

**Local Government Act 1972**

**Borough of North Tyneside**

**29 November 2012**

At the meeting of the Council of the Borough of North Tyneside duly convened and held on Thursday 29 November 2012 in The Chamber at Quadrant at which a quorum of Members were present, that is to say: -

**Present**

Councillor F Lott (In the Chair)

Mrs L Arkley (Elected Mayor)

Councillor J M Allan	Councillor C Johnson
Councillor A Arkle	Councillor D Lilly
Councillor A Austin	Councillor G Madden
Councillor K Barrie	Councillor M Madden
Councillor G Bell	Councillor P Mason
Councillor B Burdis	Councillor D McGarr
Councillor W Caithness	Councillor Mrs P McIntyre
Councillor K A Conroy	Councillor J McLaughlin
Councillor D Corkey	Councillor A McMullen
Councillor A Cowie	Councillor L J Miller
Councillor S Cox	Councillor Mrs S E Mortimer
Councillor L Darke	Councillor T Mulvenna
Councillor C Davis	Councillor P Oliver
Councillor M Finlay	Councillor D Ord
Councillor C A Gambling	Councillor J O'Shea
Councillor R Glindon	Councillor C B Pickard
Councillor S Graham	Councillor J Pickard
Councillor M A Green	Councillor M G Rankin
Councillor J L L Harrison	Councillor N Redfearn
Councillor S Hill	Councillor D Sarin
Councillor E Hodson	Councillor L A Spillard
Councillor Janet Hunter	Councillor J J Stirling
Councillor John Hunter	Councillor A Waggott-Fairley
Councillor M Huscroft	Councillor J Walker
Councillor M J Huscroft	Councillor Mrs J A Wallace
Councillor NJ Huscroft	Councillor G Westwater

**C93/11/12 Public Questions**

The Chair announced that a combined response would be provided for Questions 1 and 2:

**(1) The following question was asked by Mrs J Reay of Wellfield:**

‘Will North Tyneside become two tier for the coastal schools in the next few years?’

**(2) The following question was asked by Ms D Eardley of Whitley Bay:**

“Please can I ask if the coastal schools will move to a two tier system?”

Councillor D Lilly replied as follows:

‘There are no plans currently to move to a two tier system in North Tyneside.’

Mrs Reay asked the following supplementary question:

“Is there a time scale for this, for example within the next 5 years, or not at all?”

Councillor D Lilly replied as follows:

‘There are currently no plans to change the education system in Whitley Bay.’

**(3) The following question was asked by Mr J Philip of Forest Hall:**

“I would like to ask the Mayor why there are large increases planned for Bowling Club rents in the future years.

I understand that the planned rates are, for the year \*2013 £1200, for the year 2014, £1900, and for 2015, £2500. Bowling clubs are very important to the elderly, as they provide us with a social life, and more important they provide us with exercise. I understand that savings have to be made following the drastic cuts made by the Government, but I believe that an increase of rates up to £1200 would be sufficient and manageable to most clubs.”

\*Mr Philip clarified that his question related to the year 2012 rather than 2013 as stated.

Councillor G Westwater replied on behalf of the Elected Mayor as follows:

‘Thank you for raising this matter and giving me an opportunity to clarify the position regarding future charges.

The charge applied for the seasonal use of a bowling green this year was £1200 which was paid by the Club or Clubs who used the green as their home venue for match play and recreational use.

Whilst officers have been in discussion with Bowling Club Secretaries regarding the potential level of fees for future years, no decision has been taken.

What I can confirm is that officers from Cultural Services will continue to engage with representatives of the bowling community and their views on the issue of fees and charges will be taken into consideration, in setting the level for future years.

Thank you.'

**(4) The following question was asked by Mr K Page of Holystone:**

"Could the Mayor please explain to us, the residents, the role and remit of the Chief Executive of North Tyneside Council?"

The Elected Mayor replied as follows:

'The job description for the Chief Executive is published on the Council's Web Site and ensures the efficient running of the day to day services.'

Mr Page asked the following supplementary question:

"The post attracts a large salary and the duties are demanding and time-consuming. Is it therefore appropriate for the Chief Executive to spend his time sending letters and emails to residents threatening legal action including one for raising a moral question into the public domain?"

The Elected Mayor as follows:

'I don't think this is relevant to the question. I have already pointed out his role and remit.'

