

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14 JUNE 2012**

Present: Councillors Peter Tyson (Mayor); Geoffrey Blackwell; John Bowman; Jackie Bowman; Hugh Branney; Yvonne Clarkson; George Clements; Peter Connolly; Karl Connor; Margarita Docherty; Jon Downie; Eileen Eastwood; Anne Faichney; Geoffrey Garrity; Phil Greatorex; Stephen Haraldsen; Reg Heathcote; Ian Hill; Keith Hitchen; Lena Hogg; Allan Holliday; Joan Hully; John Jackson; Alan Jacob; John Kane; Michael McVeigh; David Moore; Alistair Norwood; Sam Pollen; David Riley; Robert Salkeld; Gilbert Scurrah; William Southward; Peter Stephenson; Graham Sunderland; Gillian Troughton; Jeanette Williams; Doug Wilson; Felicity Wilson; Elaine Woodburn; Henry Wormstrup

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Banks; Brian Dixon; John Fallows; Fred Gleaves; Peter Kane; Jack Park; Dave Smith; Paul Whalley; Norman Williams; Carole Woodman,

C 06 Minutes

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 8 May 2012 were signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

C 07 Declarations of Interests

Councillors Elaine Woodburn, Allan Holliday, K Hitchen declared Personal Interests in Agenda Item 8 Executive Report – MRWS due to being members of the partnership;

Councillor Sam Pollen declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 8 Executive Report – Nuclear Issues due to being employed at Sellafield;

Councillor Peter Tyson; Yvonne Clarkson and Joan Hully declared Personal Interests in Agenda Item 8 Nuclear issues due to having family and friends employed there.

Councillor Peter Tyson declared a personal interest in Agenda item 8 Whitehaven Planning for existing estates at Woodhouse and Greenbank due to being a resident of Greenbank;

Councillor Yvonne Clarkson declared Personal Interests in any Agenda item relating to Whitehaven Youth Centre regeneration due to being the property owner and all items referring to Rosehill Theatre Copeland Community Fund and SEC Funding due to being on the various boards.

Councillor Joan Hully declared personal interests in items relating to the arts due to having dealt with them in a separate company; Regeneration, due to being a director of WISE; and Mary Portas project due to being involved in the Cleator Moor bid at the start.

C 08 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor referred to the various engagements he had fulfilled since the last meeting of the Council.

C 09 Petitions

There were no petitions under Procedure Rule 19.

C 10 Questions from Members of the Public

There were no questions from members of the public

C 11 Questions from Members of the Council under Procedure Rule 13.1

Written notice of the following questions had been given under Procedure Rule 13.1:

Councillor Joan Hully asked the following question, to the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration.

“At the last Full Council meeting we heard about the closure of Remploy at Cleator Moor and the devastation it will cause to those employed there. Then we hear about Cumbrian Seafoods closing with the loss of 100 jobs. Could the Portfolio Holder tell Council what discussions we have had with them and give us an update on the present situation at both sites. “

The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Phil Greatorex replied as follows:

“Following our most recent meeting with Cumbrian Seafoods I can inform members that many of the 90 product workers at the factory have been on short time during the last 6 months and have been working closely with management to get support from the company to help them through this redundancy period.

The company has been pro-active and is working closely with each staff member on the following:

- Offering existing staff first refusal to transfer to their factory in Grimsby and giving them help to relocate and trial the move if needed;
- All staff have had one to ones with HR to assist them in looking at their transferable skills and employment options both in and out of the company;
- Staff have negotiated a package of help by the company including time off for interviews, training time, released early with rights to take up new employment;
- Paying staff in lieu of notice as they don't need all staff in place till site closure;
- invited Job Centre Plus onto site on a couple of occasions

We have been working with partners to secure additional support to that provided by the company and Job Centre Plus particularly to continue support post their site closure date of end July. This work is being provided by Phoenix Enterprise Centre through a package of grants. We are aware that most employees will be off the site by next Friday 22nd June. The Company have put in £50k and asked their staff how they would best see this resource help them into new

jobs. Staff requested one off cash payments to all staff being made redundant as their preferred option which has been accepted by the company

In relation to Remploy both the Leader of the Council and I have met with the operation manager at Cleator Moor and they are hopeful in terms of progressing options through social enterprise and they are working on their business case with partners. I have to say that the outlook for these employees is pretty bleak but I will certainly continue to give them my support along with the Leader.”

