

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

CABINET

4.00pm 18 SEPTEMBER 2008

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

**Present:** Councillors Mears (Chairman), Mrs Brown, Caulfield, Fallon-Khan, K Norman, Simson, G Theobald and Young

**Also in attendance:** Councillor

**Other Members present:** Councillors Kitcat, Watkins, Allen and Mrs Cobb

PART ONE

**50. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**50a Declarations of Interests**

50a.1 Councillor Mitchell declared a personal interest in Item 71 (Future Ownership Options for Edward Street Quarter Site) as a relative worked for the associated company.

**50b Exclusion of Press and Public**

50b.1 The Cabinet considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A, Part 5A, Section 100A(4) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

50b.2 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of items 70 onward.

**51. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS**

51.1 The Chairman informed the meeting that a report concerning the King Alfred development would be brought to both the October and November Cabinet.

51.2 The funders for the present scheme, ING, had declared that they would no longer be funding the project. This meant that 'Karis', the local development company, were exploring opportunities for alternative funding. This arrangement would exist until November 9th. After this date, the council would no longer have a legal partnership with Karis/ING, the company set up to deliver the project.

51.3 The Chairman announced that there would be a special cabinet meeting on the 24th September to consider the 'Local Delivery Vehicle' proposed for Housing Management. The meeting would be subject to the same arrangements as the previous special meeting, in that the only issue considered will be the substantive report.

51.4 The Chairman explained that Item 72 (Future Ownership Options for Edward Street Quarter Site) had not been included on the Forward Plan because the council did not want to fetter the discretion of Amex in dealing with their own internal communications before determining the issue. The legal implications of this were detailed in the report.

**52. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

52.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on the 10<sup>th</sup> July be approved as a correct record.

**53. MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING HELD ON 31 JULY 2008**

53.1 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the special meeting held on the 31st July be approved as a correct record.

**54. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION**

54.1 **RESOLVED** – All items were reserved for discussion.

**55. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

55.1 The Chairman noted that two public questions had been received and welcomed Mr. Chavasse and Valerie Paynter to the meeting. The Chairman invited Mr Chavasse to put his question.

55.2 Mr. Chavasse thanked the Chairman and asked the following question:

55.3 'Recalling strong advice given by the Conservation Advisory Group, as endorsed by English Heritage and ICOMOS, and given the absence, from the Report on Communal Bins, of recommended environmental impact assessments for the proposed Communal Bin positions - on what specific basis is it considered that the Council's Statutory Duties under Conservation, Listed Buildings and Highways legislation has been evidentially discharged and fairly recorded for democratic and public scrutiny as well as to underpin robust defence of exposure to

Ombudsman or Court processes and as a basis for assessment of contested deferred decisions and other changes in historic areas?’

55.4 The Chairman invited Councillor Theobald to respond. Councillor Theobald replied as follows:

55.5 ‘Proposed bin locations have been assessed on a site by site basis. An assessor has visited each individual site and identified the most suitable location taking into consideration site specific considerations to minimise their impact. Factors taken into consideration are:

- Containers need to be sited in safe locations.
- Containers need to be operationally accessible.
- Containers should, where possible, limit the loss of parking spaces.
- Containers, where possible, should not be sited directly outside of residents / businesses front doors or windows.
- Containers, where possible, are sited not to detract from views, vistas, important architecture etc.
- Container locations should be convenient for residents.
- Containers should not be sited over utility covers.

55.6 Using these criteria the most suitable bin locations are identified. We have consulted on all bin locations and where practicable have made changes.

55.7 Cityclean Officers have worked with the conservation team and will continue to do so regarding the siting of bins in sensitive areas to ensure the best possible bin locations are identified.

55.8 The guidelines above have been tailored to Brighton and Hove, and the excluded areas include the Terraces and Squares referred to ICOMOS. English Heritage is satisfied that the Council is taking a logical approach, in terms of balancing the need for an effective refuse collection system against the need to minimise the visual impact on key local views and public spaces.

