

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL
CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD ON
WEDNESDAY 16 MAY 2018, AT 7.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor K Warnell (Chairman).
Councillors D Abbott, A Alder, M Allen,
D Andrews, R Brunton, E Buckmaster,
S Bull, M Casey, Mrs R Cheswright,
K Crofton, G Cutting, B Deering,
I Devonshire, H Drake, J Goodeve, B Harris-
Quinney, L Haysey, Mrs D Hollebon,
G Jones, J Jones, J Kaye, P Kenealy,
G McAndrew, M McMullen, P Moore,
D Oldridge, T Page, M Pope, L Radford,
P Ruffles, S Rutland-Barsby, C Snowdon,
S Stainsby, M Stevenson, T Stowe,
N Symonds, J Taylor, G Williamson,
C Woodward and J Wyllie.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Simon Aley	-	Interim Legal Services Manager
Martin Ibrahim	-	Democratic Services Team Leader
Liz Watts	-	Chief Executive
John Williams	-	Electoral Services Officer

1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman (Councillor J Jones) welcomed Members, guests and the public to the meeting and reminded

everyone that the meeting was being webcast.

He reminded Members of the recent sad news relating to former Councillor Bryan Smalley, who had passed away. Bryan had represented Much Hadham ward on the District Council from 1976 until 1991 and had also been a County Councillor. The funeral thanksgiving service was taking place on 17 May 2018, at 1.30 pm, at St Andrew's church in Much Hadham. As a mark of respect, Members stood and observed a minute's silence.

On a happier note, the Chairman was pleased to welcome some special local residents who had received MBEs in this year's Queen's New Year Honours list. He introduced Derek Clarke, Rebecca Foster and James Williams.

Derek Clarke had been honoured for services to young people in Hertfordshire. He had joined The Broxbourne School as head of physics in 1969. His hard work, dedication and outstanding commitment had been instrumental to introducing young people to outdoor pursuits, as well as helping them to achieve excellent, academic results. In 1973, he had become head of the Outdoor Club, organising many youth hostelling and mountaineering trips abroad. He had headed up the school's Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, organising hundreds of Bronze and Gold expeditions. Under his leadership, the school's involvement in the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme had flourished with a very high uptake from students. He had also organised numerous 'Mountain Aid' charity fundraising events and, as a talented violinist, took part in many musical events. On his retirement from the Broxbourne School in 2005, he left behind a legacy with the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme

that continued to enrich pupils' school experiences.

Rebecca Foster was a champion for inclusive sport. A course leader for physical education and a senior lecturer in Adapted PE at the University of Worcester, she had been recognised for services to inclusive sport and supporting young people to achieve their potential. Rebecca had been a key player in the development of sporting opportunities for women and disabled people. She had been a volunteer with UK Deaf Sport for over 11 years, which had led her to three consecutive Deaflympics as athletics coach and team manager. At the university, she had set up a 'Sign circle' to increase the number of people able to communicate by sign language. She had also developed a module within the Physical Education degree pathway titled 'Teaching Special Education and Disability Physical Education in Schools' and was responsible for ensuring modules ran across academic institutes, enhancing the diversity of choice for students. Her work was among that which had led to the institution being shortlisted for the Times Higher Education University of the Year 2016. Professor David Green, University of Worcester Vice Chancellor and Chief Executive, had said "Rebecca's work to include people in education, sport and society is simply inspirational." She had also been recognised for her remarkable dedication towards her students, acting not only as an educator but as a friend, confidante and inspiring motivator.

James Williams had been nominated for his MBE by a former High Sheriff supported in particular by other past High Sheriffs, which had demonstrated the high regard in which he had been held. He had served as Under Sheriff of Hertfordshire from 1993 until 2016 and remained Secretary of the High Sheriffs' Association of England &

Wales. As Under Sheriff, he had engaged with many facets of the life of the county, but in particular with the courts, police and other institutions involved in the administration of justice and the maintenance of law and order. As such, he had been an important part of the "glue" of Hertfordshire for many years. He had gathered a great deal of knowledge about the shrievalty over those years and as Secretary of the High Sheriffs' Association he remained the go-to person for advice on the office of High Sheriff.

The Chairman invited each award recipient to come forward and receive a certificate in recognition of their achievements.

The Chairman also referred to two other East Herts residents who had been honoured but had been unable to attend the meeting. Dr Graham Hoare had received an OBE for services to the automotive industry and Cleveland Watkiss had received an MBE for services to music.