The Chair requested the Mayor to provide a full written response to the supplementary question to Mr Page and to all Members of the Council.

**(5) The following question was asked by Mr A Furness of Whitley Bay:**

"How much expenditure has North Tyneside Council, and therefore the Council Tax payers, incurred in planning appeal costs since May 2009 and how many appeal cases did this involve?"

Councillor G Westwater replied as follows:

'In total the sum of £379,365 has been accrued to date in relation to 16 separate appeal cases.

Further estimated costs relating to appeals which have yet to be determined amount to £868,586.'

Mr Furness asked the following supplementary question:

"Given the scale of the costs, why do Council Taxpayers have to pay these appeals costs instead of individual Councillors who have rejected planning applications against professional officers' advice and rendered the Council liable for costs, as I believe Councillors used to be liable for those costs?"

Councillor G Westwater replied as follows:

'Surcharging was scrapped by John Prescott in 2002, so now unfortunately the consequences of the ill founded decisions by the Planning Committee's costs now fall upon the Borough's taxpayers'.

**(6) The following question was asked by Mrs K Steven of Whitley Bay:**

"Why are we being charged for the emptying of our garden waste bins just because some people complained they don't have gardens? Perhaps you could let us know our new charge for next year's council tax minus the education budget which we have never needed."

(We have never had children, but wonder how much we have contributed to other people's children's education during our life time, having lived in the Whitley Bay area all our lives? Where does this end? If all residents nit pick the services they use and the services they don't, we would all be in a confused state, including yourselves. We feel we pay enough for council services without the addition of this charge. Our education was paid for by our parents through the old rates system.)

Councillor E Hodson replied as follows:

'Mrs. Steven's question has two parts, the one concerning the needs for a charge for the collection of garden waste and the other concerning the need to pay the full Council Tax where a resident has no requirement for children's education.

I shall deal with the second matter first.

The Council Tax is a community tax which reflects our inter dependence on each other within the community. Even if you have no children of your own in the education system other peoples' children become educated and get jobs in which they will pay tax that will be used to provide services that we all need. Some of the children will grow up to become nurses and doctors and provide health care for the sick. Others will become policemen and firemen and provide discipline and help in emergencies. Others will become care workers to provide invaluable help for the elderly and the incapacitated. We all have a self interest in the education of children whether they are ours or not. We are a community and we all need each other. None of us are isolated or independent.

Concerning the charge for garden waste. The reason for the charge is that the Council no longer has sufficient money to supply this service free of charge.

This administration introduced the brown waste system in order to remove garden waste from landfill which attracts a tax of £64 per ton and when it decays it produces damaging methane gases. Colleting and composting garden waste avoids the taxes, produces less damaging pollution and the compost benefits farming.

The garden waste collection scheme has proved very popular with residents so that rather than terminate it we are offering it to householders at a charge of £20.00 per year or approximately £1.00 per collection. This is not compulsory but we hope that householders with significant amounts of garden waste will continue to use the service. Where householders have small amounts of garden waste they may like to share a bin and its cost or they may wish to compost their own garden waste.

Other residents with very small amounts of garden waste may think it best to use the green bin waste collection service. I hope that only those with a very small requirement will use the green bin system for the disposal of garden waste for the reasons I explained before.

Mrs Steven will have heard of the draconian actions of neighbouring Councils as they attempt to cope with the reduced funding from Government. The Mayor and Cabinet of North Tyneside are exerting every sinew to avoid passing the worst financial pressures on to our residents and the garden waste charge needs to be seen against that background.'

**(7) The following question was asked by Mr F Austin of Whitley Bay:**

"Could the Mayor inform me how many affordable homes have been lost to North Tyneside since May 2011 as the result of the refusal of planning permission by North Tyneside Council's Planning Committee?"

Councillor G Westwater replied on behalf of the Elected Mayor as follows:

'Since May 2011 North Tyneside Council's Planning Committee have refused planning permission for five planning applications that included the provision of 143 affordable homes and additionally £8.5million in contributions to affordable housing provision elsewhere in North Tyneside.'

**(8) The following question was asked by Ms J Speed of Benton:**

"Could the Mayor inform me how many affordable homes have been approved in North Tyneside since May 2011 as the result of planning permission granted by North Tyneside Council's Planning Committee?"

