

## **Taunton Deane Borough Council**

At a meeting of Taunton Deane Borough Council held in the John Meikle Room, The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton on 12 April 2016 at 6.30 p.m.

Present      The Mayor (Councillor Mrs Hill)  
                  The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Mrs Stock-Williams)  
                  Councillors Mrs Adkins, M Adkins, Aldridge, Beale, Berry, Bowrah,  
                  Brown, Cavill, Coles, Davies, D Durdan, Miss Durdan, Mrs Edwards,  
                  Edwards, Gage, Gaines, Govier, Mrs Gunner, Habgood, Hall,  
                  Mrs Herbert, C Hill, Horsley, James, R Lees, Mrs Lees, Ms Lisgo,  
                  Martin-Scott, Morrell, Nicholls, Parrish, Prior-Sankey, Mrs Reed, Ryan,  
                  Miss Smith, Mrs Smith, Stone, Sully, Townsend, Mrs Tucker,  
                  Mrs Warmington, Watson, Ms Webber, Wedderkopp, Williams and  
                  Wren

Mrs A Elder – Chairman of the Standards Advisory Committee

### **1. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings of Taunton Deane Borough Council held on 23 February 2016 and 17 March 2016, copies having been sent to each Member, were signed by the Mayor.

### **2. Apologies**

Councillors Coombes, Cossey, Farbahi, Mrs Floyd and Ross.

### **3. Communications**

The Mayor reported that Charles Groom, the Sergeant-at-Mace / Mayor's Driver had recently undergone a knee operation. She would send the best wishes of the Council to Mr Groom for a speedy recovery.

The Mayor also reminded Councillors of the forthcoming Civic Service on Sunday, 17 April 2016 at St Peter's Church, Priorswood, Taunton at 10.30 a.m.

### **4. Declaration of Interests**

Councillors M Adkins, Coles, Govier, Prior-Sankey and Wedderkopp declared personal interests as Members of Somerset County Council. Councillor Mrs Herbert declared a personal interest as an employee of the Department of Work and Pensions. Councillor Wren declared a personal interest as the Clerk to Milverton Parish Council. Councillors Gage and Stone declared prejudicial interests as Tone Leisure Board representatives. Councillor Ms Lisgo declared a personal interest as a Director of Tone FM. Councillor Edwards declared a personal interest as the Chairman of Governors of Queens College. Councillor Hall declared a personal interest as a Director of

Southwest One. Councillor Coombes declared a personal interest as a Stoke St Mary Parish Councillor and as the owner of land at Haydon, Taunton. Councillor Parrish declared a personal interest as the District Councils' representative on the Somerset Pensions Committee.

5. **Receipt of Petition from Stawley Parish Council concerning The Globe Inn, Appley**

Councillor Charles St. George, Chairman of Stawley Parish Council, presented a petition containing over 200 signatures to the Council which called upon Taunton Deane to use its powers under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and/or Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to undertake repair works to the listed barn attached to The Globe Inn, Appley – a Grade II listed building – which had been derelict for more than two and a half years.

Councillor St. George went on to say that despite repeated attempts by the Parish Council and the landlady of The Globe Inn to persuade the freehold owner of the premises to repair this building, both directly and through liaison with the Conservation Officers at the Council, it remained in a derelict state without a roof or finished walls. The remains of the listed building continued to deteriorate and water was now finding its way into the pub resulting in damp and electrical problems.

The Globe Inn was an historic and popular local pub that was greatly valued by the surrounding rural communities and which had been listed on Taunton Deane's Register of Community Assets since April 2015.

The derelict building was an eyesore which threatened the structural integrity of the pub but was also adversely affecting its long-term commercial viability as potential customers were put off by its external appearance.

Councillor St. George hoped the Council would use the legal power it had at its disposal to resolve the current situation.

In response, Councillor Habgood suggested that as the saga relating to The Globe Inn was long and complicated, a detailed report should be submitted to the Council's Planning Committee. This was the correct place for the matter to be considered.

Other comments received related to the Parish Council's stance being supported and that the Council owed it to the local community to bring about the necessary repairs to the public house.

Councillors agreed that the matter highlighted by the petition concerning The Globe Inn, Appley should be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration.