55.9 The planning authority, when carrying out its planning functions in a conservation area, has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. However, the placing of communal bins does not require an application for express planning permission and therefore the council is not carrying out a “planning function” in this regard.

55.10 The Council has paid special attention to the architectural and historic significance of these areas and is aware of their sensitivity to change. In the light of the consultation responses and the success of the pilot project, it concludes that the environmental benefits will outweigh any harm to the character or appearance of conservation areas, and that any such harm can be mitigated by careful siting of containers and adjustment in their number.

55.11 The placing of the bins on the highway, using the criteria set out above is compliant with the relevant highways legislation.

55.12 The Chairman noted that Mr. Chavasse had the right to pose one supplementary question and invited him to put a further question.

55.13 Mr. Chavasse in an exchange with Councillor Theobald then posed two further questions and a number of additional points;;

- a) That Cabinet should conclusively determine, rather than re-consult areas proposed to be excluded from communal bins (Sussex Square, Lewes Crescent, Chichester Terrace and Arundel Terrace, Brunswick Square and Brunswick Terrace, Adelaide Crescent / Palmeira Square).
- b) That Cabinet should reconsider the change to the frequency of refuse collections in densely populated, central Hove locations, at least consulting with residents about such a change.

55.14 Councillor Theobald confirmed that the areas proposed to be excluded from communal bins (Sussex Square, Lewes Crescent, Chichester Terrace and Arundel Terrace, Brunswick Square and Brunswick Terrace, Adelaide Crescent / Palmeira Square) would indeed be excluded, rather than re-consulted.

55.15 Councillor Theobald concluded that the decision about the frequency of collections was not a Cabinet decision nor related to the report in question. The decision to alter the frequency of collections had been delegated to the Director of Environment and had been taken in consideration of to resource and operational issues.

55.16 The Chairman welcomed Valerie Paynter to the meeting and invited her to put her question.

55.17 Valerie asked:

55.18 'Item 19 on the P&R Agenda of 18 June 2003 concerning Leisure Facilities Management referred to "Greenwich who operate a Trust..." when comparing methods of service provision. It was clear this option was not favoured by BHCC at that time.

55.19 Since then I understand Greenwich have distinguished themselves by using their Trust template to also run the Leisure facilities of several other boroughs for them. Should this option now be revisited by BHCC, alongside others that do not involve demolitions and developers as a way forward?'

55.20 The Chairman replied as follows:

55.21 'We routinely review best practice in relation to the provision of leisure services in order to obtain value for money for local council taxpayers. We will continue to do so in the future'

55.22 The Chairman noted that Valerie had the right to pose one supplementary question and invited her to put a further question.

55.23 Valerie asked:

'In the light of current and dramatically deteriorating world financial stability which will take many years to calm, remaining a hostage to profit-driven private enterprise is moment nearly kamikaze. Can the council agree that the Sports Forum of stakeholder organisations, proposed

in the draft Sports Strategy, would provide a good opening opportunity for discussion of the merits of Community Development Trust management for council leisure facilities?’

55.24 Councillor Mears replied that it was an interesting proposal and that reports submitted to Cabinet in October and November would take due consideration of the issue.

## **56. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

56.1 The Chairman noted that there was one written question from and asked Councillor Davis to put her question.

56.2 Councillor Davis asked:

‘The Council’s consultation about installing communal bins in the roads around St Ann’s Wells Gardens has produced a very negative response from a majority of local residents, particularly in Nizells Avenue. This is because these much loved and Green Flag award winning gardens are integral with Nizells Avenue. Residents are extremely concerned that these bins will be an eye sore and attract fly tippers to this beautiful and well used community open space. As the Seafront heritage squares and terraces are being taken out of the communal bins roll-out in recognition of their special status, could the Member of the Environment tell us if he is prepared to exempt Nizell’s Avenue and these exceptional gardens for the same reason?’