Councillor G Westwater replied on behalf of the Elected Mayor as follows:

'Since May 2011 North Tyneside Council's Planning Committee have granted planning permission for eleven planning applications that included the provision of 161 affordable homes and additionally £213,000 in contributions to affordable housing provision elsewhere in North Tyneside.'

**(9) The following question was asked by Mr R Riley of Wallsend:**

"The Council Review of In-house LD Short Break Services (August 2012) indicated a range of future alternatives: Shared Lives, hotels, home-based carers, holidays and assistive technology. The report concluded that 27% of the current service users in the profound and severe categories would continue to need accommodation based provision in a 4-5 bedded unit. In connection with the launch by the Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation NHS Trust of its Carer's Charter does the Council now recognise the fundamental difference between a Respite Service for Carers and Short Break provision for service users, and can the Council confirm that an impact analysis has been undertaken to verify that such a unit will be adequate for emergency support as well as anticipated future usage and that there will be no interruption in the service during the modernisation process?"

Councillor L Miller replied as follows:

‘Thank you for the question on learning disability services. Firstly, I must point out that the Council review of the In-House Learning Disability Service is not yet complete and the Council is currently in the process of consulting with users and carers of the service.

However, I can assure you that the Council does recognise the difference between planned respite services for Carers and short break provision for Service Users and the main focus of the current provision has been around respite services for Carers. However, there will be situations where there is the need for temporary accommodation provision for Service Users.

North Tyneside has developed its own Carers Strategy and Carers Charter that recognise the role that Carers play and the need for appropriate support for Carers to enable them to be able to continue to do this.

On behalf of the Elected Mayor I opened a launch event this morning for the Carers Charter at the Saville Exchange. This Charter builds on the work of the North Tyneside Adult Carers Strategy which the Elected Mayor launched in June of this year.

At this stage all I can say is that we are looking at the options about how this service can be delivered in the future. A key part of this is the completion of an equality impact assessment so we can fully understand the impacts of any proposed changes on individuals.

However as I mentioned earlier, we will have to wait until the review is complete to finalise the next steps.’

**(10) The following question was asked by Ms M Howells of Tynemouth:**

“Provision of allotments by local government is a statutory requirement. As such, should staffing costs of managing sites be borne by the council tax payer? Or, as is currently proposed, should allotment holders bear this cost?”

Councillor G Westwater replied as follows:

‘Provision of allotments by local government is a statutory service, and I am pleased that we have managed to make sure almost all of our plots are in proper use and year on year the Council has added additional plots.

In terms of cost the fees paid by allotment holders only make a partial contribution to the provision of the service.

The Council has recently reviewed its allotment strategy, making sure those fees are fairer and related to the size of the plot.

At this stage there are no plans to raise fee levels to the point where allotment holders’ fees pay the full cost of the service.’

**C94/11/12 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Brooks, E N Darke, S Day, I Grayson, J Munby, A Normand and K Osborne.

## **C95/11/12 Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were made:

### Item 7: Urgent Motion

Mr G Haywood, Chief Executive – registerable personal interest (disclosable pecuniary interest) – directly affected by the contract for services.

### Item 7: Motion 5

Councillor A Austin – non-registerable personal interest – son currently a student at a local university and pays tuition fees.

### Item 9: Local Council Tax Support

Councillor D Ord – non-registerable personal interest – receives full council tax benefit.

## **C96/11/12 Minutes**

**Resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2012 be taken as read and confirmed and signed by the Chair.

## **C97/11/12 Chair's Remarks**

The Chair made the following remarks:

Councillor J Munby had asked him to convey to all Members of the Council the reason for her absence from meetings of full Council due to a medical condition triggered by the type of lighting in the Council Chamber. She had also expressed her thanks to Council officers who were attempting to resolve this issue.

This would be the last meeting of full Council attended by Ken Wilson, Head of Regeneration, Development and Regulatory Services before he retired from the Council. On behalf of the Council, the Chair thanked him for all of his work and services to the Council.

The Chair welcomed the return of Councillor Michael Huscroft following his election to the Council at the By-Election held in Wallsend Ward on 15 November 2012.

He also advised Council that Councillor Janet Hunter's daughter, Sarah Hunter, had captained the England Women's Rugby Team yesterday in their victory against the New Zealand All Blacks Women's team, and conveyed the Council's congratulations to her.