6. **Land at Creedwell Orchard Housing Estate, Milverton**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning a proposal to vary an Option Agreement with S Notaro Limited (SNL) for the purchase of land at Creedwell Orchard Housing Estate by amending the "Trigger Date".

An Option Agreement had been entered into with SNL on 27 February 2014 for a period of 10 years following Executive approval on 13 July 2013.

The current terms of the Agreement provided that the option had to be exercised by SNL within 120 days of the Trigger Date, details of which were included in the report.

Noted that the absolute longstop date for the exercise of the option was 12 years from the date of the Option Agreement.

A planning application for an alternative development scheme had been submitted by SNL on 18 March 2014 which was subsequently refused on 15 October 2015. Statute provided that an applicant had a period of six months in which to submit an appeal against the planning decision. The date upon which an appeal against the planning decision had to be made by NSL was 13 April 2016.

It was considered that the Trigger Date for the exercise of the Option Agreement could be some considerable time in the future if a planning appeal was to be pursued by SNL.

Reported that since the completion of the Option Agreement it had come to light that the formula for the sale price of the Council's land was based upon an incorrect valuation. This was as a result of incorrect information having been provided by SNL from the outset which was relied upon by both the Council and external valuers.

Further external valuation advice had been sought from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) who had been instructed to negotiate a revised option sale price formula with SNL based upon the correct floor areas of the extant scheme.

In the circumstances, it was considered appropriate for the Council to complete a Deed of Variation to the Option Agreement to provide that the new Trigger Date became 12 October 2016 with the Exercise Period remaining at 120 days from the trigger date. This would allow time for negotiations to be completed for a revised sale price formula which should negate the need for the Council to deal with a planning appeal that had been made to effectively delay the establishment of the Option Trigger Date.

**Resolved** that the amendment of the Trigger Date within the Option Agreement to provide that the option to purchase the Council's land must be exercised within 120 days (the Option Period) of 12 October 2016 (the new Trigger Date), be approved.

## 7. **Community Infrastructure Levy:-**

### 1. **Clarification of Regulation 123 Infrastructure List;**

- 2. Proposed draft Payment in Kind Policy;**
- 3. Proposed draft Charitable Relief Policy; and**
- 4. CIL Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy**

Considered report previously circulated which outlined proposals for additional text in the draft Regulation 123 list. The proposed additional text – details of which were submitted - related to strategic transport improvements and green infrastructure. These additions sought to clarify what would be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts and what would be sought through planning obligations, to ensure a planning application was acceptable in planning terms.

It was not seeking to add or remove any infrastructure items from the Regulation 123 list and therefore it was considered unnecessary to undertake formal consultation on the additional text.

Also proposed to introduce a Payment in Kind (PiK) Policy in line with Sections 73 and 73A of the CIL Regulations. PiK enabled a developer / CIL liable party to offset the CIL liability against the cost of direct provision of infrastructure. Whilst the introduction of the Policy would allow the Council to accept PiK in appropriate cases, the Council would retain full discretion in such matters and would not be under any obligation to accept PiK in a particular case. All PiK bids would be assessed against the Council's infrastructure priorities, considered by the CIL/Infrastructure Delivery Board and approved by Full Council before PiK bids were accepted.

The introduction of CIL Policies for Discretionary Charitable Relief, to enable charities to claim CIL relief and Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief to enable developers to claim relief from paying CIL in Exceptional Circumstances were also proposed.

This matter had been discussed at the meeting of the Community Scrutiny Committee on 5 April 2016 where Members had generally been supportive of the endorsement of the changes to the text of the Regulation 123 list and the three new policies.

However, the Committee had expressed concern that the current wording of the PiK Policy made no reference to how this would relate to the Unparished Area of Taunton. As a result, the Committee had agreed that a suitable form of additional wording should be approved by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Community Scrutiny Committee for inclusion in the Policy.

Members were concerned that although this form of words had not yet been agreed, Full Council was being asked to endorse the PiK Policy as it stood. It was therefore agreed that the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transportation be granted delegated power to agree an appropriate form of words for inclusion in the policy.