56.3 Councillor Theobald replied:

‘The majority of respondents to the consultation on communal bins were in favour of the proposals. We have run successful trials with communal bins in many beautiful parts of the city where they have cleaned up the streets and proved very popular. The introduction to communal bins will mean an end to ripped open black sacks which blight much of the city centre.

We cannot roll services out on a street by street basis as this would prove to be inefficient, and practice has shown that streets without communal bins would in fact use the bins in other streets. I am therefore not able to exclude Nizells Avenue from the scheme.

I hope that, if Cabinet today decides to approve the scheme, residents in Nizells Avenue will realise the benefits of the scheme.’

56.4 The Chairman agreed to accept a second supplementary question from Councillor Mitchell.

56.5 Councillor Mitchell asked for the total number of parking spaces that would be lost in making the communal bins scheme.

56.6 Councillor Theobald offered a written response.

**57. PETITIONS**

57.1 The Cabinet received a petition presented by Councillor Mears, signed by 1000 people in respect of the A259 coast road bus lanes.

'We the undersigned request Brighton & Hove City Council to urgently review the bus lanes now being constructed on the A259 coast road between Longridge Avenue and Ovingdean roundabout before a serious or fatal accident occurs. The lanes are too narrow, the pedestrian crossing lights are not consistently operating, emergency vehicles are having to drive on the wrong side of the road at the Rottingdean traffic lights to get through the traffic queues and the white line is so confusing that a head-on vehicle collision is almost inevitable.'

57.2 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and referred to the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

57.3 The Cabinet received a petition presented by Councillor Watkins, signed by seven people in opposition to communal bins in First Avenue.

57.4 'We the undersigned residents of First Avenue are opposed to the introduction of communal bins in our road.'

57.5 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and referred to the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

**58. DEPUTATIONS**

There were none.

**59. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

There were none.

**60. NOTICES OF MOTIONS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

There were none.

**61. MATTERS REFERRED FOR RECONSIDERATION**

There were none.

**62. OUTCOME FROM THE ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 'CALL-IN' MEETING HELD ON 13TH AUGUST 2008 (IN RELATION TO THE ACCOMMODATION NEEDS OF TRAVELLERS)**

62.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance that reported to the outcome of the 13<sup>th</sup> August 2008 Call-in meeting of the Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The meeting was convened to determine a call-in request from Councillor Craig Turton relating to the 31st July 2008

Cabinet decision on meeting the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers (for copy see minute book).

- 62.2 Councillor Mears noted that due process had been followed and that scrutiny of the issue had been undertaken in a timely and open way.
- 62.3 Councillor Mitchell noted the report. Referring to confidential items later in the agenda, she noted that there were no 'open' versions of the confidential reports and wondered why this was the case.
- 62.4 The Director of Strategy & Governance explained that, where possible 'public' versions of confidential reports could be included with agenda papers. In this instance the circumstances leading to the drafting of both items had not afforded the opportunity to do so.
- 62.5 **RESOLVED -**
- (1) That decision of the Environment and Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee not to refer back the Cabinet decision in relation to the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers be noted.
- (2) That the following two additional recommendations agreed by the Committee for referral to the Executive be approved.
- (A). That the rest of the process regarding the proposed permanent travellers site is progressed having regard to the need to keep Ward Councillors and residents informed and properly consulted.
- (B). That issues of custom and practice relating to Special Meetings be reviewed and clarified with regard to the Constitution.

### **63. TARGETED BUDGET MANAGEMENT (TBM) MONTH 4**

- 63.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Finance & Resources that set out the forecast outturn position on the revenue and capital budgets as at the end of July 2008 (month 4) (for copy see minute book).
- 63.2 In response to a series of questions from Councillor Mitchell the following information was provided.
- 63.3 Councillor Caulfield explained that the position in relation to the worsening situation for Housing Benefit (Corporate Critical Budgets) was related to the General Fund rather than the Housing Revenue Account.
- 63.4 Councillor Young noted that the position related to a predicted underspend of 600K when in fact the actual position spend had been 560K. The position was not as poor as has been predicted and officers were monitoring the budget.

