

COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 15 DECEMBER 2010

Present: Councillors: M McVeigh (Mayor); D Banks; G Blackwell; J W Bowman; H Branney; Mrs Y R T Clarkson; G Clements; R Cole; P C Connolly; Mrs E Eastwood; G Garrity; Mrs C A Giel; K Hitchen; A Holliday; Mrs J I Hully; A E Jacob; J Kane; T J Knowles; S J Meteer; D W Moore; A D Mossop; A Norwood; J Park; R Salkeld; G Scurrah; W Southward; J G Sunderland; P D Tyson; P Whalley; Mrs C Watson; P Watson; C J Whiteside; Mrs J Williams; N Williams; D A Wilson; E M Woodburn; A Wonnacott; Mrs M B Woodburn; H Wormstrup.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E Brenan; A Carroll; N Clarkson; B A Dixon; Mrs M Docherty; Mrs D A Faichney; F Gleaves; F R Heathcote; J Jackson; Mrs W Metherell; R F Pitt; J Prince

C303 Minutes

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 October 2010 were signed by the Mayor as a correct record subject to Councillors Jackson and Mossop being included in the attendances.

C304 Declarations of Interests

Councillor T Knowles declared a personal interest in question from Mr Seymour due to being the Portfolio holder for Environment at the County Council

Councillor G Sunderland declared a personal interest in Councillor Garrity's question to the Deputy Leader due to being a social housing landlord.

Councillor T Knowles declared a personal interest in the executive report on issues relating to travel concessions due to being the Portfolio Holder for Transport for the Cumbria County Council.

Councillor R Cole declared a personal interest in the executive reports on issues relating to community safety due to being on the police authority.

C305 Mayor's Announcements

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

C306 Petitions

There were no petitions under Procedure Rule 19

C307 Questions from Members of the Public

A question from Mrs L Gilligan was read on her behalf

“Given that the Government is permitting Councils to create income by generating renewable energy and selling it to the grid, what assessment of the energy generating potential has Copeland Borough Council undertaken of the land and buildings in its ownership? If no such assessment has been carried out, what plans are in place to do so in the near future?”

Councillor A Holliday, Portfolio Holder responsible for the Environment replied as follows:

“The Council is currently participating in the Carbon Trust’s 2010/11 Local Authority Carbon Management Programme with the aim of identifying further opportunities to reduce the Council’s own carbon emissions. Although focusing on energy and fuel efficiency, the potential for renewable energy is part of the programme. Initial investigations show that there is the potential for installing solar PV panels on suitable buildings that could generate electricity to sell back to the grid. Our leisure provider North Country Leisure is also undertaking studies into the potential for renewable energy at the sites they manage. The scope for generating income from renewable energy at Council sites will be subject to further detailed investigation and referenced in our Asset Management Plan and Carbon Management Plan which are in development.”

Mrs J Micklethwaite asked the following question of the Leader of the Council:

“Will all the job losses be this year or will some be spread over a number of years, the job losses that will be the consequence of the cuts?”

Councillor E Woodburn, Leader of the Council replied as follows:

“I unfortunately had the opportunity yesterday to attend one of the staff briefings and I know how difficult it was for our corporate leadership team to have to tell our staff yesterday that there would be up to 20 job losses next year due to the coalition budget cuts. Its not a good message to have to give anybody, its a message that I’m sure will be replicated both in Cumbria County Council, at the police authority, hospital and every other public service provider in Copeland and indeed in Cumbria”

Mrs Micklethwaite asked the following supplementary question

“What measures have been taken with regard to reducing the impact of service delivery throughout the borough”

Councillor E Woodburn, Leader of the Council replied as follows:

“We’ve done a lot of work - it would be fair to say that we were working on a budget cut of around 25%. Reality has now shown us that we are probably looking at a 28-29% cut over the next four years which changes us from £3.7 million up to about £4–4.5 million that we have to save as an authority. I don’t think any leader of any authority can stand up and say that there won’t be any impact on public services because that’s what we’re here to provide. What we have done for the next 12 months is to minimise the impact on public services as much as we possibly can but with four years of cuts facing us I think that ultimately there will be cuts in services”.