As this was his last meeting as Chairman, he thanked Members for giving him the opportunity to represent the Council over the past year. He spoke of the honour and pleasure to serve as Chairman and to represent the Council at over 110 events. He thanked the Vice-Chairman for his support in attending numerous events as well.

The Chairman referred to some of these events and was delighted to announce that over £8,000 had been raised for his chosen charities, Isabel Hospice and Essex & Herts Air Ambulance. He expressed his gratitude to everyone who had supported the various events.

The Chairman referred to three particular highlights of the past year - judging the East Herts Dog Show, attending the High Sherriff's Garden Party in Sarratt and representing the District with Councillor N Symonds at the Royal Garden Party.

Finally, the Chairman introduced a brief slide show which he thought better explained his time as Chairman.

The Leader thanked the Chairman and congratulated him on his year. She spoke of his sense of humour, his inclusive approach in dealing with people and the support given to him by his wife. The Leader moved, and Councillor S Rutland-Barsby seconded, a motion that the Council place on record, its thanks for the Chairman's year of service. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED - that Councillor J Jones be thanked for his year of service as Chairman.

2 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN 2018-19

It was moved by Councillor L Haysey and seconded by Councillor K Crofton that Councillor K Warnell be elected Chairman of the Council to hold office for the civic year 2018/19.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, Councillor K Warnell was elected Chairman of the Council for the civic year 2018/19.

RESOLVED - that Councillor K Warnell be elected Chairman of the Council and hold office for the civic

year 2018/19.

The newly-elected Chairman made the statutory Declaration of Acceptance of Office, and took the Chair.

3 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL FOR 2018-19

It was moved by Councillor D Oldridge and seconded by Councillor M Allen that Councillor J Kaye be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council to hold office for the civic year 2018/19.

After being put to the meeting and a vote taken, Councillor J Kaye was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council for the civic year 2018/19.

RESOLVED - that Councillor J Kaye be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Council and hold office for the civic year 2018/19.

The Vice-Chairman made the statutory Declaration of Acceptance of Office and in thanking Members, looked forward to supporting the Chairman over the coming year.

4 FURTHER CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman (Councillor K Warnell) thanked Members for giving him the honour of representing the District Council over the coming year. He thanked the Past Chairman, Councillor J Jones and presented him with his Past Chairman's badge. He also added his congratulations to the New Year's Honours recipients.

He looked forward to using his time as Chairman to promote East Herts and its values. He spoke of the diversity within the District and referred to a recent inter-faith meeting he had attended with Councillor J Kaye. He hoped to organise a festival to celebrate cultural diversity which might include food, dance and displays to promote unity and cohesion.

He referred to 2018 as the centenary of the Armistice and advised that a themed civic service "to end all wars" was being organised in conjunction with the Mayor of Bishop's Stortford, Councillor G Cutting and would be held on 1 July 2018.

The Chairman advised that his main charities would be Mind and Isabel Hospice, but other charities would also benefit. He referred to other events being planned, which included "Music in the Garden" on 29 July 2018, at Hopley's garden centre in Much Hadham, a rock n' roll night and a "Fawlty Towers" dinner.

Finally, the Chairman congratulated Councillor P Ruffles, who at 43 years, a few days and still counting, had become the longest-serving Member ever on the Council.

5 MINUTES

The Chairman moved, and Councillor J Wyllie seconded, a motion that the Minutes of the previous meeting be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, this was CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 1 March 2018, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of Minute 10 – Community Governance Review of Bishop’s Stortford, Councillors D Abbott, G Cutting, H Drake, Mrs D Hollebon, G Jones, G McAndrew, S Stainsby, N Symonds, T Page, K Warnell, C Woodward and J Wyllie each declared a non-pecuniary interest as they were members of Bishop’s Stortford Town Council.

In respect of Minute 13 – Ardeley Parish Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Councillor K Crofton declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of Ardeley Parish Council. On the same item, Councillor P Kenealy declared a non-pecuniary interest on the basis that he was a resident of Ardeley.

7 PETITIONS

Parish Councillor Robin Lumsden, Chairman of Thorley Parish Council, presented a petition signed by 960 people, which had been submitted calling for no change to the current boundary between Thorley village and Bishop’s Stortford. He believed this represented the depths of local feeling and suggested that no evidence to support the changes had been submitted. He contended that the people most impacted by the proposed changes, if agreed, did not want any changes.