Councillor Sam Pollen asked the following question, to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources

“Government has said there will be a 10% reduction in council tax benefit and allegedly left it to local authorities to design their own scheme led by individual community needs. The Government quite rightly stated pensioners were not included in this cut, then they say disabled people are to be exempt, then single people are giving an exemption, what I'm trying to work out is what will be left for us to locally decide upon? Why doesn't the Government just be honest and say we want to penalise those who are of working age and have no job, because that is what the Government is actually doing?

The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Gillian Troughton replied as follows

“I'll make no apologies for the length of this answer as it's quite a complicated subject. The Welfare Reform Act was given Royal Assent on 8th March 2012. This Act enables the introduction of Universal Credit to replace most other working age benefits, and also abolishes Council Tax Benefit. The Local Government Finance Bill introduces the measures to introduce locally defined Council Tax discount schemes which replace Council Tax Benefit. Unfortunately, given that local schemes need to be in place by 31st January 2013 (as the draft legislation stands), the Local Government Finance Bill is still a bill. It has entered the Lords but has yet to be timetabled for the committee stage. It is looking increasingly likely that the Bill will not clear the Lords and receive Royal Assent before the summer recess. Now clearly that is an unacceptable state of affairs.

As the legislation is not fully enacted it is not fully clear the exact implications for local government in general and this Council in particular, hardly a sound basis for planning a scheme designed to help some of the most vulnerable people in our community in any meaningful or responsible manner.

Some things are known:

- ⤴ the overall budget that will be transferred to precepting authorities to fund the new discounts will be 10% less than the current Council tax Benefit budget. However it is not clear whether all authorities will receive a 10% cut or as seems more likely this could be more or less than this depending on some factor as yet not defined.
- ⤴ The intention is, in the Bill as it stands, that the Local Scheme will be defined by the current collecting authority, which in our case is this authority, Copeland Borough Council. Other authorities are consultees only but any scheme put in place will be binding on them too; naturally there is heavy lobbying occurring particularly the higher tier County Authorities to change this before it is enacted to give them more control of the local scheme and this may well change before it is enacted.

- ⤴ The local scheme must preserve the arrangements for pensioners as they are now ie if a pensioner meets the criteria for benefit under the existing scheme then they will be entitled to the similar discount under the new local scheme. (These arrangements are prescribed within the Bill) With approximately 50% of current Council Tax Benefit claimants being of pensionable age, this clearly shifts the full burden of any cut onto either other claimants or the Council's revenue budget.
- ⤴ The local scheme must protect vulnerable people as defined locally and there are some. The expectation and stated purpose of the new scheme is to encourage entry in to paid employment, thus by default it must be expected that any loss of benefit must be carried by those who are unemployed.
- ⤴ The Local Government Finance Bill will allow some changes to the discounts for empty properties as way of defraying some of the costs of the new discount scheme as well as bringing empty properties back into use. It also allows changes to the charges on second homes. However it does not allow any changes to the Single Person's Discount. With these parameters there are very few flexibilities for any local scheme. We need to be mindful that even if we were of the opinion that there were large swathes of people who could be encouraged into work by withdrawal or reduction in benefits, which I do not believe to be true especially in light of the current unemployment level with large numbers chasing every vacancy, that simply billing people for larger amounts will not necessarily increase their collection as poor vulnerable people will just not have the means to pay. In other words decreasing discounts for certain groups needs to be balanced with the increased likelihood of defaulters.