Mr S Haraldsen asked the following question of the Leader of the Council

“Over the last year how many Freedom of information requests has the Council received, how many were dealt with in the allotted time, how many were late, by how much time were each late in being replied to, how many Freedom of Information requests does Copeland Borough Council currently have awaiting reply and how many of those are out with the allotted time for reply and therefore outstanding.”

The Leader Councillor E Woodburn undertook to provide Mr Haraldsen with a written reply.

Mr S Haraldsen asked the following supplementary question:

“Will copies of the written reply be sent to all Councillors?”

The Leader confirmed that it would.

Mr Seymour asked the following question of the Leader of the Council

“Has Copeland Council made representations to Cumbria County Council’s Budget consultation. If so what? If not will it, If not, why not?”

Councillor E Woodburn, Leader of the Council replied as follows:

“Thank you for that I mentioned to you earlier that like many other people I received an invite to join the web chat and it seems like many other people I couldn’t get through unless I had purposefully been blocked. I read in the paper last night about the County facing a 1.9% cut and in reality I saw that it means the email that they are releasing which means that they are taking a 15.2% cut so they’re like any other authority that they’re having to look to where they’re having to make savings. What I can say is that we have a Leaders’ forum with the County and all other districts where we’ve been very clear saying that the County needs to consider what are possibly the knock on impacts of some of the decisions they are going to make, so obviously if these are reduced hours or even closed down there’s a risk that the extra cost will be falling on us. There could be an increase in fly tipping, and yes we will be making a response to the consultation. You can see that it’s a lengthy document and they are taking difficult decisions but as you rightly say Copeland need to make sure that it’s thoughts are heard and that’s what we will be doing and I would welcome a chat with you with regard to your views on this as well.”

Mr Seymour asked the following supplementary question:

“Has the Council signed an inter authority Agreement with Cumbria County Council?”

The Leader Councillor E Woodburn undertook to provide Mr Seymour with a written reply

C308 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:

Due to the number of questions received under Procedure Rule 13.1, the Mayor exercised his right to not allow supplementary questions at the meeting but did state that questions supplementary to those asked at the meeting could be put to the Chief Executive in writing.

Councillor Whiteside asked the following question of Councillor A Holliday

“Will the portfolio holder please?

1. Make and press release a statement to clarify how this council's responsibilities for parking enforcement differ from and overlap with those of the police, and
2. Arrange for our officers to discuss with the police better arrangements to work together to address problems, and particularly how we can avoid the situation where residents with a problem, such as cars parked blocking their drive, are told when they phone this council that it is a police matter and when they phone the police that it is the Council's responsibility?”

The Portfolio Holder Councillor A Holliday replied as follows:

“Thank you Mr Mayor can I just go through the different responsibilities first as we know them as we know it can be a bit of a grey area but the responsibility for the on and off street parking enforcement under the Traffic Management Act 2004 is Civil Parking Enforcement. We also enforce Double and Single lines and on street parking bays such as Loading, Disabled, Bus, Taxi, Disk parking and Permit parking bays. We also enforce dropped kerbs, obstructing a pedestrian crossing or disabled access within the Town Centres but not residential estates. We also enforce restricted areas outside schools zigzag markings. Enforcement for off street parking on all Council owned car parks are the responsibilities of the local authorities.

The police no longer have powers to issue tickets for particular parking offences which are now decriminalised and have been since the Traffic Management Act 2004.

The Police can, however, still address offences of wilful and unnecessary obstruction on the road or pavement, the blocking of pedestrian/crossing and disabled zigzag lines points, dangerous parking on chevrons at pedestrian crossings etc, parking on school zigzags and issues of double parking or parking too close to a junction. These offences are subject to an immediate fine and do not come under the remit of Civil Enforcement Officers.