Councillor G Williamson thanked the petitioner and

advised that he would address the points made later in the meeting (see Minutes 8 and 10).

8 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairman advised that eight questions had been submitted by the public and they would all be answered by the Executive Member for Finance and Support Services.

Question 1

Colin Arnott, Thorley, referenced the Executive's recommendations to the Council and noted that these now proposed to make more limited changes to the Thorley Parish boundary than that requested by the Town Council. However, with regard to the areas still recommended for transfer to Bishop's Stortford, whilst seeing the logic of unifying St Michael's Mead, the site south of Whittington Way was an entirely different issue. He asked why a CGR of 53 hectares of agricultural land with no residents was required at this time or if ever. The Town Council had suggested that, if and when this site was developed, future residents "are likely to feel of part of Bishop's Stortford" yet offered no compelling evidence for this. Indeed, the consultations with existing Thorley residents suggested the opposite. Therefore, he also asked if a CGR of this area was appropriate at this time or whether it should be left to await the outcome of any potential development and the actual views of any future residents.

In reply, the Executive Member commented that, in carrying out a community governance review, the Council was required to have regard to the number of electors in the areas under review and any change in that number

which was likely to occur in the next five years. Electorate forecasts based on existing planning consents and projections in the East Herts District Plan suggested that by February 2023, there would be 300 dwellings on the site south of Whittington Way, which would be home to approximately 500 electors.

The current parish boundary ran through the site and therefore, when the site was developed, the boundary would no longer meet the Local Government Boundary Commission's guidance which was that parish boundaries 'should reflect the "no-man's land" between communities [...] or barriers such as rivers, roads or railways.'

The Executive, in reaching its recommendations to Council, had taken account of relevant information and the range of arguments presented by parties regarding the Review, including the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It had considered that once developed, the area concerned would be sufficiently different in character to other parts of Thorley Parish and that future residents of this urban extension to the town of Bishop's Stortford were likely to feel part of the Bishop's Stortford community.

Question 2

Roger Halford, Thorley, asked what compelling evidence had been submitted to Bishop's Stortford Town Council that must have caused them to ask for a Community Governance Review (CGR) to make drastic change to the town boundary with Thorley Parish, probably leading to the demise of the parish. Now that a considerably changed version of the request had been put forward

through the Executive, had the Town Council's original request been withdrawn and a new CGR proposed by the District Council. Further, if a new CGR was put forward by the District Council, should this not be considered by an independent body having no interest in the outcome.

In reply, the Executive Member stated that East Herts Council had agreed to undertake the CGR following a request from Bishop's Stortford Town Council. He suggested that the questioner would need to approach the Town Council regarding any background information to that request, which had not been withdrawn or varied.

Legislation provided that responsibility for community governance matters and the conduct of community governance reviews rested with principal authorities such as the District Council. Reviews were conducted impartially in accordance with the statutory criteria. There was no provision for any other body to carry out a community governance review and district councils across the country carried out such reviews on a regular basis, alongside but separate from their planning and other responsibilities.

Having agreed to proceed with a review, as the Principal Authority, East Herts Council had to take account of all relevant matters and evidence submitted, of which the Town Council's submission was only one element. It was open to East Herts Council to make recommendations that varied from those proposed by the body that had requested the review. In relation to this review, all evidence received had been considered against the criteria set out in the guidance in arriving at these recommendations.

In response to a supplementary question, the Executive Member confirmed that it was the Executive's recommendations that would go forward for public consultation, if agreed by Council.

Question 3

Anthony Robins, Thorley, commented that this review was stated to be in response to the request for boundary change by Bishop's Stortford Town Council. Given that the draft recommendations following the opinion expressed both by the Scrutiny Committee and the Executive differed so significantly in both fact and degree from the original request, he asked whether it would now be sensible for the Town Council to submit a revised request, and for Thorley Parish Council to submit its own counter proposal before the second consultation.

In response, the Executive Member referred to his reply to question 2, and that having agreed to undertake a community governance review, the Council had to consider all information received against the criteria in the statutory guidance. The Council was not limited to the terms of the original request and consideration of the evidence might lead the Council to recommend changes that were different to any initial request received. Any draft recommendations agreed later in this meeting would be published for a further round of public consultation before any final decisions were made. As part of this consultation, Thorley Parish Council might wish to submit their comments and/or any counter proposal which would be considered alongside all other submissions. Equally, Bishop's Stortford Town Council might also wish to submit a revised request but there was no requirement for them

to do so.

