

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**4.30pm 26 APRIL 2012**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Meadows (Chair), Barnett, Bennett, Brown, Buckley, Carden, Cobb, Cox, Davey, Deane, Duncan, Farrow, Fitch, Follett, Hamilton, Hawtree, Hyde, Janio, Jarrett, Jones, Kennedy, A Kitcat, J Kitcat, Lepper, Littman, Mac Cafferty, Marsh, Mears, Mitchell, Morgan, A Norman, K Norman, Peltzer Dunn, Pidgeon, Pissaridou, Powell, Randall, Robins, Rufus, Shanks, Simson, Smith, Summers, Sykes, C Theobald, G Theobald, Wakefield, Wealls and West.

**PART ONE**

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 1.1 The Mayor drew the Council's attention to Item No. 9 Review of Members Allowances, on the agenda and stated that all councillors held a personal and prejudicial interest in the item. However, it was not practical to prevent them from voting on the matter and therefore all councillors had a general dispensation, in order to be able to consider and vote on the matter. She therefore sought agreement, which was given, to take the declaration of personal interests from all councillors as having been declared.
- 1.2 The Mayor then sought declarations of interest in any other matters appearing on the agenda.
- 1.3 Councillor Pissaridou declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 6, School Admission arrangements 2013/14 and her daughter was directly affected by the issue.
- 1.4 There were no other declarations.

**2. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.**

- 2.1 The Mayor welcomed Mr. Keane as the Chair of the Independent Remuneration Panel which had considered and made recommendations in respect of Members Allowances, Item 9 on the agenda to the meeting. She also noted that there was no formal call over for the meeting and therefore all the items listed on the agenda would be taken.

**3. TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.**

- 3.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from councillors and members of the public that related directly to any of the items listed on the agenda. She reminded the

Council that any such petitions would need to be taken into consideration during the debate on the relevant item.

3.2 The Mayor noted that there were no petitions.

#### **4. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.**

4.1 The Mayor noted that there were no written questions from members of the public that related directly to any of the items on the agenda.

#### **5. DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.**

5.1 The Mayor reported that one deputation had been received from members of the public and invited Ms. Sylvester as the spokesperson for the deputation to come forward and address the council.

5.2 Ms. Sylvester thanked the Mayor and stated that:

“You may remember us. We presented a petition showing overwhelming support from our local community for this sensible boundary change at the last council meeting. We were touched by the warm reception we received and encouraged by the cross-party support to reconsider this issue. Thank you.

We are delighted that the boundary change for Map 1 is being recommended to council today. You will be able to change lives for the better with a simple ‘yes’ vote. This straightforward, popular decision will transform our local community and deliver benefits citywide.

#### **Let’s look at the problem.**

Stanford is the only junior school in the affected area, slap-bang on the catchment boundary. Torn apart by the current system, it has 96 children split between 11 different schools. It’s tough on children, sent miles from home. Even if they are lucky and get the school they want, it’s rare for them to go with the friends they’ve grown up with. In the past, the school has dealt with up to 20 appeals in one year.

Kids need certainty and support when they move to secondary school. Our children face division, disappointment and distress. Some families can’t stand the uncertainty. They choose ‘knees’ or ‘fees’ – either faking a faith to get into Cardinal Newman or reluctantly going private; not options open or attractive to everyone.

Sending children to their fifth and sixth closest schools makes no sense. Blatchington Mill and Hove Park are simply NOT our local schools. Children don’t walk or cycle; they take crowded buses. They can’t participate in after-school clubs because there is no bus service to bring them home. They join classes dominated by feeder schools in unfamiliar neighbourhoods.

Today, you can send our children back to their closest inclusive schools – Stringer and Varndean. You will transform our community. It’s a better, fairer, and more sustainable solution.

**Here's why. It means more children will:**

- walk and cycle on safe routes to schools they can see from home
- help the council meet sustainable travel targets
- attend after-school clubs
- remain part of their local community
- go on to secondary school with friends

It means:

- less pollution and improved fitness
- less pressure on Hove secondary school places
- less time, money and resource spent on appeals and further consultation
- less uncertainty and anxiety for families.