As you can see it is a grey area but what we are trying to do is give extra training to Copeland Direct, so that they are able to direct residents to the correct organisation if it is a matter that we are unable to deal with. Regular meetings are to be set up with the local Community police teams to look to have a clear understanding of what both organisations undertake with regards to parking. We will be updating the webpage

outlining what the police and Civil enforcement officers are responsible for when undertaking parking duties. We understand that parking has become a problem in Bransty as a result of the Blen Cathra House now being occupied, and we will be happy to take this matter up with Cumbria County Council to try and alleviate these particular problems. It is complicated and I understand the concerns of the residents but the main thing now is to get the proper training so that we can direct the general public to the right areas."

Councillor G Garrity for the Deputy Leader

"Could the Deputy Leader and housing portfolio tell Council how many people in Copeland are going to be affected by the Government's changes in housing benefit please?"

The Deputy Leader Councillor G Clements replied as follows:

"Thank you Mr Mayor. We as a Council have looked at the tax implications for the proposed housing benefit changes and there are quite a few. I'll run through the savings made: there will be an increase in the age threshold for the Shared Room Rate in Housing Benefit from the age of 25 to 35 from April 2012. This will affect single people and couples with no children under the age of 35 who live alone. They will only be entitled to a certain amount of housing benefit whether they live in a bedsit or a two or three bedroom house. Currently that rate is £58.50 per week. There are quite a number of residents in Copeland between the ages of 25 and 35 that now qualify for £80.55 per week housing allowance that will be reduced to £58.50 per week. The local housing rate is restricted to four bedrooms maximum, families who require five or more bedrooms due to the household size will have their local housing allowance rate restricted to a four bedroom rate and that is going to impact on Copeland.

The £15 excess is removed -At the moment customers can receive up to £15 more than their rental charge in relation to the local housing allowance rate. For example if the rent charged is £70 and the local housing allowance rate for that household is £90 the customer could be awarded the maximum of £85 per week under the current rules. From April next year the £15 excess will be removed - again it will impact on quite a number of properties in Copeland.

The maximum local housing allowance: there will be a new and upper limit for each housing allowance property size with the upper limit set at £250 for a one bedroom property, £290 for a two bedroom property, £340 per week for a three bedroom property and £400 per week for a four bedroom property. This possibly could impact on Copeland residents. At this moment in time it would not be a big impact because our rents haven't reached those levels yet.

The increase to non dependant reductions: Staged increases to non dependant deductions will be introduced with the initial increase likely to be around 30%. This could lead to older children being asked to leave the family home and find their own accommodation and more rent arrears due to the higher increases.

Changes in the way local housing allowance is set: Local housing allowance rates will be based on 30 percentile to market rents which could lead to less properties being

available to benefit customers. At the moment the local authority rate is set by gathering information in each area and taking the medium rent as the local housing authority rate.

The changes that will come into operation in 2013/14: Local authority housing allowance rates uprated in line with CPI rates will be updated annually using CPI rather than RPI. Between 1991 and 2009 rates have increased by 2.75% per annum above CPI which again could impact on properties available to benefit customers.

Cuts in housing benefit for job seeker customers: Housing benefit will be reduced by 10% for customers who have been in receipt of job seekers allowance for 12 months or more until they return to work and for this to be applied net would mean an average reduction of £11.20 for private tenants.

Limited housing benefit from social sector to size sector - Housing benefit will be awarded based on the size of the property and customer needs in the same way as local housing allowance. This is likely to increase the number of larger properties available but increase demand on smaller properties. This could also impact on the demands on the transfer market.