Question 4

Russell Cox, Bishop's Stortford, asked if the Executive Member agreed that, given Thorley and Bishop's Stortford had equal status as parishes, there was no reason why the proposed development land could not remain in Thorley.

In reply, the Executive Member referred to his response to question 1. The Executive had felt that the parish boundary which currently ran through the area identified for development south of Whittington Way should be reviewed and that it would be desirable for the area of proposed development to be within a single parish area. This led naturally, on to consideration of whether that parish should be Bishop's Stortford or Thorley. As he had stated previously, the Executive had taken account of the relevant information and range of arguments presented by parties and considered that, once developed, the area concerned would be different in character to other parts of Thorley Parish and that future residents of this urban extension were likely to feel part of the Bishop's Stortford community.

Question 5

Janet Rolph, Thorley, was not present to ask her question. She had referred to Thorley as a parish of scattered, identifiable communities, each focusing on different activities because of circumstances, but also having in common tradition, sense of place, and linkages homing in from settlements all around to its central village church. It already had community, connectivity and cohesion that

Community Governance Reviews were meant to achieve. She asked on what grounds and with what benefits for Thorley Street and Pig Lane residents, could the boundary move to the bypass, allowing encroachment of town into the very middle of parish land, be justified.

In reply, the Executive Member stated that the Executive's recommendations did not propose any change to the status of the areas around Thorley Street and Pig Lane which, contrary to Bishop's Stortford Town Council's original proposal, were recommended to remain part of Thorley Parish. Under the Executive's proposals, the only existing residents of Thorley Parish who would transfer to Bishop's Stortford Town Council were those in St Michael's Mead, which crossed the existing parish boundary so that boundary no longer met the government guidance. Relatively few consultation responses had been received from St Michael's Mead residents of Thorley compared to those in other parts of Thorley Parish.

Proposals in relation to community governance reflected actual and proposed development but they did not determine whether or not that development took place, which was a matter for the planning process. Under the Executive's proposals, Thorley Parish would remain in existence and it could be said that those areas included in the revised boundary of the Parish would share more strongly the common traditions, sense of place and identity that the questioner referred to.

Question 6

Sylvia McDonald, Thorley, asked why two quite different issues, with nothing in common apart from being two

examples of Bishop's Stortford town interests straddling Thorley village boundary, were being linked together in one of the Executive's recommendations at (B)2. This had been proposed ostensibly as meeting the "need to secure community governance which is reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area". Looking at order of magnitude, some 16% of St Michael's Mead physically fell in Thorley parish territory at its very western edge and in the other, some 95% of parish territory was being proposed for what was town urban extension and encroachment into the very middle of the village environs right up close to two of the scattered communities that categorised so many rural Hertfordshire villages. They were different issues needing separate procedural treatment.

In reply, the Executive Member commented that, in reaching its recommendations, the Executive had considered each element of the community governance review separately and as the questioner had suggested, different considerations had applied to each of the areas under review. In relation to St Michael's Mead, as stated in his reply to question 5, this existing development had crossed the parish boundary which therefore required revision.

In relation to the land to the south of Whittington Way, he had explained in his responses to questions 1 and 4 the Executive's approach to consideration of this site within the context of the review. Although the majority of the site was currently in Thorley, the view had been taken that once developed, it would have more in common with the town of Bishop's Stortford. He noted that the questioner herself had described the proposed development as 'town

urban extension’.

As both St Michael’s Mead and the land south of Whittington Way were proposed by the Executive for inclusion within the area of Bishop’s Stortford Town Council, both areas had been included in a single recommendation. However, for clarity and recognising the different considerations that had applied, he intended to move them as two separate recommendations.

In response to a supplementary question, the Executive Member commented that the size of the St Michael’s Mead settlement was not a consideration and that the proposals sought to regularise the current anomaly.

Question 7

Robin Lumsden, Thorley, asked if the combined effect of recommendations 3 and 4 meant that on a map of the proposed boundaries, if a straight line was drawn from end to end east to west following the line of the bypass across the areas, there would be ward boundary crossings from Thorley urban, into Bishop’s Stortford South, Thorley urban again, then Thorley rural. He suggested this arrangement did not lend itself to achievement of good governance and would mimic the already existing anomaly in Church Lane which had not been addressed in the Town Council’s original request for boundary change.