**Resolved** that it be agreed to endorse:-

- (1) The additional text clarifying the current Regulation 123 infrastructure list;
- (2) The proposed draft Payment in Kind Policy, subject to the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transportation – Councillor Habgood –

being granted delegated authority to approve the additional wording as recommended by the Community Scrutiny Committee;

- (3) The proposed draft CIL Charitable Relief Policy; and
- (4) The proposed draft CIL Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy.

## 8. **Proposed Changes to the Council's Constitution**

Considered report previously circulated, concerning a number of proposed changes to the Council's Constitution.

If approved, the proposed changes would provide greater clarity to timescales by which certain motions / amendments / questions were to be submitted in advance of Council meetings and provided sufficient time for any relevant research / analysis to be undertaken prior to the meeting in question.

The present clauses were somewhat ambiguous and did not always allow sufficient time for the necessary preparation work to be undertaken especially in terms of preparing responses to formal questions submitted.

The proposed changes had been considered and approved by both the Constitutional Sub-Committee and the Corporate Governance Committee.

**Resolved** that the proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution as set out in Appendix A to these minutes, be approved.

## 9. **Electoral Review of Taunton Deane Borough Council**

Considered report previously circulated, which set out the context for the process and timetable associated with the Electoral Review (ER) of Taunton Deane Borough Council (TDBC) which is to be undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE).

On 9 July 2013, the LGBCE had agreed that there should be an ER of TDBC. The review was triggered as 42% of Wards currently had 10% more or fewer electors in them than the average (in the region of 1400 per Councillor) for the authority (the trigger figure was 30% of all Wards).

Where the LGBCE considered that such imbalance was unlikely to be corrected by foreseeable changes to the electorate within a reasonable period, then an ER was instigated. The last review of TDBC's electoral arrangements had been undertaken in 2006 when it had been agreed to increase the Council size from 54 to 56 members and to make some adjustment to the warding patterns.

Due to a busy schedule of work nationally, the LGBCE had not been able to begin the ER for TDBC until now and following an introductory meeting on 24 November 2016 commenced its work with briefings for TDBC Members, officers and Parish Councils on 29 February 2016. Going forward, the first formal stage of the process would be for the LGBCE to make a proposal

regarding the size of the Council (number of Councillors) in the future and there would be an opportunity for TDBC to submit its own proposal for consideration. The deadline to do this was by 6 May 2016.

The LGBCE would consider all submissions on Council size and would then issue their recommended option after 21 June 2016. There would then be a period of consultation from 28 June 2016 until 5 September 2016. Once again, TDBC would have the opportunity to put forward a submission in this regard and it might be necessary to schedule a special meeting of Full Council to meet this deadline.

After considering any submissions received, the LGBCE would then issue their draft recommendations on 8 November 2016 and allow a further period for consultation until 9 January 2017. The final recommendations would be made on 14 March 2017 with an Order then being laid in Parliament with any new electoral arrangements coming into force for the May 2019 Local Government Elections.

It had been agreed that the Constitutional Sub-Committee should lead on co-ordinating the work in TDBC to support this process and had already received progress reports at its most recent meetings. Work had commenced on providing the latest electoral data and developing electoral forecasts for the middle of 2022 as requested by the LGBCE.

The ER had two distinct parts. The first was consideration by the Council of its future size. This referred to the number of elected Members required for the effective conduct of Council business corporately and by individual Members. In determining size, the LGBCE would consider not only any proposal from this Council but also any other submissions it received.

The second part of the process would be consideration of new Polling Districts and, in turn, new Ward boundaries. This would occur after the LGBCE published its initial conclusions on Council size. A further report on this phase would be produced in due course.

In terms of Council size, the LGBCE guidance indicated that in exercise of its judgement on this issue, it would consider three key areas:-

- (i) The Council's governance arrangements, and how it took decisions across the range of its responsibilities;
- (ii) The Council's scrutiny functions relating to its own decision-making and the Council's responsibilities to outside bodies; and
- (iii) The representational role of TDBC Councillors in the local community, and how they engaged with residents, conduct casework and represented the Council on wider partnerships.

Reported that all Group Leaders had been contacted and requested to submit any proposals or views with regard to the size of the Council and a representation was received from the Conservative Group which suggested that consideration be made aiming for a figure in the early 40s which would represent a reduction from the current figure of 56.