The amount of people on housing benefit: As from last week this was 6600 out of the 70,000 we have in Copeland. The issues I have highlighted will have a big impact in Copeland. I don't like quoting from the Conservatives but the Lord Mayor of London did say "social cleansing" and this does come into mind when we look at all the cuts in the benefits in this country. We will be fighting to help as many of the people as possible to get over the cuts in this area. Thank you Mr Mayor"

Councillor J Kane to the Portfolio Holder for Cultural Services

"Thank you Mr Mayor I read recently that the very successful schools sports partnership is to be finished at the end of this school term. Could the portfolio holder tell us why this partnership is stopping and is there anything we can do to help keep this going and is there any other impact on any other sporting provision in Copeland?"

Councillor H Branney, Portfolio Holder for Cultural Services replied as follows:

"Thank you. There's a very short answer: the Coalition Government has pumped the funding, however you're right in saying it has been very effective at getting young people into sport and physical activity. We know that obese young people grow up to be obese adults and this impacts on their lives accordingly, leading to shorter lives, poorer life expectancy as well as diabetes and amputations and all that from poor physical activities and these are lessons that should be learned early on in life.

I can give you some numbers. The initiative has shown 58% of people accessed 3 hours of Physical Education in participating schools, which is 9% above the national average, something that we should be really proud of in this area. Funding for the initiative came from the Youth Sport Trust who have had notification the funding is being withdrawn so you are right it is finishing. However, we understand the coalition Government are undertaking an urgent review of this proposal and we await the outcome with interest. So we think that there may be another U turn on the way.

Our officers are in discussion with the Schools Sports Partnership to determine the help and support that can be provided by the Council and we hope the participating schools will retain their enthusiasm. To date it should be noted there are 39 primary link teachers supporting the work in schools and without their help success would have been impossible. I have no doubt I will be reporting back to Council once officers and Government have concluded their review.”

Councillor D Banks to the Portfolio Holder for Development Strategy

“Could the portfolio holder inform Council about the coalition’s thinking on business rates remaining with local authorities? What does the Portfolio holder think the chances are of new businesses starting up in Copeland when our economy is based on public sector jobs, social workers, Council workers, teachers, carers, dinner ladies, the police. 50.35% of our working population is public sector and is predicted to be the worst hit in the country by the cuts? What is our economic future? “

Councillor C Giel, Portfolio Holder for Development Strategy replied as follows:

“Thank you Mr Mayor. In a word bleak, I think, but that’s not the response you’re looking for.

The Local Growth White Paper, which I think is the first part of your question which referred to the business rates remaining with local authorities, was published in October and it recognises that whilst local authorities have a vital role to play in supporting the local economy, there is limited direct fiscal incentive to do so. The non-domestic rates revenue collected by local authorities is pooled for redistribution.

The White Paper argues that the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive was too bureaucratic, opaque and unfair and what is needed is a transparent, understandable and predictable set of incentives.

The Coalition Agreement called for the development of a Business Increase Bonus to reward those authorities where growth in business rates exceeds a threshold, by allowing them to keep the increase up to a certain level for a period of six years. Where there is additional growth in future years, the local authority would retain this as well.

The White Paper reports that work on decentralisation and the spending review has resulted in the Government looking at other options, including the retaining of business rate revenues. The Government believes that this would be a greater incentive to foster growth and would be more predictable.

The Coalition Agreement sets out plans for a review of Local Government finance and local business rate retention that will be launched in January. The White Paper states that the review will be “a significant opportunity to consider a range of options to provide genuine incentives for local economic growth. I’ll give you some statistics: 50% of our jobs are in the public sector and with the public sector cuts that we’re just receiving it’s hard to see where there will be any growth. We don’t know what levels are being set and we don’t know what the thresholds are so it’s very hard to predict how this will pan out and I suspect that we need to wait for the outcome of the consultation. We really need more information on this before we can predict how it will go for the Borough.”