So on the limited information I currently have, I believe it is unlikely that changes to empty home and second home discounts will be able to defray the 10% cut. Our priority as a Council must be to protect the most vulnerable in our society yet the Government's intention seems to be to deliberately demonise and financially punish them. The legislation for the localisation of Council Tax Benefit will tie the hands of local councillors at the same time as the Welfare Reform Act is already penalising the very same groups of vulnerable people I have identified. Universal Credit will cap benefits as well as introducing new rules such as the controversial 'bedroom tax' which will affect many households in Copeland. Yet the Government denies this intention, as well not being honest that in fact this Bill will de facto introduce yet another cut into local government finances. Cuts at a time of already significantly reducing Local Government finance; cuts that will affect the ability of all the major precepting authorities that's ourselves, County Council and Police to deliver essential services for vulnerable people in our area. "

Councillor David Riley asked the following question of the Leader of the Council

"I know schools are not the responsibility of this Council but the education of our young people must be a priority. It has been recently publicised about the two failing schools in Whitehaven, schools which have also lost out on funding that would have built a new school at Whitehaven. But regardless of this the educational attainment must improve therefore can I ask the Leader what we are doing about this present situation?"

The Leader of the Council Councillor Elaine Woodburn replied as follows:-

"Thank you Mr Mayor. We actually discuss a lot of things in here that probably to Members of

the public seem quite minor this isn't one of those if we don't get education right for the youth of our area we are actually going to lose generations of people and with the right skills and the right knowledge to work within this community never mind elsewhere. I can remember someone telling me that they had met with about 40 teachers from the Whitehaven School and when asked how many of their children actually attended I think it was about two that said that their children attended the school that they taught at. Now to me in some ways that speaks volumes they should be wanting their children to attend the schools locally because they're providing the best education that they want for their children and they should equally want that same education for other people's children.

We aren't the authority, you're right, for schools but it's very clear that we have a responsibility for the wellbeing of the people of Copeland and that includes the young people. We have invited senior officers from the County Council to attend a meeting with elected members I am hoping this doesn't come as a surprise to the Overview and Scrutiny Chairs as I would like this to be led through the Overview and Scrutiny process. Apart from inviting them in to see their plans and what they're actually going to do to make the improvements we will then invite them back in six month time to make sure that they're delivering on those improvement plans. I know the school especially Whitehaven and I shamefully shouldn't forget Mayfield School because Mayfield was on the list to get some building skills for the future funding obviously with the change of Government that changed and I think all of us from whatever side were equally disappointed when they produced a list that didn't include Mayfield or Whitehaven School. I know there's another round of funding coming up I know we're meeting with the Strategic Forum on the 26th of this month where the intention is to make sure that this is on the agenda that they look at and prioritise new build of our schools. But in all fairness that isn't the answer to the problem we can put up new buildings and no doubt having a better environment to work in does give them that boost but we have got to make sure that the right quality of teacher the right quality of Governors and the local education authority is making sure that they are not doing a disservice to the youth of Copeland. So there is intention of having a meeting through Overview and Scrutiny to make sure that we keep on top of them and they deliver for the young people of Copeland."

Councillor Henry Wormstrup asked the following to the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration: -

"Tomorrow will be the launch of the updated West Cumbria blueprint which sets out the direction that economically we need to move in to offset some of the challenges that face us. But what is of concern is that with the stopping of reprocessing we are facing many thousands of job losses and I would like to hear the reassurance that this blueprint will help reduce the impact of these job losses?"

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration Councillor Phil Greatorex replied as follows: -

"The Britain's Energy Coast Economic Blueprint represents one of the most important issues to be discussed at full council this year in that it aims to set out the development priorities which, for better or for worse, will impact on Copeland communities for many generations to come.