No one action will solve the citywide school place issue. But this change is a quick and effective way of addressing Hove's ticking timebomb **and** solving our community's problem.

**Let's tackle some concerns head on.**

Will there be enough places in the Stringer/ Varndean catchment? Frankly, there's no point making a change unless there are.

Yes, the numbers stack up.

- after all, this boundary shift was originally proposed by the council!
- places at Stringer have been increased to 330
- Varndean placed 54 children out of catchment this year
- Cardinal Newman will continue to attract pupils
- the removal of out of catchment sibling link frees up more places
- honouring sibling link in the boundary change area, to help families with children already in Hove schools, also creates space.

Meanwhile, primary schools in Hove have been expanded to take an additional 270 children this year. These children will need secondary school places. They need to access **their** local schools too. Soon, Hove secondary schools simply won't have enough space. Inaction is not an option.

**Has there been opposition to this boundary shift?**

Residents in our area support this change passionately. We represent the majority view. You have seen the evidence: a (TBC)-strong petition, a committed action group and a steady stream of emails.

Of course, you can't please all the people all the time. However, opposition has been minimal. A dozen parents on the other side of Dyke Road in Hove want our children to keep theirs company as they travel to Hove and Hangleton. We ask them to consider

the bigger picture. We urge people focused on protecting places for themselves at Stringer/ Varndean to find reassurance in the figures. We advise anyone keen to push our kids to another faraway school to think again.

### **Are there lessons to learn from the consultation?**

In short, yes. It is difficult to get consultations right. Five years ago, our community campaigned fiercely to keep our local schools. We were ignored. Commitment to return our children to Stringer and Varndean is undiminished. So why didn't the original consultation reflect this? Many interpreted the consultation wording incorrectly – they thought it was a done deal. Two information sessions were nowhere near the affected area and information was not distributed reliably.

But the community stepped in. We have worked hard to inform residents by:

- including information about the consultation in school newsletters
- holding four community meetings
- ensuring links to the online petitions (both for and against) were sent by text to all parents at Stanford Juniors
- going door-to-door asking people to consider the boundary change, contact their councillors and sign petitions.

You can be confident that people have been effectively engaged.

Let's not meet again next year and rehash the same arguments. We will have failed another year group, Hove schools will be fit to burst and frankly, we know the city needs to focus on the pressing issues of creating new schools and improving school performance.

***This*** decision is easy. We want our children to walk to their local school, participate in after-school clubs and go to secondary school with friends. You need to alleviate pressure on Hove schools, cut pollution, reduce appeals and respond to local communities. The numbers stack up and the outcome would be a greener, fairer, better, popular solution. So, what are we waiting for?

I implore you to vote for this change. We hope that we can count on your support."

- 5.3 The Mayor thanked Ms. Sylvester for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the deputation. She explained that the points had been noted and would be taken into consideration during the debate on Item 6 on the agenda and therefore Ms. Sylvester was welcome to remain to see the outcome of the debate.
- 5.4 The Mayor then invited Councillor Shanks as the Cabinet Member for Children & Young People to respond to the two deputations.
- 5.5 Councillor Shanks thanked Ms. Sylvester for attending the meeting and putting forward her deputation. She noted that the matter had been considered at her recent Cabinet Member Meeting and was to be debated during consideration of the next item on the agenda, however she had listened to the points made in the deputation and would be putting forward recommendations to meet those points.

5.6 The Mayor then moved that the deputation be noted and taken into consideration during the debate on the following item relating to school admission arrangements.

5.7 **RESOLVED:** That the deputation as outlined be noted.

## 6. SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2013/14

6.1 Councillor Shanks introduced the report and stated that following further consideration of the issue in regard to the proposals for extending the catchment area for Dorothy Stringer / Varndean Schools, she wished to recommend the changes as detailed. She believed that the revised boundary changes supported the admission arrangements across the city and should be implemented. She also wished to thank Councillor Wealls for bring the matter to the attention of the council.

6.2 Councillor Lepper stated that she supported the proposal and that the authority needed to press ahead and address the needs of the children in the city and their education. There was a need to tackle the problems and find solutions for the children and their parents and she hoped that the consultation process would be thorough and as open as possible.