Councillor Y R T Clarkson asked the Leader of the Council on behalf of Councillor N Clarkson:

“Under the Leader and Cabinet responsibility, and considering the amount of tax payer money at risk, would the Leader agree that the ultimate responsibility to monitor the financial state of the WRLFC lay with the Executive, particularly since this course of action was advised by the former Section 151 Officer. According to the Report tabled at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting this did not happen.

Can you kindly inform me why this advised course of action was not followed?”

Councillor E Woodburn, Leader of the Council replied as follows:

“I’m not quite clear or understand the reason why this question is being asked because I am lead to believe that it has already been asked at the Special OSC meeting who were tasked to look at this topic. I will correct the statement that the course of action wasn’t advised by the former S151 officer, that the financial state of the rugby lay with the Executive so the question has been slightly twisted there.

The report of the Chief Executive dated 22 November 2010 accepted that as part of his investigation he had found systems and processes which had not worked and he undertook to address those issues.

What is clear, from the report, is that the administrative procedures for supporting Members of the Executive were not properly followed in this instance.”

Councillor Y R T Clarkson asked the Portfolio Holder for Development Strategy:

“Does the situation to which they now find themselves impact on the sustainability of the proposed Powe Beck Project”

The Portfolio Holder Development Strategy Councillor C Giel replied as follows:

“In a nutshell no, the club coming out of administration and going into new ownership has released the new owners from the legacy debt which was crippling the previous owners. It will actually give the Pow Beck Community Sports Stadium a more sustainable business case rather than impact on it in a negative way and the club has been in and out of administration and is now in new ownership. The new owners are committed to the Pow Beck Sports Village concept and to Pow Beck Community Sports Stadium and they are on the special purpose vehicle and are pro actively working with their parent body which is the WRFL. They are committed and they are the power behind it. They are proactively involved with the SPV as well so we’re in a better position as a local authority and they are in a better position as a club.”

Councillor K Hitchen asked the Leader of the Council:

“Does the Leader agree with me that the time has come to implement Equality and Fairness of taxation on the residents of Copeland?”

Does the Leader also agree with me that this could be achieved by applying Special Expenses on the unparished areas of Copeland?

In the spirit of Equality, Fairness and Transparency will the Leader ensure that in the budgeting process this year that Special Expenses are applied to the unparished areas of Copeland?"

Councillor E Woodburn, Leader of the Council replied as follows:

"Thank you Councillor Hitchen, can I just clarify that Copeland Borough Council claims the same amount of Council Tax depending on the banding of your property whether you are in Millom, Whitehaven or Egremont. When we talk about the additional amounts that some areas pay these are served by the Parish and Town Councils through their precepts, so it is not Copeland Borough Council charging different amounts for different things.

I also want to clarify that that I don't think applying special expenses to the unparished areas would be the answer. When we had this discussion at the resource planning working group there was a lot of debate about it and a lot of understanding needed to see that if we did this to the unparished areas then there would be a knock on to the parished areas which would have to be looked at and taken into consideration.

The Resources Planning Working Group considered a comprehensive report from the then Head of Finance and MIS in January 2010. The minutes of that meeting shows that it was decided not to pursue Special Expenses "at this time" but that it "would be necessary to continue to identify which additional services are provided in Whitehaven over the parished parts of the Borough". There is therefore a commitment from the Resources Planning Working Group not to completely dismiss the concept of charging for Special Expenses. However, in view of the complexity of calculations which will be involved it will not be possible to apply Special Expenses to the unparished areas of Copeland in time for the 2011-12 budget. The Resource Planning Working Group will be asked if they wish to consider Special Expenses for financial year 2012/13."

Councillor A W M Norwood asked the Leader of the Council:

"Contained in the report which the Chief Executive submitted on the Whitehaven Rugby League to overview and scrutiny there were answers to my questions concerning the moneys held by the WCDF. In his answers Tim Hirst outlines that the WCDF is holding £355, 470 which was given by BNFL to build a new stadium and regenerate Pow Beck. It was a condition of this money that if not used by the end of this year it could be reallocated as long as the money was used on West Cumbrian economic regeneration. As Copeland is one of the two bodies required to approve the spending of the money who in the Council will make the decision on how to spend the money and how will the decision be reported?