- 63.5 Councillor Mears noted that the mid-term financial strategy was being monitored.
- 63.6 In response to queries from Councillor Mitchell as regards funding the restoration of the Bandstand, Councillor Theobald noted the following. That previous attempts to gain funding from English Heritage had failed and that the additional allocation of 70K to the project was for improved lighting in the area.
- 63.7 Responding to comments from Councillor Mitchell about the state of Madeira Drive, Councillor Theobald noted that funding for repairs to the Madeira Lift was being sought. He added that the Strategic Plan developed for such issues would assist in determining priorities and setting budgets.
- 63.8 Councillor Mitchell welcomed Government funding for Early Years and Childcare priorities and noted similar funding for the 'Cycle Demonstration Town', she asked for detail on how this funding was due to be allocated.
- 63.9 Councillor Theobald noted that detail would be provided at a future Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.
- 63.10 **RESOLVED –**
- (1) That the forecast outturn for the General Fund, Section 75 Partnerships and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for 2008/09 as at month 4 be noted.
  - (2) That the financial recovery plans for managing directorate overspends be noted.
  - 3 That a contribution from HRA revenue reserves of £0.250 million to fund the increased energy costs pressure be approved.
  - 4 That the forecast outturn position on the capital budgets as at month 4 be noted.
  - 5 That the following changes to the capital programme be approved.
    - i) budget re-profiles as set out at appendix 3;
    - ii) budget variations as set out at appendix 4; and
    - iii) new schemes as set out at appendix 5.

#### **64. CORPORATE PROCUREMENT STRATEGY**

64.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Finance & Resources introducing the revised Corporate Procurement Strategy and setting out the council's strategic approach to purchasing goods, services and works. The strategy replaced the Corporate Procurement Strategy 2005 – 2007 (for copy see minute book).

64.2 Councillors Fallon-Khan and Young welcomed the report and commended the work of the report author in preparing it.

64.3 Speaking as Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission Councillor Mitchell thanked Councillor Fallon-Khan for his attendance and note the excellent work that had gone into preparing the strategy.



**64.4 RESOLVED -**

- (1) That the principles outlined within the revised strategy attached as Appendix 1 of the report be approved.
- (2) That the Corporate Procurement Strategy 2008-2011 be endorsed and approved.

**65. 2008 / 09 QUARTER ONE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT REPORT - NEW PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

- 65.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance that introduced a new performance and monitoring framework in response to recent changes introduced by Government and in line with the priorities contained within the Corporate Plan (for copy see minute book).
- 65.2 Councillor Fallon-Khan welcomed the report and commended the work of the report authors in preparing it. The Chairman endorsed his comments.
- 65.3 Councillor Young welcomed the report, she was keen to include in future reports statistics on the prompt payment of invoices.
- 65.4 Councillor Norman noted that there were numerous issues of merit related to his portfolio for Adult Social Care. He noted that targets for the move toward 'Self Directed Care' were being met and praised the success of the 'Single Access Points' that had so far generated in excess of 2,500 contacts. Councillor Norman was keen to retain and improve on the three star rating currently enjoyed by the service.
- 65.5 Councillor Simson noted the need to improve on reaching the desired Equalities standard noting that this area was being monitored for improvement.
- 65.6 **RESOLVED** – That the new performance management approach and the quarterly frequency of reporting as noted in the report, be approved.

**66. INCLUSIVE COUNCIL POLICY**

- 65.7 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Strategy & Governance regarding the Council's Inclusive Council Policy 2004-2007. This set the policy framework and priorities for equalities work in the City Council and priorities for the next three years 2008-2011 (for copy see minute book).
- 65.8 Councillor Mitchell broadly welcomed the policy, noting that key to its success would be stringent implementation and monitoring. She was pleased to note the 'Buggy Healthwalks' and the consequences of the 'Count Me In Too' LGBT survey.
- 65.9 As Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission, Councillor Mitchell noted that the committee had considered the report and would be paying attention to the proposals for 'Dignity at Work'.