This representation was subsequently discussed at the meeting of the Constitutional Sub-Committee on 4 February 2016 when there was a general consensus that the suggestion was probably in the right area and that there was merit in exploring an option in this quantum.

The representation was then circulated to all political groups for comment and work had continued on documenting current and proposed governance arrangements and fine tuning the electorate forecasts. This work had resulted in the draft submission which was submitted with the report for the information of all Councillors.

**Resolved** that the draft submission, attached as an Appendix to the report, be submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in respect of the proposed size of the Council in the future.

## 10. **Written Questions to Members of the Executive**

- **To Councillor John Williams from Councillor Simon Coles**

**(i) Electoral Review of Taunton Deane – Regarding the proposed changes to the number of Councillors and the make-up of the Council Committees thereafter**

(a) Whilst I am not opposed to a reduction in the number of Councillors elected to the Council, per se, I am concerned as to how we ensure that Democracy is served via new ward boundaries. Before agreeing to any number I would need to be satisfied regarding ensuring there is no Democratic Deficit. There is still a lot of work to do to reach a consensus on this matter. I welcome the debate and look forward to the discussion. Can Councillor Williams please outline the process he intends to follow?

**Reply** - *As the report explains, an Electoral Review is a two stage process as laid down by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). The issue of agreeing ward boundaries forms the second stage and with the report being debated tonight dealing with the first stage which is to determine the size of the Council.*

*Once the LGBCE has agreed what the size should be in June 2016, there will be an opportunity for the Council to put forward any proposals in regard to ward boundaries reflecting the recommended size of the Council. It is intended that the Constitutional Sub-Committee will again lead on seeking a consensus submission from the Councillors. As in stage one, it is intended that all political groups will be given the opportunity to input into this process which will happen over the summer months. It is important to note that whatever Taunton Deane proposal comes forward (whether by consensus or not), it will be the LGBCE who will make the final decision.*

(b) It is wholly unacceptable that two Scrutiny Committee's are reduced to just one Committee.

I believe that, we should, as part of this review, discuss the re-introduction of the "Committee System".

I would also ask why there is the suggestion that the Planning Committee is to be a different size to all the other Committees. It strikes me that we should maintain the same numerical composition of these five statutory Committees. Therefore, again, I will not support the suggestion made.

**Reply** - *The suggestions set out on pages 12 and 13 of the report are in the context of demonstrating options that could be applied should a lower size of say 43 be determined by the LGBCE. On page 13 it states that 'it should be stressed that the suggested numbers shown in the right hand column is but one possible variant that could be adopted should the size of the Council be set at a lower figure of 43'. Examples of other options are listed at the bottom of page 13, after which it is clearly stated that 'It is not considered necessary or appropriate to be prescriptive of such detail at this stage'.*

*Therefore, the issues referred to have been referenced to demonstrate that there are options that would enable the Council to operate an effective decision making process with a smaller number of Councillors. By agreeing the recommendation, the Council is not committing itself to any specific option at this stage. Once the LGBCE have completed the Electoral Review and the future size of the Council is known, that will be when such detail will need to be reviewed and properly debated.*

## **(ii) Devolution**

Despite all the fine words that the Prospectus has been submitted to Central Government and accepted, Councillor Williams does not even acknowledge that the Government dictat requires acceptance of the Mayoral structure or the bid will go to the back of the pile. Does Councillor Williams's assertion in item 1 of his report signify a change from the previously held view that a "Mayor" for Somerset and Devon was wholly unacceptable? And if so, when and how and by whom was this fundamental change agreed?

**Reply** - *I refer you to Minute No 6 of the meeting held 23 February 2016 and forming part of this agenda on pages 4 and 5, Heart of the South West Devolution. The last paragraph on page 4 is clear that no decision on Governance had been made but that a form of Combined Authority was proposed. In the resolution recorded on page 5, part (b) it is also clear that any devolution "deal" negotiated with Government would come back to Full Council for approval.*

*Also in my report to Council tonight item 1.1 clearly refers to a "Combined Authority" so I am not seeing any fundamental change in my position as is suggested. Final proposals negotiated with the Government, will be brought back to Full Council for approval or otherwise as resolved at our meeting on 23 February 2016.*

## **(iii) Shared Services and Management with West Somerset Council**

It is a given that the costs incurred will be scrutinised to ensure that there is no cost shunting to the taxpayers of Taunton Deane. Can Councillor Williams



please outline the record keeping he proposes to use to ensure due diligence on costs for this stage of the project?