## **C98/11/12 Petition – Withdrawal of direct bus links from the Marden Estate to Rake Lane Hospital**

The Chair announced that, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, a request had been received to present a petition on 'Withdrawal of direct bus links from the Marden

Estate Rake Lane Hospital' to full Council. The petition was simply being presented to Council as it did not contain the required number of signatures to trigger a debate by the Council.

Councillor G Westwater presented the Petition on behalf of the petitioners. The Petition, containing 597 signatures, was set out in the agenda in the following terms:

'The withdrawal of the only bus service from the Marden Estate area of Cullercoats to North Tyneside General Hospital, Rake Lane is very concerning and deeply disappointing for local residents.

This change has left the elderly and vulnerable residents who rely on public transport unable to have a direct link to the hospital in order to attend appointments/consultations or visit family/friends.

The residents of the Marden courteously ask that Nexus, the private bus companies and North Tyneside Council to consult properly with them and to listen to residents' concerns with the view to reinstate the direct bus service.'

The Council agreed to receive and note the petition.

#### **C99/11/12 Petition – Parking control around the Triangular Green of Tynemouth**

The Chair announced that, in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme, a request had been received to present a petition on 'Parking control around the Triangular Green area of Tynemouth' to full Council. The petition was simply being presented to Council as it did not contain the required number of signatures to trigger a debate by the Council.

Councillor J McLaughlin presented the Petition on behalf of the petitioners. The Petition, containing 218 signatures, was set out in the agenda in the following terms:

'As Residents of Percy Park, Tynemouth, we need parking permits, including Seafeld View, Percy Park Road. We must be one of the only terraced streets in Tynemouth without parking permits. We cannot park outside our houses as visitors take our spaces. This can only get worse come summer and sunny days. Giving parking permits to residents in the village centre has made things even worse for us. Now everyone parks on our street. Where are we meant to go?'

The Council agreed to receive and note the petition.

#### **C100/11/12 Exclusion Resolution - urgent motion**

The Chair requested a Member to move the Exclusion Resolution in respect of the next item – the Urgent Motion.

It was moved by Councillor J Allan and seconded by Councillor J O'Shea that:

"Council do not agree to pass the exclusion resolution in relation to the Urgent Motion".



In considering this procedural motion, Members were advised that they should consider whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was approved by 34 votes to 16 votes.

### **C101/11/12 Urgent Motion**

[The Chief Executive withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the discussion of this item.]

The Chair announced that under Council Procedure Rule 11(2), he had accepted an urgent motion, signed by Councillors J Allan, N Redfearn, L Spillard, C Gambling, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna, for consideration at this meeting for the following reasons:

"The matter relates to an issue previously considered by Cabinet, the next meeting of Council is not until 24 January 2013, and two months' worth of savings could therefore be lost to the Council if the matter is not debated."

It was moved by Councillor J Allan and seconded by Councillor J'O Shea that:

'This council notes that Cabinet at their special meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> November has set out in their draft budget proposals that a saving be made from the end of the current Interim Chief Executive's contract on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013. As a consequence the Cabinet are proposing a Budget saving of at least six months salary by not replacing the position. Therefore Council would suggest that Cabinet look at the current situation and consider that if they do not need a Chief Executive after 31<sup>st</sup> May for at least six months, then why does the Council need a Chief Executive from now until 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013. Council would recommend to Cabinet that they terminate early the current contract of the Chief Executive, which would help with a saving for this year's budget which is showing a projected overspend of £1.9 million.'

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was approved by 40 votes to 13 votes.

### **C102/11/12 Motions**

- (i) **A Motion with notice, signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, T Mulvenna, N Redfearn and J O'Shea was submitted for consideration by Council**

It was moved by Councillor J Allan and seconded by Councillor J O'Shea that:

'This Council requests that the Council's Monitoring Officer looks to determine whether the distribution of " the Widening Horizons December Issue" during an election period in November, across the borough was in accord with the Council's protocols and guidance on the use of council resources during any election period. A report on the conclusions be presented to a future Council Meeting.'

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was unanimously agreed.