How will the spending of the money align to Copeland's priority?

Will scrutiny be able to review this decision?

When will any decision be made?

Can we be assured that none of this money or any of Copeland's other funds will be used to help with the funding of the running of the Club when it comes out of administration?"

Councillor C Giel, Portfolio Holder Development Strategy replied as follows:

Thank you Councillor Norwood.

The answer to question one - who in the Council will make the decision on how to spend the money and how will the decision be reported?

The decision on spending the remaining balance will be made by the Council's Executive and will be subject to scrutiny in the usual way. But I must emphasise that any decisions taken must be supported and approved by Britain's Energy Coast and that has been the case with any spend against that £500,000.

Your second question, how will the spending of the money align to Copeland's priority?

All Executive decisions are required to be in accordance with the policy framework set by the Council.

Question three, when will any decisions be made?

West Cumbria Development Board is to meet tomorrow afternoon and there is a paper going which is outlining a plan for the spend of that money. Britain's Energy Coast Board will follow that and a paper on Pow Beck Community Stadium will be going forward and the outcome from the two boards will inform how that money will be spent.

Question four, can we be assured that none of this money or any of Copeland's other funds will be used to help with the funding of the running of the Club when it comes out of administration?

Yes this assurance can be given."

Councillor D Moore asked the Leader of the Council:

Item 1

£100,000 was released in May 2009 "to progress the development of a joint stadium to be shared by Whitehaven Rugby League FC and Whitehaven Amateurs Football Club. Agreement in principle has now been reached with both clubs to form a Special Purpose Vehicle to develop the new stadium".

Item 2

£44,530 was released in June 2010 "to be used by Whitehaven Rugby League FC for essential activities required for the transition to a Special Purpose Vehicle and the new stadium".

Questions

- (1) Who in the council authorised the draw down of these monies?
- (2) Who was consulted on this decision?
- (3) Is there an audit trail available?
- (4) Are there accounts available to verify all £100,000 spend?
- (5) What is 'Special Purpose Vehicle'?"

Councillor E Woodburn Leader of the Council replied as follows:

“Thank you Mr Mayor.

Item 1

- 1 An urgent action was made on 28 May 2009 for £80,445, ie is £62,445 to Whitehaven Amateur Football Club and £18,000 to WRLFC, spend from the BNFL allocation for Pow Beck Valley development. This urgent action was then reported to the Executive on 30 June 2009.
- 2 Consultation on this decision was led by the Director of Development, Acting Chief Executive at the time, with the Leader, Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Britain's Energy Coast. The Pow Beck partners were part of the discussion on development requirements.
- 3 An audit trail is available – all urgent action spend in 2009/10.
- 4 There are accounts available for the full £100,000 spend, which includes legal support to develop the sports valley and partnership special purpose vehicle. There is still an underspend of £8,089 which is allocated for the cost of the eventual setting up of the legal company as the Multi Sports Stadium special purpose vehicle when all the partners are ready and authorised to formally commit.
- 5 Whitehaven Multi-Sports Stadium Ltd was incorporated on 15 June 2009 as a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) with the objective of bringing forward the delivery of a new shared Stadium at Pow Beck Valley.
The Partners involved in the SPV are Copeland Borough Council, West Lakes Renaissance Ltd, Whitehaven Amateur Football Club and Whitehaven Rugby Football League Club Ltd with the intention that each Partner would own 25% of the shareholding. In view of the impending demise of the North West Development Agency and therefore West Lakes Renaissance Ltd it has not been possible to complete the formalities of the SPV which will now be subject to further deliberations between the current Partners and successor bodies.