**Reply** - *Costs for the Business Case will be split 80:20 unless there is evidence to suggest this should be varied for any particular piece of work required to complete this stage of the project.*

*In terms of ongoing work by the One Team, costs splits are kept under review by individuals, Managers and the Corporate Centre. Our auditors are satisfied with our current arrangements.*

#### **(iv) Broadband Provision**

I am given to understand that not only will the 90% threshold not be met by the target date (December 2016) but that it is most unlikely that the phase two target of 95% by the end of 2017 will be met. What actions does Councillor Williams propose to counteract this likelihood?

**Reply** – *Connecting Devon and Somerset is hosted by Somerset County Council and therefore it would be best if Councillor Coles directs his question there in his role as a County Councillor. I am on the Board as the Somerset Districts representative for phase 2, so can enquire progress in that wider role, not just as Leader of Taunton Deane. As far as I am aware we are not at the end of Phase 1 works yet so final coverage has not been calculated.*

*In terms of Phase 2 that has not been let or started yet, so how any conclusion can be drawn is difficult to understand as it is planned to run to at least the end of 2017.*

- **To Councillor John Williams from Councillor Simon Nicholls**

Would Councillor Williams please explain to Members what he expects from Councillors in terms of time frames when responding to residents' questions?

I raise this as a resident within my Ward has recently experienced a four month delay from a question that was directed to Councillor Habgood at November's Full Council meeting. You, along with senior officers, recently highlighted the need for better communication between Taunton Deane and the Parish Councils, and this was recorded at a recent meeting with Bishops Hull Parish Council which features in their minutes of the 17 December 2015.

As Leader of the Council you will be well aware of the poor perception this causes. Could you please share with Members what action you have taken since your statement in November - And if action has been taken, why it has not been followed by a senior Member of your Group?

**Reply** - *I of course support and promote prompt responses to any queries and can only apologise for the inadvertently delayed response from Councillor Habgood.*

*Councillor Habgood finds it very regrettable that his response was delayed, however dealt with it very quickly once brought to his attention. As it is always*

*our aspiration to improve communication, it is a clear intention to respond quickly to any queries raised. If by chance we do not respond promptly, it is helpful if a timely reminder can be provided.*

- **To Councillor Catherine Herbert from Councillor Simon Nicholls**

Would Councillor Mrs Herbert share with Members in broad terms the new "Master Plan" for reinstating the Green Flag status for Victoria Park?

I raised this question late last year. Hopefully Members can now be briefed.

I attended Victoria Park Friends Group meeting earlier this year and considerable disappointment existed regarding lack of leadership and Council engagement. Presumably this has been addressed within the new "Master Plan".

**Reply** – *An Action Plan for Victoria Park, Taunton for 2016 has been produced with a series of proposed actions under the following 'Aims':-*

- (1) A Welcoming Place;*
- (2) Healthy, Safe and Secure;*
- (3) Clean and Well Maintained;*
- (4) Sustainability;*
- (5) Conservation;*
- (6) Heritage;*
- (7) Community Involvement;*
- (8) Marketing; and*
- (9) Management.*

*A copy of the detailed Action Plan had already been circulated to Members for information.*

- **To Councillor Richard Parrish from Councillor Richard Lees**

(a) HR and Organisational Development (Paragraph 3.2 of Councillor Parrish's Report)

With regard to Personal and Work Related Stress - Are we providing any counselling support for staff?

**Reply** - *Yes. This is an area of staff wellbeing which Managers and Members regard with the utmost importance. Managers and key staff have had stress management awareness training and mental health awareness training and employees have access to a confidential external counselling help line service called Care First. I have sent Councillor Lees the Council's Wellbeing and Sickness Absence Policy by email for his information.*

(b) ICT and Information (Paragraph 4.2)

Who makes up the Southwest One Steering Group, as some Councillors may not know?