65.10 Councillor Fallon-Khan welcomed the report, noting that the coming months would see an emphasis on training and development of staff, building on the strong officer work already apparent.

65.11 **RESOLVED** - That the new Equalities & Inclusion Policy and Equality Scheme Action Plan be approved.

## 67. COMMUNAL BINS

67.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Environment that requested approval of an extension of the communal bin scheme in central parts of the city, following consultation with residents, ward councillors, and interested parties (for copy see minute book).

67.2 Councillor Theobald noted the petition presented earlier in the meeting in opposition to the proposals. He also noted letters of support from residents of Brunswick Square and requests from neighbouring areas for the introduction of communal bins. He had also received letters from persons initially against the proposal who were now in favour.

67.3 The Chairman noted that Councillor Kitcat had requested to speak to the item and invited him to address the meeting.

67.4 Councillor Kitcat was opposed to the introduction of communal bins for various reasons. He felt that consultation had been flawed, that the move toward communal bins was detrimental to the councils recycling programme and that the scheme was not sensitive to the locations proposed.

67.5 Councillor Theobald noted that there were no negative impacts on recycling in relation to the proposals and offered a written response to Councillor Kitcat detailing this. Councillor Theobald refuted that the consultation had been flawed noting the roughly equal amount of response for and against the proposals.

67.6 The Chairman noted that Councillor Watkins had requested to speak to the item and invited him to address the meeting.

67.7 Councillor Watkins noted that the Liberal Democrats did not oppose communal bins per se and noted their success in achieving cleaner streets. However he did feel that greater thought should be given the location and the impact of their presence on the street scene and for residents unfortunate enough to have one near their home.

67.8 Councillor Watkins noted the twice weekly refuse collection afforded residents in the most densely populated areas of central Hove. This had been offered in recognition of the sheer volume of refuse created in the locality. He was concerned that for those living in basement areas (where communal bin stores were located) the build up of refuse so near to their home, would be intolerable. He asked for more time for this to be considered and could not understand why this particular decision had been delegated to officers.

- 67.9 Councillor Theobald noted that that the change to the frequency of collections was not directly related to the proposals as regards communal bins. However, he noted that he did not feel it appropriate that some areas of the city should have twice weekly collections while other areas did not. He added that he was happy to speak with the Ward Councillors about the situation at any time.
- 67.10 The Chairman suggested that Councillor Theobald clarify the details as pertaining to the change to the frequency of collections with Councillor Watkins away from the meeting.
- 67.11 Councillor Mitchell was concerned that the majority of people affected by the proposal to place communal bins in their area were unaware it. She felt that the initial consultation exercise should have been followed up explaining the results of it and the conclusion that had been reached.
- 67.12 Councillor Theobald felt that there had been more than adequate publicity surrounding the proposals; this was evidenced by the correspondence that Members had received.
- 67.13 Councillor Mitchell suggested that any decision should be deferred until residents were fully aware of the proposals being made.
- 67.14 Councillor Theobald confirmed that Sussex Square, Lewes Crescent, Chichester Terrace, Arundel Terrace, Brunswick Square, Brunswick Terrace, Adelaide Crescent and Palmeria Square were excluded from the scheme.
- 67.15 Councillor Mitchell asked if would be possible to also exclude the listed properties at 160-163 Marine Parade.
- 67.16 Councillor Fallon-Khan noted the concerns of residents in Nizells Avenue and the contribution made by Councillor Davis on their behalf. He noted that there were differences of opinion in the area and felt that the positive impact of the proposals would outweigh the localised opposition.
- 67.17 Councillor Mitchell noted that that when the communal bins scheme had been initially considered for the city centre it had been tested and every household had been contacted. Consultation had continued during the trial and following the conclusions of the trail before full implementation. Councillor Mitchell stated that communal bins had only been placed in areas where they had been requested, whereas the current proposals offered a different approach.
- 67.18 Councillor Theobald recalled the initial resistance to the scheme and noted that many of those initially opposed had been convinced of the benefits following a period of adjustment. He commended officers for their extensive work in this area.