Supported by our consultants GVA Ltd, the Blueprint has been compiled over a six month period in partnership with representatives from Britain's Energy Coast plus Copeland Borough

Council, Allerdale Borough Council and Cumbria County Council have also been widely consulted. Its goal is to deliver 3000 new knowledge intensive jobs over a decade and double prosperity levels in the area.

As you might expect, the Blueprint centers on maximising the benefits of inward investment from nuclear decommissioning and waste management, new reactor build, low carbon energy technologies plus opportunities in supporting Construction, Arts and Culture, Retail, Professional Services and Agriculture and Forestry Sectors. It also identifies the critical role of the National NL and the Dalton Institute as the innovation engines to support these sectors in a similar way the National Nuclear Labs do in the US, but on the back of substantial Federal Government support.

When this work was first conceived I stated then that I would judge the credibility of what was contained in the document on simply whether or not it clearly articulated the business sectors, the technology platforms and vehicles to deliver the innovation required to maintain our economy and the target markets. Now I know the document aims to identify much more than that, but without a clear line of site of the technologies and pathways for job creation, and that includes jobs for the thousands of skilled labouring classes in Copeland, then issues around infrastructure development, town centre renewal and tackling worklessness all fall away in significance. I am reasonably content the document does go some way to achieving this.

Putting aside questions of whether or not West Cumbria could in fact develop a comparative advantage in low carbon energy technologies and whether the benefits of nuclear new build could be sustained in the long term, I want to focus on the contribution from the £45bn decommissioning programme to transitioning our economy.

Since John Hutton launched the energy Coast Masterplan in 2008, Britain's Energy Coast West Cumbria Board have spent four years procrastinating over the contribution to be made from the decommissioning programme. Consequentially the jobs and prosperity we were promised have not materialised. Over this time the NDA have made no attempt to align the twenty five decommissioning related delivery strategies to the Masterplan.

The key to understanding whether this document carries substance ultimately depends on two factors. Firstly whether the BEC Board can acquire the skills establish a suitable implementation plan and also whether the appetite of the NDA, or more likely the National Audit Office who are currently here reviewing NDA performance, to press for the prioritisation and inclusion of socio economic outcomes in the NDA value framework, that is its decision making framework. As you know I have been pressing for this both here and at Westminster, yet despite the new CEO of the NDA pledging his support for our communities, this fundamental shortcoming remains. Therefore Mr Mayor, I would suggest the council should give only a cautious welcome to the Blueprint and recognise, unless the BEC Board up their game and there is a shift in the NDA position, the document will only at best set us on the path of long term managed economic decline. Mr Mayor, I truly hope I am wrong on this point, but we cannot afford to take the chance and I therefore call upon members from across the chamber to support my call for the NDA to embed socio-economic considerations in to their delivery programmes and give us the transparency and reassurance we seek."

Councillor David Moore asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration: -

“In the answer to my question at Council on March 22nd you said "when it became clear that the Pow Beck Partners had secured access to build the Copeland Community Stadium in time for hosting the 2013 world cup, the Leader had to be coaxed down from cloud 9, the Chief Executive was breathing a huge sigh of relief " which cloud is Leader currently sitting on and when will the portfolio holder give full response to all Councillors on that went wrong and were the blame for this debacle rests. Our community needs to know how we are to go forward from this to provide good sports facilities across the Borough?”

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration Councillor Phil Greatorex replied as follows: -

“I also said, David, on the 22 March that as a Council we did not wish to see senior officers of this Council pull rabbits out of hats no matter how spectacular and if as a Council we continue to lead on product delivery it would have a future to radically improve in areas such as product governance and particularly project risk management and change control now as it happens there was no rabbit and there was no hat.