**Reply** - *The first meeting of this Steering Group is scheduled for 20 April 2016. It is comprised of the following Members; Councillors Parrish, Gaines, Mrs Herbert and R Lees. Minutes will be taken and disseminated to Members.*

(c) Southwest One (SWO) (Paragraph 6.2)

When do you expect the due diligence as to the costs of repatriating services to be completed?

**Reply** - *This issue is a complex one and has resulted in requiring more time to analyse responses from SWO. I am advised by officers that it is anticipated to have the full analysis during May. The Council will then be in a position to formalise an agreement with SWO by 31 May 2016.*

(d) Revenues and Benefits Service (Paragraph 10.3)

The Department of Work and Pension's £118,000 is reported to have been distributed. How many people throughout Taunton Deane has this assisted?

**Reply** - *We assisted 303 customers with Discretionary Housing Payments. There were a total of 375 awards meaning that some customers received more than one award.*

(e) Law and Governance SHAPE Partnership Service (Paragraph 8.2)

I would just like to reiterate your kind words about Roy Pinney, and say a personal thank you to him for the work he has done for Taunton Deane and wish him well in his new appointment.

**Reply** - *I will invite Councillor Lees to make his comments to Mr Pinney at the Full Council Meeting.*

## 11. Recommendation to Council from the Executive

### Community Asset Transfer Policy

A consultation exercise had recently been completed in respect of the Council adopting a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Policy.

The consultees had comprised:-

- o Councillors: County, Town and Parish as well as the Member of Parliament;
- o Education Organisations;
- o Faith Groups/Churches;
- o Internal Officers;
- o Partner Organisations; and
- o Voluntary and Community Organisations.

The Council had received a total of 27 responses giving a response rate of 7.9%.

The key themes of the consultation concerned:-

- (i) Whether the consultee believed that the Policy would deliver wider public benefits as part of a CAT process;
- (ii) Whether the consultee believed the Policy would achieve the Council's Corporate Aims and Values;
- (iii) Agreement as to the principles underlying the Policy which sought to involve local communities, to provide a pro-active asset management programme as well as giving clear transparency in decision making. Consultees were asked whether these principles would help the Council achieve a successful CAT Policy; and
- (iv) Acceptance of the application criteria set out in the CAT Policy.

Although it was generally apparent that the majority of the consultees were supportive of the Council transferring assets, there was concern about continuing liabilities, lack of ongoing support from the Council but a continuing 'interest' in the land by the Council. Others believed that assets should be retained by the Council.

As a result of the consultation, a number of amendments had been made to the proposed CAT Policy a copy of which had been circulated to all Members along with a copy of the Initial Expression of Interest Form.

The transfer of assets to community groups would have the potential to create opportunities for these groups to commission Deane DLO or other services to support them post transfer.

On the motion of Councillor Edwards, it was

**Resolved** that the Community Asset Transfer Policy and the Initial Expression of Interest Form be adopted by the Council.

## 12. Reports of the Leader of the Council and Executive Councillors

### (i) **Leader of the Council (Councillor Williams)**

Councillor Williams's report covered the following topics:-

- Devolution;
- Shared Services and Management with West Somerset Council;
- Proposed Firepool Development;
- Broadband Provision;
- Road Works, Taunton;
- Deane DLO Relocation;
- The Deane House Relocation Project; and
- Halcon One Team Award.

(ii) **Planning, Transportation and Communications (Councillor Habgood)**

The report from Councillor Habgood provided information on the following areas within his portfolio:-

- Planning Policy – Site Allocation and Development Plan (SADMP);
- Core Strategy Review;
- Regulation 123 Review;
- Neighbourhood Planning;
- Custom / Self-Build Register;
- Technical Consultation on implementation of Planning Changes;
- Quarterly Policy Update;
- Major Applications – Local Development Order; Staplegrave; Regeneration – Firepool; Transportation – Twenty Year Infrastructure; Transportation – Variable Message Signing; and
- Parking.

(iii) **Sport, Parks and Leisure (Councillor Mrs Herbert)**

The report from Councillor Mrs Herbert dealt with activities taking place in the following areas:-

- Community Leisure and Play – Bandstand Concerts and Blackbrook Pool;
- Parks and Open Spaces – Vivary Café; Hanging basket deals for town centre traders; and Grass Cutting;
- Tone Leisure (Taunton Deane) Limited Activities – Health Development; Active Lifestyles; and Facility News.