6.3 Councillor Wealls thanked Councillor Shanks for taking on board the concerns that had been raised and acknowledged that the objective had to be to enable children to attend school and extra-curricular activities. There was a clear need to consult parents and he hoped this would be extensive and clearly understood by parents in terms of what the implications were for their children. He hoped that parents would be contacted directly as it had shown that sending letters via the children was not sufficient.

6.4 Councillor Littman stated that as a ward councillor he supported the proposed changes which he felt were generally a good thing.

6.5 Councillor Jones stated that he was aware of the long history in regard to school admission arrangements and that he supported the changes proposed. However the need for clear and concise consultation had become evident and he hoped that the future process would prove to be more open and transparent and reach all affected.

6.6 Councillor G. Theobald noted that ex-councillor Allen was in attendance and that they had both argued previously for the change to boundary along Dyke Road and whilst the proposed changes went some way he hoped that further consideration could be given to this point.

6.7 Councillor Shanks noted the comments and stated that there was a need to look at how children could be supported to enable them to attend extra-curricular activities and also noted the point about boundary changes, although there was also a need to take account of the availability of places. She then moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.

6.8 The Mayor noted that the report had been moved and put the recommendations to the vote.

**6.9 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That alteration to the boundary between the catchment areas for Dorothy Stringer/Varndean and Blatchington Mill/Hove Park for 2013/14 as indicated by the yellow area on the indicative plan appended to the report, the Dorothy Stringer/Varndean catchment area to include the area to the east of Dyke Road be approved; and
- (2) That commensurate with that in (1) above, the sibling link to be retained for a five year period to expire in 2018/19.

**7. HOUSING ALLOCATION POLICY REVIEW**

- 7.1 Councillor Wakefield introduced the report and stated that the report had resulted from concerns raised by this group of vulnerable people took account of the results of a public consultation exercise that took place between November and December last year. It was recommended that care leavers should be awarded Band A priority for social housing following a case conference which would identify the support package required for each individual. She noted that the council had a corporate parenting responsibility towards these people and hoped that this would enable the council to meet this responsibility.
- 7.2 The Leader of the Council stated that the allocation of housing in the city to care leavers who were a vulnerable group that required support was an important issue which needed to be addressed and he wished to thank the Labour & Co-operative Group for their support in this matter.
- 7.3 Councillor Peltzer Dunn moved an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group which sought to amend paragraph 3.26 of the report to read, "Where a care leaver seeks to appeal an assessment decision and/or agreement cannot be reached by professional assessors, the matter is to be referred to the Strategic Director People and the Strategic Director Place for determination."
- 7.4 Councillor G. Theobald formally seconded the amendment.
- 7.5 Councillor Robins noted that he had previously recounted his personal experience as a care leaver at the recent Housing Management Consultative Committee meeting and that he would not have managed without the support of friends, siblings and others. Although society was somewhat different today from then, as a corporate parent the council should support care leavers and he did not see how they would be placed at an advantage to others and therefore urged all Members to support the proposed policy.
- 7.6 Councillor Mears stated that she wished to put the record straight and make it clear that the policy under her previous Administration had been a legal one and had not been under the threat of judicial review. She was concerned about some of the recommendations and felt that the proposed policy raised a serious question about confidence. She believed that there was only one Member of the Administration with housing knowledge and her administration had worked to engage and bring tenants on board with the decision-making process. She was not against care leavers and was

aware of the duty of care that the authority had, however the whole situation needed to be reviewed and the report delayed.