In accordance with standard management practice we have commenced a project evaluation of the Pow Beck community stadium project and this process is still alive and I can confirm that after negotiation with the minors welfare came to an end our Chief Executive did approach me to seek input to the terms for the evaluation. Now the eternal exercise has identified aspects both in terms of what went well and what could have been done differently the review did not commence until the scoping was complete and in accordance with the scoping and the process the civil partners have now been engaged to offer challenge and develop that learning. The terms for the evaluation will be shared with the scrutiny groups and no doubt the findings will be shared through that particular process. Now I have no interest in assigning blame and this Council has made a considerable effort in moving away from that a blame culture and in doing so ensuring that we do not placate blame and fear and that officers can challenge as necessary and all that is necessary if we are to maintain our high standards of performance. The project evaluation is a very robust process and whilst I understand that the opposition will no doubt want to have some input into this we do have a duty to follow process make the review and base any discussion on the facts rather than the considerable hearsay.

I welcome being able to respond to your second question on the existing delivery and future opportunities of both the Council and community and commercial partners to provide good sports facilities across the borough but will hand over to the portfolio holder for sports and leisure Councillor Branney to answer this question.”

The Portfolio Holder Leisure Culture and Youth Councillor Hugh Branney answered the second question as follows:-

“Member will be aware that we already have a very good package of existing sports facilities throughout the Borough not just provided by the County but in partnership with a whole range

of voluntary and other supporting organisations. Our leisure division has been contracted out as members on the other side will be aware as some sit on the local board. We facilitate partnerships in the north and the south we're looking at proposed developments in Copeland Pool and to support Egremont Pool and our health sports development members, members of the community and our staff are looking at community based provision across the board. I think we have a very good sports provision across Copeland. Our uptake in sport is greater than national average and far greater than the Cumbria average of people who take up a sporting opportunities. I feel confident that we'll continue to build and assist those developments as we go forward but there is a however you'll also be aware that this Council, along with many others, are facing huge financial cut backs all put forward by the coalition Government. It means that all services, not just sports, are under review. This review has not officially commenced but it is likely to have a major impact on all the services that we provide the residents of Copeland. We are looking to save £2 million this year. At one time we had a budget of £14 million that will be reduced at the end of this to £10 million and that's not taking into account other reductions other grant fundings we will be looking now at reducing our budget our overall budget by about 1/3rd. To expect us to keep providing the best is really not going to happen and the impact will be felt across all our communities it's not just sport but in all services."

Councillor Steven Haraldsen asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration: -

"Given that Copeland Borough Council is the accountable public body among the Pow Beck partners and has a duty of care and a responsibility to exercise due diligence, and there is now £1.2 million pounds wasted and no longer available to benefit all the people of Copeland, will the Portfolio Holder commit to a full independent inquiry into the stadium debacle?"

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration Councillor Phil Greatorex replied as follows: -

"Firstly, I need to be clear that the Council has undertaken full due diligence on its management of the £568,000 (2010-12) private sector grant from Energy Coast West Cumbria on the Pow Beck Valley Joint Sports Stadium Development. There was one other pre joint stadium development activity, Pow Beck Valley Stadium re-development, focusing on the Rugby Club stadium, which we acted as accountable body for in 2006-08 which received £50,500 WLR. All procurement, spend and claims have been fully processed and signed off within our governance rules and fully processed and scrutinised by the Britains Energy Coast claims process via their accountable body team. I am unsure how you have reached your figure but am clear that all spend has been undertaken with the necessary due diligence this Council demands.

In terms of the Copeland Public Inquiry I will repeat what I have already stated we will have an independent review element to our project evaluation on this project. It is standard practice within our project management framework to undertake end of project reports and full evaluations as needed. This full project evaluation will adhere to this and offer an independent element for robustness. Again, we are looking at our options on the best way to enable this independent work and associated costs. I am pretty sure that the findings will be made available as it is in the best interest of the public and the Council that we do fully understand what went wrong with the Pow Beck project."

C 12 Executive Report

The Council received and noted the Executive report.

C 13 Nuclear New Build

Arising from the Executive report the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Leadership and Nuclear undertook to write a letter of thanks to NuGen for the work done in order to gain access onto the Mooreside site to commence site investigations.