**67.19 RESOLVED -**

- (1) That the introduction of a communal bin scheme in the central areas of Brighton and Hove as defined in Annex 1 of the report be approved.
- (2) That it be noted that the following historic squares and terraces are excluded from the scheme:
  - (A) Sussex Square, Lewes Crescent, Chichester Terrace and Arundel Terrace
  - (B) Brunswick Square and Brunswick Terrace
  - (C) Adelaide Crescent / Palmeira Square

**68. REFURBISHMENT OF LONDON ROAD AND LANES CAR PARKS**

- 68.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Environment that sought funding and authority to appoint a works contractor to carry out these improvements to the Lanes and London Road car parks (for copy see minute book).
- 68.2 Councillor Mitchell supported the proposals but noted that the initial costs had almost doubled.
- 68.3 Councillor Theobald noted the extensive nature of the refurbishments and the increasing costs of raw materials.
- 68.4 **RESOLVED –**
  - (1) That the allocation of a further £1.01m additional funding for high quality improvements at The Lanes Car Park and minor improvements at London Road Car Park be approved.
  - (2) That the release of £0.300 million from the Car Parks Maintenance Reserve as a contribution towards the capital costs be approved.
  - (3) That the appointment of a works contractor by the Director of Environment be approved.

**69. VERNON GARDENS**

- 69.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Adult Social Care & Housing in regard of a capital grant of £1,000,000 awarded to the City Council from the Department of Health's 2008/10 Extra Care Housing Fund. The report set out the background to the successful bid and the decisions required in order to take the proposed scheme forward. The proposed site of the scheme was 3-5 Vernon Gardens, Brighton (for copy see minute book).
- 69.2 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report, noting the success of a similar scheme at Knoll House.
- 69.3 Councillor Norman welcomed the funding that had been made available to progress the work.

**69.4 RESOLVED –**

- (1) That Guinness Housing Association will be the Council's approved partner to develop the extra care housing scheme.
- (2) That the transfer of the land known as 3-5 Vernon Gardens, Brighton, be approved on terms to be settled by the Director of Finance & Property, based on a 150 year lease to Guinness Housing Association.
- (3) That the receipt of the Department of Health grant be approved and the transfer of 3-5 Vernon Gardens at nil consideration to Guinness Housing Association under an agreement be approved, on terms to be settled by the Director of Adult Social Care and Housing, requiring Guinness Housing Association to develop an extra care housing scheme for disabled adults on the site.

## PART TWO

**70. FALMER ACADEMY RELEASED LAND**

Exempt categories 1, 3, 5 & 6.

70.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Cultural Services that advised on work undertaken to date and that sought approval for officers to lead a further investigation into the opportunities for the surplus land at Falmer, following the end of the exclusivity period on 5 September 2008 previously granted by the council to Brighton & Hove Albion Football Club (for copy see minute book).

70.2 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report.

70.3 **RESOLVED** – That the recommendations be approved as per the report.

**71. FUTURE OWNERSHIP OPTIONS FOR EDWARD STREET QUARTER SITE**

Exempt category 3

71.1 The Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Cultural Services that sought authority to proceed to detailed negotiations with American Express for the potential sale of the city council's freehold interest in Amex House. This with 'in principle' support for sale to the existing long-leaseholders (for copy see minute book).

71.2 Councillor Mitchell declared a personal interest in the item as a relative worked for the associated company. She left the chamber for the duration of the debate.

71.3 The Chairman commended the work of officers in relation to the preparation of the report and the sensitive negotiation that it had required

71.4 **RESOLVED** -

(1) That the recommendations be approved as per the report.

**72. TO CONSIDER WHETHER OR NOT ANY OF THE ABOVE ITEMS AND THE DECISIONS THEREON SHOULD REMAIN FROM DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

72.1 The Cabinet considered whether or not any of the above items should remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

72.2 **RESOLVED** – That items 70-71 inclusive, contained in Part Two of the agenda and the decisions thereon remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 5.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of