**(ii) A Motion with notice, signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, T Mulvenna, N Redfearn and J O'Shea was submitted for consideration by Council**

It was moved by Councillor G Madden and seconded by Councillor S Graham that:

'This Council expresses its dissatisfaction at the cancellation of the PSA event at Wallsend Town Hall on 16 October and the attempt to cancel a subsequent meeting of the Labour Party, apparently based upon a community lettings policy of North Tyneside Council, because they were classified as being political.

Council therefore requests that the Chief Executive considers the implications and operation of any such policy, and reviews the two matters referred to above, and reports back to a future Council meeting, on

- i) the existence of such a community lettings policy
- ii) the availability of the policy to elected members, council staff, and members of the public
- iii) his review of the two matters referred to.'

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was unanimously agreed.

**(iii) A Motion with notice, signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, T Mulvenna, N Redfearn and J O'Shea was submitted for consideration by Council**

It was moved by Councillor N Redfearn and seconded by Councillor L Spillard that:

"This Council seeks clarification of the lease arrangements for the pitch and putt golf facility on the Links in St Mary's Ward. In particular, the clauses contained within the lease which require landlord approval to change and/or alter or extend the building. Council would like a full explanation on who has the responsibility for agreeing the lease and which Cabinet Member was involved in agreeing the lease."

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was approved by 39 votes to 0 votes.

**(iv) A Motion with notice, signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, T Mulvenna, N Redfearn and J O'Shea was submitted for consideration by Council**

The Chair informed Council that a request had been received for a proposed alteration of the Motion to insert after paragraph vi) the following:

'vii) Council further resolves to inform the local media and local MPs of this decision.'

The mover of the Motion indicated that he agreed to accept the alteration.

The Council agreed.

It was moved by Councillor J Allan and seconded by Councillor M Green:

'That North Tyneside Council

- i) supports the bottom up process in the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 that enables councils and their communities to drive the action and assistance that central government gives in promoting thriving local economies and sustainable communities;
- ii) notes that the Act gives councils the power to make proposals to government for action and assistance from government to promote sustainable communities, and that those proposals can be for, but are not restricted to, new powers or a transfer of powers or public money and function from central control to local control;
- iii) notes that the Act defines sustainable communities broadly, that definition having the 3 aspects of the improvement of the local economy, protection of the environment, and promotion of social inclusion, including participation in civic, political and democratic activity;
- iv) notes that new regulations for the Act made in June 2012 improve the process and make it more favourable for councils in the following ways - councils' proposals are submitted directly to the government, there will no longer be short listing, councils can submit proposals whenever they are ready as the process is now ongoing, there will be a time limit of six months on the government to consult and try to reach agreement with the Selector (currently the Local Government Association) regarding councils' proposals and to then respond to those proposals. Councils that choose to submit proposals may now decide how to consult (subject to specific requirements on consultation under the Act or associated regulations) and try to reach agreement with representatives of communities in their areas on what proposals to submit;
- v) notes that the government has formally invited all Local Authorities to use the Act by submitting proposals;
- vi) resolves to request that Cabinet use the Act by responding to this invitation and taking forward consultation upon and submission of proposals for action and assistance from central government each year for the next three years and that Cabinet then review the outcome of this activity and consider whether to continue to use the Act; and
- vii) Council further resolves to inform the local media and local MPs of this decision

Council requests that a report be brought forward to Council on the opportunities or circumstances that North Tyneside Council could use to their advantage and/or benefit the Borough.'

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was unanimously agreed.

- (v) **A Motion with notice, signed by Councillors J Allan, N Redfearn, J O'Shea, C Gambling and T Mulvenna was submitted for consideration by Council**

It was moved by Councillor C Davis and seconded by Councillor C Johnson:

'That this Council is seriously concerned with the recent news \*, which indicates that university applicants from North Tyneside have shrunk by a staggering 23%. Council requests the Strategic Director of CYPL to produce an initial report on the circumstances of such a reduction and a proposed action plan to reverse this massive decline.'

\*Observer 11 November 2012 – “Middle Class pupils shun Universities as Fees rises.

Full Observer article:

### **Middle-class pupils shun universities as fees rise**

Demand for places falls by up to 20% in richer areas as families see costs soar out of reach University applications have fallen by almost a quarter in some parts of the country, including some of the most affluent regions, figures reveal.

The hardest hit is North Tyneside, a part of the country with higher than average unemployment, where there was a 23% drop in the number of applications to university this summer.