In reply, the Executive Member stated it would not because the proposal was for the new Thorley Parish Council, on its revised boundaries, to be unwarded, so there would be no crossings between Thorley Urban and Rural. There would be one stretch where the east-west line mentioned would

cross from Bishop's Stortford to Thorley and back again, but this was to address an issue within the Church Lane area that the questioner had mentioned. The recommendations before Council proposed that a small area north of the bypass should remain within Thorley, including the whole of Rectory Close which was currently split between Bishop's Stortford and Thorley.

In response to a supplementary question, the Executive Member confirmed that the Rectory Close proposal would be considered as part of tonight's recommendations.

Question 8

Ann Lowe, Bishop's Stortford, asked whether the numbered recommendations under (B) would be taken individually in turn, with any subsequent recommendations (or parts of recommendations) withdrawn if precluded by earlier approval or rejection of recommendations (or parts of recommendations). Also, would a recommendation, linking together two unrelated issues, for example as in recommendation (B)2, be treated as two separate recommendations.

In response, the Executive Member, in respect of recommendation (B)2, referred the questioner to his reply to question 6, in which he had indicated that he intended to move the two elements of that recommendation separately. On the other items he believed it would be for the Chairman to determine whether these were taken together or individually, which would depend on how the Members' debate unfolded.

In response to a supplementary question, the Executive

Member confirmed that no final decisions would be taken tonight and that a further round of consultation, running from May – July 2018, would take place.

9 EXECUTIVE REPORT - 24 APRIL 2018

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 24 April 2018 be received.

(see also Minutes 10 – 14)

10 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF BISHOP'S STORTFORD TOWN COUNCIL

Council considered a report on the Community Governance Review (CGR) of Bishop's Stortford Town Council. The Executive Member for Finance and Support Services presented the responses received during the initial consultation period for the CGR of Bishop's Stortford Town Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive. He referred to the criteria for making recommendations and the timetable for a further round of consultation on the recommendations agreed by Council.

Councillor G Williamson moved, and Councillor S Rutland-Barsby seconded a motion that the recommendations as printed in the report now submitted, be approved, except for recommendation (B)2 being split into (a) and (b) to separate the St Michael's Mead and the land south of Whittington Way issues.

In response to Members' questions and comments, it was confirmed that the consultation period would begin by the end of the next week in May and run until the last week in

July 2018.

The Chairman agreed to a request that each recommendation be put individually for Council to determine.

After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken individually, the recommendations now detailed were declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) the responses received to the initial consultation on the Community Governance Review of Bishop’s Stortford Town Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive in relation to the review, be received; and

(B) the draft recommendations of the Community Governance Review be approved as the basis for a further round of public consultation as follows:

(1) that the detailed ward boundary changes within the existing area of Bishop’s Stortford Town Council, as proposed by the Town Council and shown in the maps included in Essential Reference Paper B of the report submitted, be agreed;

(2) (a) that the whole of the St Michael’s Mead development be incorporated within Bishop’s Stortford; and

- (b) the proposed area of further housing development south of Whittington Way be incorporated within Bishop's Stortford;
- (3) that Thorley Street and the areas east of London Road and the railway, including Pig Lane and Twyford Bury Lane remain part of Thorley parish;
- (4) that the revised parish boundary between Bishop's Stortford and Thorley be as shown in the plan at paragraph 7.35 of the report now submitted;
- (5) that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be recommended to amend the district ward boundaries accordingly;
- (6) that the revised area of Thorley Parish Council be unwarded; and
- (7) that the revised Thorley Parish Council comprise of five parish councillors.

(see also Minute 9)

11 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF BUNTINGFORD TOWN COUNCIL

Council considered a report on the Community Governance Review (CGR) of Buntingford Town Council. The Executive Member for Finance and Support Services presented the responses received during the initial

consultation period for the CGR of Buntingford Town Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive. He referred to the criteria for making recommendations and the timetable for a further round of consultation on the recommendations agreed by Council.

Councillor G Williamson moved, and Councillor L Haysey seconded a motion that the recommendations as printed in the report now submitted, be approved.

Councillor J Jones expressed his support for the recommendations.