C 14 Dilapidated Buildings

During consideration of the Executive report Members asked for their thanks to be given to the Building Control Team for all their hard work with regard to dilapidated buildings throughout the Borough

C 15 Wheatsheaf - Egremont

Arising from the Executive report and in response to a question from Councillor Lena Hogg the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Planning and Community Safety undertook to send a written reply updating on the current position with regard to the Wheatsheaf Building at Egremont.

C 16 Economic Blueprint

Arising from the Executive report the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration undertook to request BEC to set up a Task Group to see how they are going to deliver the Blueprint and 3000 jobs into Copeland.

C 17 Designation of Statutory Officers

Consideration was given to the proposed changes to the designation of the S151 officer following the resignation of the Corporate Director, Resources and Transformation.

RESOLVED – That the Head of Corporate Resources be designated Chief Finance officer for the purposes of Section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972, as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report, with immediate effect.

C 18 Treasury Management Out-turn

Consideration was given to the Treasury Management Out-turn for 2011/12

RESOLVED - That

- a. the actual 2011/12 prudential and treasury indicators attached at Appendix A of the report be approved;
- b. the Treasury Management Out-turn 2011/12 detailed in Section 8 of the report be noted;
- c. the make-up of the portfolio of investments as at 31st March 2012 attached at Appendix B of the report be noted; and
- d. it be noted that this report will be formally considered by the Audit Committee on 20th June and delegate authority be given to the committee to approve the out-turn.

C 19 Capital Programme Out-turn

Consideration was given to the provisional Capital out-turn position for the Capital Programme 2011/12.

RESOLVED – that a) the amendments to the budget as detailed in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 of the report be approved;

- b) the virement from the Energy Efficiencies budget under Corporate Resources to North Country Leisure (NCL) budget under Regeneration and Communities as detailed in paragraph 4.3.2, of the report and within the Cliff Stabilisation Works as detailed in paragraph 4.3.4 of the report be approved;
- c) the provisional out turn (subject to audit) as detailed in Table 1 paragraph 3.1 of the report be approved;
- d) the carry forwards of £303,707 as detailed in Table 1 and paragraph 4 of the report be approved;
- e) the financing of the capital programme for 2011/12 as set out in Table 2 paragraph 5.1 of the report be approved;
- f) the addition to the 2012/13 capital programme of £80,000 for Moor Row Playground as detailed in paragraph 6.2 of the report be approved:
- g) the revised budget for 2012/13 of £1,927,356 as detailed in Table 4 paragraph 6.1 of the report be approved.

C 20 Revenue Budget Out-turn

Consideration was given to the provisional Revenue Outturn position for 2011/12

RESOLVED – That

- a) virements of £129,121 from the Choosing to Change budget to service revenue accounts as detailed in paragraph 3.3.2 of the report be approved;

- b) the use of £132,704 from earmarked reserves in accordance with the requirements outlined in paragraph 5.3 of the report, which will increase the approved budget to £14,953,449 be approved;
- c) the re-phasing of the use of earmarked reserves of £1,169,778 to 2012/13 as detailed in paragraph 5.4 of the report be approved;
- d) the proposed spend in 1012/13 for LABGI, as detailed in paragraph 5.5 of the report and Working Neighborhood funds in paragraph 5.6 of the report be approved; and
- e) balances be increased on the budget for 2012/13 to £12,435,720 as set out in paragraph 7 as a result of the approval of the above changes.

C 21 Review of Constitution Recommendations of Constitution Working Group

Consideration was given to recommendation from the Constitution Working Group proposing changes to the Councils constitution and decision making process.

