVED

To **APPROVE** £1.77m capital funding to facilitate the infrastructure works & construction of new buildings under development Phase 2a of the Oakham Enterprise Park Development Strategy.

--o0o--
Mr Bird returned to the meeting.
--o0o--

506 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMISSION / SCRUTINY PANELS

No reports were received.

507 JOINT ARRANGEMENTS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS

- i. Mr Baines – Rutland Water Partnership
Meeting on 12 January 2018, there had been some debate earlier in year regarding future role of this group, unanimous in those attending that was still a worthwhile group and process, and welcomed that it was not subject to formalities. Discussion on whether there could be some semi-formal arrangements with St Georges Barracks Group and ongoing issues at Lyndon Top were reported, which members were already aware of.
- ii. Mr Bool – Combined Fire Authority
The next meeting would be held within the next 10 days to discuss the budget, an update would be provided at the next Council meeting.
- iii. Miss Waller – SACRE
Meeting on 9 January 2018, discussion on agreed syllabus for Religious Education which was being developed jointly with Peterborough, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire. This would be approved by Council at a later date. Also started preparation of the Annual report and wanted to thank Councillor Stephenson for her assistance.
- iv. Miss Waller – Rutland Access Group
Meeting on 10 January 2018, helpful to have Mr Brown, Director for Places, present. Would be helpful to have better attendance by elected members. It was hoped that nominations next year would be for councillors who were able to attend on a regular basis. The task and finish group on Oakham town should include consultation with RAG to address concerns over pavements.

508 LGBCE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ELECTORAL REVIEW - RCC RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Report No. 13/2018 was received from the Director for Resources, the purpose of which was to approve the RCC response to the Draft Recommendations on new electoral arrangements for Rutland County Council published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) on 5 December 2017.

Mrs Mogg, Director for Resources, provided a brief introduction highlighting that the proposal put forward to the Boundary Commission in September had met the LGBCE criteria with minimal changes required, but that the draft recommendations of the LGBCE were significantly different to those proposed by RCC. The Constitution Review Working Group (CRWG) had met in December and agreed that the Councils original proposal was still the most effective in meeting the criteria, in particular in protecting the identities and interests of the community.

Miss Waller (Member of CRWG) confirmed that the group felt strongly that the original RCC proposal satisfied the needs of the community, particularly in relation to Oakham and Barleythorpe; and that the LGBCE proposal to combine Martinsthorpe and Braunston did not meet their own criteria in terms of community interest, or equality of

representation. The original RCC proposal was considered the best approach, but would only work with 28 Councillors.

Miss Waller proposed the recommendations in the report. Mr Gale seconded the recommendations.

During debate of the recommendations, points raised included:

- i. Mr Gale re-iterated the importance of Barleythorpe having its own 2 member ward, the Parish Council were keen to keep governance arrangements separate from Oakham North West;
- ii. Mr Baines highlighted the importance of all members encouraging Parish Councils to respond to the consultation;
- iii. Mr Bool emphasised that as elected members, who understood the County, the RCC proposal should be the one taken forward;
- iv. Mr Oxley encouraged individual Councillors to respond to the consultation;
- v. Mr Cross highlighted that there had been considerable member and officer time dedicated to coming up with the original proposal;
- vi. Mr Walters confirmed that he had submitted his own response and suggested that the response letter to the LGBCE might be accompanied by more specific evidence on the proposed changes which were considered to be inappropriate and reasons for this view; and
- vii. Members were asked to forward any detailed examples to accompany the letter as soon as possible.

RESOLVED

Council **APPROVED** the RCC response to the LGBCE consultation on draft recommendations (Report No. 13/2018 Appendix A).

509 SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2019

Report No. 15/2018 from the Director for People was received, the purpose of which was to inform Council of the outcomes of the formal consultation on Rutland County Council Admission Arrangements 2019 for maintained voluntary controlled schools in Rutland so that Council can approve the Arrangements.

Mr Wilby introduced and moved the recommendations in the report. Mr Hemsley seconded the recommendations.

RESOLVED

Council:

- 1) **APPROVED** Rutland County Councils Admission Arrangements 2019.
- 2) **AUTHORISED** the Director for People, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Lifelong Learning, to approve Admission Arrangements annually if no changes are to be made.

510 ANY URGENT BUSINESS

No matters of urgent business were received.

---oOo---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.01 pm.

---oOo---