After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the recommendations were declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) the responses received to the initial consultation on the Community Governance Review of Buntingford Town Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive in relation to the review, be received; and

(B) the draft recommendations of the Community Governance Review be approved as the basis for a further round of public consultation as follows:

- (1) that the area including Parkside and the new housing development north of Park Farm Industrial Estate, shown as Area 'A' on the map in Essential Reference Paper B of the report submitted and currently in Cottered

Parish, be incorporated within the area of Buntingford Town Council;

- (2) that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be recommended to amend the district ward and county division boundaries accordingly; and
- (3) that the area occupied by Buntingford Business Park, shown as Area 'B' on the map in Essential Reference Paper B of the report submitted, remain part of Aspenden Parish and that no change be made to the parish boundary between Buntingford and Aspenden.

(see also Minute 9)

12 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF EASTWICK & GILSTON PARISH COUNCIL

Council considered a report on the Community Governance Review (CGR) of Eastwick & Gilston Parish Council. The Executive Member for Finance and Support Services presented the responses received during the initial consultation period for the CGR of Eastwick & Gilston Parish Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive. He referred to the criteria for making recommendations and the timetable for a further round of consultation on the recommendations agreed by Council.

Councillor G Williamson moved, and Councillor E Buckmaster seconded a motion that the recommendations as printed in the report now submitted, be approved.

After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the recommendations were declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations now detailed.

RESOLVED - that (A) the responses received to the initial consultation on the Community Governance Review of Eastwick & Gilston Parish Council, together with the recommendations of the Executive in relation to the review, be received; and

(B) the draft recommendations of the Community Governance Review be approved as the basis for a further round of public consultation as follows:

That the number of parish councillors to be elected to Eastwick and Gilston Parish Council by electors in Gilston Parish be increased from three to four, thereby increasing the total size of the grouped parish council with effect from the May 2019 parish elections to seven councillors.

(see also Minute 9)

13 ARDELEY PARISH CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLANS INCORPORATING THE THREE CONSERVATION AREAS OF ARDELEY, MOOR GREEN AND WOOD END

Council considered the recommendations of the Executive in respect of the Ardeley Parish Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans.

Councillor K Crofton referred to the local support for this matter.

The Leader moved, and Councillor M Allen seconded, the recommendations as now detailed. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the recommendations were declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) the responses to the public consultation be noted and the Officer responses and proposed changes to the Ardeley Parish Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans be supported;

(B) authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control, in consultation with the Executive Member for Development Management and Council Support, to make any further minor and consequential changes to the document which may be necessary; and

(C) the Ardeley Parish Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans incorporating the three conservation areas of Ardeley, Moor Green and Wood End be adopted.

(see also Minute 9)

14 OLD RIVER LANE RESOURCES

Council considered the recommendations of the Executive

in respect of Old River Lane Resources.

The Leader moved, and Councillor G Jones seconded, the recommendations as now detailed. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the recommendations were declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) up to £161,893 from the Priority Spend Reserve is allocated for recruiting a project manager on a 3 year fixed term contract (subject to the outcome of the Northgate End planning application) for the Old River Lane Project; and

(B) up to £100,000 from the Priority Spend Reserve is allocated for any ancillary legal costs for Old River Lane.

(see also Minute 9)

15 REVIEW OF CONSTITUTION

Council considered a report of the Constitutional Review Group on a revised constitution. Councillor B Deering referred to the length of time taken to complete this work and the detailed work undertaken on reviewing the constitution. He thanked Officers for their support to the Group.

Councillor B Deering moved, and Councillor L Haysey seconded, a motion that the recommendations now detailed, be approved. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendations as now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) the revised Council Constitution be approved;

(B) the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any minor amendments, correcting typographical or drafting errors and ensure all cross-references within the Constitution are correct prior to publication;

(C) Members of the Constitution Working Group be thanked for their contribution to the drawing up of the revised Constitution; and

(D) the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any consequential changes to the Constitution arising from any legislative changes or other decisions that may be taken during the year.

16 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S DECISION-MAKING ARRANGEMENTS

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services submitted a report reviewing the Council's decision-making structure. Council noted that the Leader had given notice that an additional Executive Member had been appointed and the consequent impact on portfolio areas was detailed in Essential Reference Paper 'B' of the report submitted.

Council was also advised that the size of the Conservative Group was now 45 and that there were now four sole independent Members. A revised list of group nominations to seats had been circulated at the updated

Essential Reference Paper 'D'. This included the appointment of Chairmen to committees and it was noted that Vice-Chairmen would be appointed at each committee's first meeting.