(iv) **Corporate Resources (Councillor Parrish)**

The report from Councillor Parrish provided information on the following areas within his portfolio:-

- Corporate Strategy and Performance;
- Facilities Management;
- HR and Organisational Development;
- ICT and Information;
- JMASS Project and Transformation Project Management;
- Southwest One;
- Democratic Services;
- Law and Governance – Shape Partnership Services;
- Customer Contact Service Report;
- Revenues and Benefits Service; and
- Finance and Procurement.

(v) **Community Leadership (Councillor Mrs Jane Warmington)**

Councillor Mrs Warmington presented the Community Leadership

report which focused on the following areas within that portfolio:-

- One Teams;
- RuralReach;
- Let's Make Loneliness History! and
- Taunton Welcomes Refugees.

(vi) **Housing Services (Councillor Beale)**

Councillor Beale submitted his report which drew attention to the following:-

- Deane Housing Development – Creechbarrow Road, Taunton, Weavers Arms, Wellington, Scooter Storage and Car Parking;
- Right to Buy Social Mobility;
- Affordable Housing Delivery;
- Insulation and Energy;
- Rent Arrears;
- Welfare Reform Visits;
- Discretionary Housing Payments;
- Universal Credit;
- Pathway for ASDults P4A;
- Housing Revenue Account; and
- Pre-Void Inspections and Tenancy Enforcement.

(vii) **Environmental Services and Climate Change (Councillor Berry)**

The report from Councillor Berry drew attention to developments in the following areas:-

- Environmental Health / Licensing;
- Somerset Waste Partnership;
- Deane DLO; and
- Crematorium.

(viii) **Economic Development, Asset Management, Arts and Tourism and Communications (Councillor Edwards)**

The report from Councillor Edwards covered:-

- Creating, Commissioning and Supporting Local Business Networks;
- Supporting Inward Investment and Investor Fulfilment;
- Improving Employment Opportunities and Enhancing the Skills of the Workforce;
- Supporting Place Based Regeneration Projects and Initiatives – Firepool; Coal Orchard The Market House and Town Centre WiFi;
- Marketing the Areas as Business and Lifestyle Destinations with

Links to Tourism and Culture – Taunton Visitor Centre; Town Centre Rotunda, promotional lamp-post and Castle Bow banner site; Town Centre Marketing Contract; Social Media and e-newsletters; Visit Somerset and South West Tourism Growth Fund; Promotional Literature and Cultural Events in Taunton;

- Asset Management Service General Fund Activities; and
- Communications.

(Councillors Davies left the meeting at 8.52 p.m. Councillors Miss Durdan, Stone, Ms Webber, Wedderkopp and Wren left the meeting at 8.55 p.m. Councillor Govier left the meeting at 9.12 p.m. Councillors D Durdan and Gage left at 9.25 p.m.)

(The meeting ended at 9.29 p.m.)

## APPENDIX A

### APPROVED AMENDMENTS TO THE TAUNTON DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL CONSITUTION

REF.	CURRENT	PROSED
Notices of Motion (page 92) 4 (2)	Eight calendar days' notice are required in order to have a Notice of Motion included in the summons to a Council meeting.	Seven clear working days' notice is needed in order to have a Notice of Motion included in the summons. This means that written notice must be delivered to the Democratic Services Manager by 4 pm on the Thursday of the week prior to the week that the summons for the meeting is to be dispatched or by 4 pm on the day that provides seven clear working days before the council meeting (excluding the day of the meeting itself).
Amendments (page 94) (6)	If there is to be an amendment to the proposed budget then it must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 12 noon the day before the Council meeting.	If there is to be an amendment to the proposed budget then it must be received by the Democratic Services Manager by 4 pm on the Thursday before the Council meeting or by 4 pm on the day that provides two clear working days before the Council meeting (excluding the day of the meeting itself).
Questions from Councillors (page 98) 14 (2)	Any Councillor upon giving two working days written notice to the Democratic Services Manager may ask ....	Any Councillor, upon giving written notice to the Democratic Services Manager by 4 pm on the Thursday before the Council meeting or by 4 pm on the day that provides two clear working days before the Council meeting (excluding the day of the meeting itself) may ask.....