However the first national breakdown of university applications, based on parliamentary constituencies, provides evidence that traditionally affluent middle class parts of the country have seen a disproportionate number of young men and women reject university as an option.

Amid difficult economic times and a trebling of [tuition fees](#), in areas such as Banbury, near Oxford, where unemployment rates are traditionally among the lowest in the country, there has been a 22% fall in applications to universities, from 4,400 to 3,427.

Even the prime minister's own well-heeled constituency, Witney, in west Oxfordshire, has seen an 18% drop, from 4,088 applications in June 2011 to 3,353 this summer. And George Osborne's Tatton constituency, in Cheshire, has seen a 16% fall in applications, from 3,958 in 2011 to 3,314 this year.

The demand for degree courses from British [students](#) has dropped by more than 50,000 – almost 9% – this year, with the University and College Admissions Service also concluding that there was evidence of a sharper fall in application rates for young people from wealthier backgrounds, compared with poorer teenagers.

It is believed that demand among the middle classes has plummeted quicker than it has among applicants from poor families because they are not able to take advantage of a generous system of living grants and tuition fee waivers.

The fall coincides with a decision to almost triple the cap on annual tuition fees to as much as £9,000 in 2012, although the fees regime means that no one need repay their debts until they earn more than £21,000.

One of the best performing constituencies was Rochdale, which has one of the worst youth unemployment rates in the country, but where there was a 6% increase in applications from 4,723 to 5,013 this year. Birmingham Yardley, where 8.1% of the population is unemployed, also saw an increase in applications from their young people of 4% from 3,743 to 3,902.

Gareth Thomas, Labour MP for Harrow West, who uncovered the statistics, said: "These figures suggest that the ambitions and university aspirations of young people from middle-class families have taken a big hit as a result of the huge hike in tuition fees.

David Cameron doesn't understand just how much £9,000 fees are making [young people think twice about going into higher education](#) – even young people in his own constituency."

Liam Burns, president of the national union of students, said young people would be marching in London in protest at the government's [higher education](#) policy at the end of this month.

He said: "These figures show the scale of the gamble the government has taken with the futures of young people from right across the country.

"David Willetts and Vince Cable can play down the drop in applications all they like, but families and communities across the country are seeing their dreams of going to university disappear before their eyes.'

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was approved by 37 votes to 0 votes.

At this point, the Chair announced that he proposed to alter the order of business to deal with agenda Item 9 – Local Council Tax Support'; and Item 8 – The Gambling Act 2005', as decisions were required on these matters. He would then return to Motion 6.

### **C103/11/12 Local Council Tax Support**

The Council received a report which set out the options for providing a Local Council Tax Support Scheme by 31 January 2013, to replace Council Tax Benefit from April 2013, in compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Finance Act 2012.

It was moved by Councillor Mrs J Wallace and seconded by Councillor G Westwater that:

'Council

- '1. Notes the outcome from the consultation exercise and the additional financial information provided in this report;
2. Considers the options available, as set out in Section 1.6 to this report; and
3. Notes and considers the scheme proposed by Cabinet on 13 August 2012 upon which consultation has been undertaken (the Option 2 scheme described at paragraph 1.6 of the report) and determine it as the Local Council Tax Support Scheme for North Tyneside, to be adopted with effect from 1 April 2013.'

A procedural motion was moved by Councillor B Pickard and seconded by Councillor J Stirling that:

"The matter be deferred until the next Council meeting."

The procedural motion, on being put to the meeting, was approved by 36 votes to 13 votes.

**C104/11/12 Revised Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling) – Final Proposals**

The Council received a report which provided the final proposals in respect of the revised Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling); and requested the Council to determine whether or not to pass a 'no casino' resolution under Section 166 of the Gambling Act 2005.

It was moved by Councillor G Westwater and seconded by Mrs L Arkley, Elected Mayor that:

'Council

- (1) agrees the final proposals in respect of the revised Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling), attached as Appendix 1 to the report; and
- (2) agrees a 'no casino' resolution under Section 166 of the Gambling Act 2005.

The Motion, on being put to the meeting, was unanimously agreed.

**C105/11/12 Adjournment of Meeting**

At this point, the Chair announced that the meeting was adjourned and that all Members of the Council would be advised of the date of the reconvened meeting.