Item 2

1. Who in the council authorised the draw down of these monies?
The Director of Development.
2. Who was consulted on this decision?
Consultation took place with the Leader , Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Programme Director and Chair of Britain's Energy Coast
3. Is there a audit trail available?
4. Are there accounts available to verify all £44.530 spend ?

Payments were made against a number of cost headings which were verified on behalf of the Council by the delegated project manager. Invoices or other evidence to substantiate the spend are held by the Administrators of the former WRLFC.”

Due to the time limit on asking questions being reached and in accordance with standing order 13.8 it was

RESOLVED – that a) answers to the remaining questions be given in writing to the Members concerned within 5 days (which shall be circulated to all Members); and

b) any supplementary questions to those already answered at this meeting be submitted to the Chief Executive for a written response.

C309 Executive Report

The Council received and noted the Executive report.

C310 Choosing to Change

The Council considered a progress report on the Choosing to Change initiative.

RESOLVED – that the Council notes the report

C311 Urgent Business – Nuclear New Build Procurement of Consultants Support

RESOLVED – That the decision made on grounds of urgency in

a) agreeing that the Council acts as accountable body for £350,000 of external funding from British Energy Coat with this funding used to procure planning consultants to carry out spatial and economic Impact studies; and

b) authority being delegated for the selection of the Ad Hoc list of consultants and acceptance of tender to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the relevant Portfolio Holder, be noted.

C312 Taxi Licensing

Arising from the Executive report the Portfolio Holder for Health, Legal & Democratic Renewal and Chairman of Licensing Panel undertook to provide a written reply to Councillor Meteer's question as to whether the Council had any plans to extend the accessibility criteria to private hire vehicles and if there were any proposals to encourage them to do so.

C313 Community Safety

Arising from the Executive report the Portfolio Holder Health, Legal & Democratic Renewal undertook to provide a written response to Councillor A Norwood's question as to what is Copeland doing with regard to domestic abuse and whether we have a refuge and if not are there any plans to have one.

C314 Recommendation of the Constitution Working Group

Consideration was given to recommendations from the Constitution Working Group to Council to approve the amended Financial Regulations and three minor amendments to the Rules of the Councils Contract Standing Orders.

RESOLVED – That a) subject to the reworking of A.10 to “Planning, Conservation and Licensing are not executive functions but are exercised through the Planning Panel, the Taxi and General Licensing Panel and Licensing Committee” the amended Financial Regulations be approved and adopted;

b) Reference to the Democratic Services Manager in Rule 11 of the Contract procedure Rules be either deleted or where appropriate replaced by reference to the s.151 Officer or their representative.

C315 Executive Arrangements

Consideration was given to a report detailing the requirement of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 that the Council choose a new form of executive arrangements and provides that a decision must be made by 31 December 2010.

During consideration of this item Councillor Whiteside moved and the motion was duly seconded that

“a) for the purposes of the 2007 Act, this Council will adopt the Leader and Cabinet model, but

b) this decision be revisited within three months of the forthcoming Local Government Act, or any other legislation giving local authorities more choice of Governance arrangements, receiving Royal assent, and

c) at that time there should be extensive discussions and debate with local residents about the best structure for Copeland, culminating in a local referendum.”

Following the Motion an amendment was moved by Councillor G Clements duly seconded that the Council adopt the Leader and Cabinet model with effect from the third day after the May 2011 election. Upon the amendment being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED – That The Council adopt the Leader and Cabinet Model with effect from the third day after the May 2011 election.

C316 Community Governance Review – Drigg and Carlton and Irton with Santon

Consideration was given to a report of the Parish Review Working Party on a Community Governance Review of parts of Drigg and Carlton and Irton with Santon.

RESOLVED – that that Council approves the reorganisation order.

C317 Community Governance Review – St Bees

Consideration was given to a report of the Parish Review Working Party on a Community Governance Review of St Bees

RESOLVED – that that Council approves the reorganisation order.

The meeting closed at 6.40pm

Mayor