That (a) the proposed changes to executive arrangements arising from the localism bill set out in paragraph 2 of the report, be agreed;

(b) the proposed changes to working groups and panels in Chapter 18 of the constitution be agreed including

- (i) the replacement of Resource Planning Working Group with informally constituted policy groups, set out in paragraph 2; and
- (ii) the changes in the terms of reference for Choosing to Change Board, set out in paragraph;

(c) changes to Chapter 9 (Licensing) set out in Appendix "A" to the report be agreed;

(d) the revised Scheme of Delegations to Officers and Proper Officer designations set out in Appendix "B" to the report be agreed and incorporated into the new version of the Constitution;

(e) the changes to Financial Regulations summarised in Appendix "C" to the report be agreed and incorporated into the new version of the Constitution;

(f) the changes to the remit of Audit Committee and its proposed name change to Audit and Governance Committee, as set out in paragraph 6 of the report, and detailed elsewhere on this Council agenda, be incorporated into the new version of the Constitution.

(g) the changes to Contract Procedure Rules summarised in Appendix "D" of the report be agreed and incorporated into the new version of the Constitution;

(h) the proposed changes to the Choosing to Change Board be agreed as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the report;

(i) the Monitoring Officer and S151 Officer be delegated to finalise the Financial Regulations and Contract Procedure Rules in accordance with the principles in this report and in consultation with the Portfolio holder for Finance.

C 22 Standards – Recommendation from Standards Committee

Consideration was given to recommendations of the Standards Committee on implications of the Localism Act provisions on Members Codes of Conduct and registration and declaration of interests and other associated matters. During consideration of this item and with regard to recommendation (c) recruitment of Independent Persons it was noted that an application had been received from an existing Independent Members of the Standards Committee and Members were asked to confirm this appointment, following clarification that the transitional provisions bringing the relevant provisions of the Act into force provided for former independent Members to be so appointed.

It was noted that regulations specifying the categories of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests under Sections 30 and 31 of the Act had been published on 9 June and Council was recommended to adopt these as part of the Code of Conduct.

RESOLVED - That:

(a) The draft Code of Conduct and defined Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as attached to the report be approved and adopted as the Copeland Borough Council Code of Conduct for Members, with effect from 1 July 2012;

(b) the arrangements for assessment, review and determination of allegations of non-compliance with the Code of Conduct be approved as set out in Appendix “B” be approved, including appointment of 3 Independent Persons;

(c) the arrangements and timetable for recruitment, appointment and remuneration of Independent Persons be approved as set out in paragraph 5.3 and the appointment of Anthony Payne as an Independent Person be confirmed.

(d) the Audit Committee be re-styled the Audit and Governance Committee with amended terms of reference to include the matters referred to in paragraph 6.2; and

(e) the remaining arrangements described in the report relating to the conduct of members be brought into force on 1 July 2012, and that the Standards Committee as presently constituted ceases to exist on that date subject to no further complaints being received.

C 23 Member Development Strategy – Recommendation from Member Development Panel

Consideration was given to a recommendation from the Member Development Panel to approve the revised Member Development Strategy and re-affirm the Council’s continued commitment to training and development for Members.

RESOLVED – That the Member Development Strategy be approved and the Council’s continued commitment to training and development for members be reaffirmed.

C 24 Appointment of Representative to the Police and Crime Commissioners Panel and North Country Leisure

Consideration was given to a Member appointment to the Cumbria Police and Crime Panel.

It was moved by Councillor Elaine Woodburn duly seconded that Councillor Geoff Garrity be appointed to the Panel.

It was further moved by way of amendment by Councillor Alistair Norwood that Councillor Fee Wilson Be appointed to the Panel the amendment was duly seconded and upon being put to a vote it was

RESOLVED – That a) Councillor Geoff Garrity be appointed to the Panel; and

b) the proposed arrangements for further appointments on a Cumbria-wide basis be noted.

In moving the motion Councillor Elaine Woodburn further moved that as Councillor John Jackson be reappointed to North Country Leisure in place of Councillor Steven Haraldsen this was duly seconded and

RESOLVED – that Councillor John Jackson be confirmed as Council’s representative on North Country Leisure.

The meeting closed at 4.45pm

Mayor