- 7.7 Councillor Barnett stated that the previous Conservative Administration had undertaken a comprehensive review of the situation only a year ago and therefore she could not understand the need for the latest policy change. She appreciated the difficulties faced by care leavers but they were not unique to them and many people were in a similar situations and needed help. She welcomed the proposed amendment and hoped it would be supported and noted that under the new Localism Act it was very likely that there would be a need for yet another review, so the latest one did appear to have been a waste of resources.
- 7.8 Councillor Marsh stated that as a corporate parent all Members needed to be responsible and to support care leavers. The proposed changes only affected a small number of people but the impact would be significant and she felt it had been a shame that the Conservative Members on the HMCC had not been able to vote on the matter. The Children's Act was clear in that the child had to be placed first and accommodation was an important factor in this regard.
- 7.9 Councillor Randall stated that there was no hidden agenda in terms of tenants' rights and noted that the Innovations Group was due to report to the HMCC next week on several points, including improving tenant involvement in decision-making. He noted that the last meeting of the Corporate Parenting Board had been attended by three young people, one who had been at university, one who was currently at university and one at an academy which just showed what could be achieved with the right level of support in place.
- 7.10 Councillor Cox stated that he has listened carefully to the points made during the debate and remained confused as to how the process would work. He was unsure whether all care leavers would be automatically placed under Band A or if the decision was discretionary and queried how it would be implemented if someone was a drug-user. He noted that he had a resident with an autistic child who was placed on Band C and yet if the child's needs were accounted for he believed they would be in Band A.
- 7.11 Councillor G. Theobald stated that previously there had been an element of discretion which enabled people to be placed in Band A and the proposed amendment was aimed to enable that to happen with the two officers taking the decision together, rather than placing the responsibility on one person only. He also felt that it was likely that the matter would have to be reviewed again as part of the requirements of the Localism Act, which meant that the recent review had been somewhat superfluous and an unnecessary use of resources.
- 7.12 Councillor Wakefield noted the comments and stated that a care leaver was not automatically granted Band A status, but it was an option that was available should officers feel that it was appropriate, after all it might not be the best option available. She was happy to accept the proposed amendment and noted that the young people faced a number of difficulties in their lives and the intention was to provide a positive experience of a tenancy.

- 7.13 The Mayor noted that an amendment had been moved and put it to the vote which was carried.
- 7.14 The Mayor noted the report as amended had been moved and put the recommendations to the vote.
- 7.15 **RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the proposals set out in paragraphs 3.22 to 3.28 in the report, as amended and also Appendix 3 to the report be approved;
  - (2) That the Strategic Director, Place, be authorised to amend the Council's Housing Allocations policy to reflect the above changes; and
  - (3) That the Strategic Director Place and the Strategic Director People, be authorised to take all steps necessary or incidental to the implementation of the proposals in paragraphs 3.22 to 3.28, including making appropriate arrangements for assessments, referrals and reporting to Members as suggested in paragraphs 3.14 and 3.24 of the report.

## **8. REVIEW OF CONSTITUTION**

- 8.1 Councillor Randall introduced the report which set out the proposed new constitution for the council following its decision to move to a committee system. He noted that the new governance arrangements had taken on board those elements of the Leader and Cabinet model that had worked well and incorporated them into the new committee system. He wished to thank the Member Working Group and the officers involved in reviewing the constitution and commended it to the council. He stated that with the introduction of a committee system a number of councillors and officers faced a big learning curve and encouraged them to take advantage of the support and training that was being offered. He also noted that the Conservative Group wished to propose two amendments and stated that he could not accept either. The changes proposed in the amendments had been discussed at a number of levels, including the last Governance Committee and were not conducive to the aims and objectives of the new constitution. With regard to the proposed Transport Committee he believed there was justification for a separate committee but was happy to review its status as part of the yearly review of the constitution. He therefore moved the recommendations as outlined in the report.
- 8.2 Councillor Theobald moved two amendments on behalf of the Conservative Group which he believed recognised the political make-up of the council and the benefit of merging two committees into one which could deal with the overall remit of environment, sustainability and transport.
- 8.3 Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the amendments and stated that there was a need for the Policy & Resources Committee as the principal decision-making committee to reflect the political balance of the groups represented on the council. He also believed that one environment committee was sufficient to deal with the various matters that would come before it and thereby generate a saving.



- 8.4 Councillor Morgan stated that he wished to thank the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Democratic Services and officers who supported the Member Working Group in bringing forward the new decision-making system in what had been a short space of time. The Working Group had been clear that there was a need for clear and open decision making without having too many levels and one that was understood by residents.
- 8.5 Councillor J. Kitcat stated that the aim had been to develop a new modern system, and the new constitution reflected that having been developed by a cross-party approach. Brighton & Hove was the first council to make the move to new governance arrangements and he wished to add his thanks to the legal team, Democratic Services and Members of the Working Group. He believed the new arrangements would be less bureaucratic and would enable greater efficiencies and involvement in the decision-making process. He stated that the size of the committees at ten meant that Members would not be over-burdened and that they had been apportioned in line with regulations. He did not accept the Conservative amendment and questioned the reasoning for it.
- 8.6 Councillor Mitchell stated that the council had resolved to change its governance arrangements in the shortest time possible and she supported the Leader's analysis for the change to the committee system. She did not support the amendments and noted that that the residents of the city had given the Green Administration a clear mandate and whilst reservations had been raised over the need for a separate Transport Committee, she was happy to review its role in a year's time.
- 8.7 Councillor Cox stated that whilst he understood the decision to move to a committee system he had previously supported the Elected Mayor model and would have done so again. He agreed with Councillor Morgan that the system needed to be streamlined and able to implement decisions and this would be tested in 2015 when people looked at what had been achieved.
- 8.8 Councillor Marsh stated that she welcomed the decision to retain the overview & scrutiny process, which had proved to be innovative and well supported by an excellent scrutiny team. She hoped that the scrutiny role would continue to be used to develop and influence policy.
- 8.9 Councillor Janio stated that the current proposals were biased and did not reflect the actual council situation and the committee proportions should be reviewed as they would not lead to a true decision-making process. It was clear that the Administration had wanted to retain control and used the sizes of committees to enable this. The retention of two scrutiny committees was not a real version and was unlikely to be effective. He believed that a further review should be undertaken.
- 8.10 Councillor Fitch stated that he had seen the benefit of having a committee system in the past and believed that the new system would encourage greater debate and allow for lobbying and influence decisions. The recent elections had put the Green Group in power and they should be able to take decisions and be held accountable for them.
- 8.11 Councillor Mears stated that the change to a cabinet model had been required by the Labour Government and the Conservative Administration had introduced the most open and transparent model that could have been. The pressure now was to ensure that the

new system enabled decisions to be taken effectively and not get bogged down in bureaucracy for the benefit of the city and that was yet to be determined.

- 8.12 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he was encouraged by the support for the committee system but noted that the Working Group had not been in agreement in regard to the proposed size of committees and had put forward a view for the Policy & Resources Committee to be increased to twelve. However, the Leaders Group had decided against that and accepted the size of ten for each of the policy committees. He questioned whether the overall balance of committees was proportionate and sought the support of the Labour & Co-operative Group for the two amendments that were proposed.
- 8.13 Councillor Randall stated that he fully supported Councillor Marsh's comments in regard to overview and scrutiny, which had proved itself and had an excellent team of officers to support it, which was why it had been retained in the new model. He could not accept the amendments and recommended that the recommendations as listed in the report be approved.
- 8.14 The Mayor noted that there were no other speakers and stated that she would put each of the Conservative amendments to the vote. She then put the first amendment to increase the size of the Policy & Resources Committee from 10 to 12 to the vote, which was lost.
- 8.15 The Mayor then put the second Conservative amendment to merge the Environment & Sustainability and Transport Committees into one committee to the vote, which was lost.
- 8.16 The Mayor then noted that the report had been moved and put the recommendations to the vote which were carried.
- 8.17 **RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the Council resolves, in accordance with section 9KC of the Local Government Act 2000, to change its governance arrangements from Leader and Cabinet to a Committee System;
  - (2) That the parts of the constitution set out in Appendix 1 to the report (being the parts where there are substantive changes) be approved;
  - (3) That the transitional arrangements in relation to the Audit and Standards Committees, as set out in paragraph 16.3 of the report, be approved and adopted until such time that the relevant Regulations relating to standards are made and come into force;
  - (4) That the current scheme of delegations to officers be approved subject to the changes set out at Appendix 5 to the report and any other consequential modifications;
  - (5) That the rest of the existing constitution be approved and adopted, subject to such amendments as are necessary to make them fit for a committee system;

- (6) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the minor and consequential changes referred to in resolutions (4) and (5) above;
- (7) That the constitution as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, with the addition of the parts referred to in resolution (5) above, be approved and adopted as the Council's constitution in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2000 and relevant Regulations, Orders and Directions made by the Secretary of State;
- (8) That the new system of governance and the new constitution come into force immediately after the conclusion of Annual Council on 17 May 2012;
- (9) That the Chief Executive be authorised to take all steps necessary or incidental to the implementation of the new governance arrangements, including the power to make such transitional arrangements as are necessary for the orderly implementation of the proposals;
- (10) That officers be instructed to make copies of the Council's new constitution available at its principal offices and to publish a notice describing the new arrangements, in accordance with s9KC of the Local Government Act 2000; and
- (11) That it be noted that the issue of Member's Allowances dealt with separately elsewhere on the agenda and that any proposed Code of Conduct be referred to Council as part of the recommendations from the Standards Committee.

## **9. REVIEW OF MEMBERS ALLOWANCES**

- 9.1 Councillor Littman introduced the report and noted that the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel had been accepted by the Governance Committee and were put before the council for approval. He wished to thank the Chair and the Panel members for their speedy review of the allowances scheme following the council's decision to move to committee system of governance and noted that a further review would be undertaken to compliment the yearly review of the new constitution. He then moved that the report and the recommendations be agreed.
- 9.2 Councillor A. Norman stated that she wished to thank the Panel Members for their work and asked that as part of their next review they look at the role of the Chair, which was not equivalent to that of a Cabinet Member and that of the Opposition Spokesperson which increased under a committee model.
- 9.3 The Mayor noted that the report had been moved and put the recommendations to the vote.
- 9.4 **RESOLVED:**
  - (1) That the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Leader's position remain at the current level of £28,758 as outlined in paragraph 3.4 and appendix 1 to the report;

- (2) That the Special Responsibility Allowance for the two Deputy Leaders' positions remain at the current level of £17,254 as outlined in paragraph 3.4 and appendix 1 to the report;
- (3) That the Special Responsibility Allowance of £10,927 be payable to the Chairs of Committees as outlined in paragraphs 3.6 to 3.9 and appendix 1 to the report;
- (4) That a Special Responsibility Allowance of £8,626 be payable to the Deputy Chair of Policy & Resources (with responsibility for Finance & Resources), as outlined in paragraph 3.7 of the report;
- (5) That a Special Responsibility Allowance of £3,594 be payable to the Deputy Chairs of Planning and Licensing Committees, as detailed in paragraph 3.9 of the report;
- (6) That the Special Responsibility Allowance of £2,156 for the Deputy Chairs of Committees be payable as outlined in paragraphs 3.6 to 3.9 and appendix 1 to the report;
- (7) That a Special Responsibility Allowance of £2,156 be agreed for the four positions of Opposition Spokesperson as outlined in paragraph 3.10 of the report; and
- (8) That the remaining aspects of the current Members' Allowance Scheme be retained with the inclusion of the changes in Special Responsibility Allowance's as outlined above (2-8) form the Members Allowances Scheme 2012/13 set out at Appendix 2 to the report and to take effect from 18 May 2012.

## **10. HEALTH AND SAFETY ANNUAL SERVICE PLAN 2012/13**

- 10.1 Councillor Duncan introduced the report which detailed the Annual Health & Safety Plan for 2012/13 and stated that he was delighted to have the opportunity to use the small grants programme to help businesses to improve their position.
- 10.2 The Mayor noted that the recommendation to approve the Health & Safety Annual Service Plan 2012/13 had been moved and put it to the vote.
- 10.3 **RESOLVED:** That the proposed Health & Safety Annual Service Plan 2012/2013 at Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

## **11. OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE PLAN 2012/13**

- 11.1 Councillor Randall introduced the report which detailed the proposed Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan, as required by the Food Standards Agency.
- 11.2 The Mayor noted that the recommendation to approve the official feed and food controls plan had been moved and put it to the vote.
- 11.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2012/2013 set out in the appendix to the report be approved.

## **12. CLOSE OF MEETING**

12.1 The Mayor thanked everyone for attending and formally closed the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 6.20pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of