Councillor G Williamson moved, and Councillor D Andrews seconded, a motion that the recommendations now detailed, be approved. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

Council approved the proposals as now detailed.

RESOLVED – that (A) the following Scrutiny Committees, Regulatory Committees and Joint Committees be appointed, with the number of voting Members stated:

<u>Committee</u>	<u>No. of Members</u>
Overview and Scrutiny	14
Performance, Audit and Governance Scrutiny	14
Development Management	12
Human Resources	7
Licensing	12
Chief Officer Recruitment	5
East Herts Council and Stevenage Borough Council Joint Revenues and Benefits Committee (3 from East Herts and 3 from Stevenage)	6
Joint CCTV Executive (3 from East	12

Herts)

(B) the allocation of seats on committees in (A) above, as detailed at Essential Reference Paper 'C' of the report submitted, be approved;

(C) the membership and Chairmen of Scrutiny Committees, Regulatory Committees, joint Committees be as set out in Essential Reference Paper 'D' of the report submitted, with Members being appointed in accordance with the wishes of the political group to whom the seats on these bodies have been allocated;

(D) the intention of the Leader of the Council to appoint 6 Members to the Executive (in addition to the Leader) with the portfolio responsibilities as detailed at Essential Reference Paper 'B' of the report submitted, be noted;

(E) the programme of Council meetings, as detailed at paragraph 5.1 of the report submitted, be approved;

(F) the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make changes in the standing membership of committees and joint committees in (A) above, in accordance with the wishes of the political group to whom seats on these bodies have been allocated;

(G) the action to be taken by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Leader, under delegated authority, concerning the

appointment of representatives to outside bodies, be noted; and

(H) the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make such amendments to the Council's constitution as may be necessary to account for the decisions in (A) to (G) above.

17 OUTSIDE BODIES - ANNUAL REPORT

Council considered an annual report reviewing the activities of outside bodies to which the Council appointed representatives

Councillor J Wyllie moved, and Councillor Mrs D Hollebon seconded, a motion that the recommendation now detailed, be approved. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendation now detailed.

RESOLVED – that the reports of Members, as now submitted, be received.

18 EXTENSION OF THE MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report requesting an extension to the current Members' Allowances Scheme until 25 July 2018.

Councillor I Devonshire moved, and Councillor P Moore seconded, a motion that the recommendation now detailed, be approved. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendation now detailed.

RESOLVED – that the deadline for consideration of the Members' Allowance Scheme 2017/18 be extended until the next meeting of Council on 25 July 2018.

19 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2018-19

Council was invited to consider a recommendation from the Human Resources Committee meeting of 18 April 2017 on the Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 (Minute 440 refers). Council noted that a Pay Policy Statement was required to be produced annually under the Localism Act 2011.

Councillor C Woodward moved, and Councillor B Deering seconded, a motion that the recommendation now detailed, be approved. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the motion was declared CARRIED.

Council approved the recommendation now detailed.

RESOLVED – that the Pay Policy Statement 2018/19 be approved.

20 LICENSING COMMITTEE: MINUTES - 15 NOVEMBER 2018

Councillor D Andrews moved, and Councillor G Cutting seconded, a motion that the Minutes now detailed, be received. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the Minutes were received.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Licensing

Committee meeting held on 15 November 2017, be received.

21 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: MINUTES - 12 DECEMBER 2017 AND 20 FEBRUARY 2018

Councillor M Allen moved, and Councillor J Goodeve seconded, a motion that the Minutes now detailed, be received. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the Minutes were received.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 12 December 2017 and 20 February 2018, be received.

22 HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE: MINUTES - 10 JANUARY 2018

Councillor C Woodward moved, and Councillor S Bull seconded, a motion that the Minutes now detailed, be received. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the Minutes were received.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Human Resources Committee meeting held on 10 January 2018, be received.

23 PERFORMANCE, AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: MINUTES - 16 JANUARY 2018

Councillor M Pope moved, and Councillor M Allen seconded, a motion that the Minutes now detailed, be received. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the Minutes were received.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Performance, Audit and Governance Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 16 January 2018, be received.

24 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: MINUTES - 31 JANUARY, 27 MARCH AND 28 MARCH 2018

Councillor T Page moved, and Councillor J Jones seconded, a motion that the Minutes now detailed, be received. After being put to the meeting, and a vote taken, the Minutes were received.

RESOLVED – that the Minutes of the Development Management Committee meetings held on 31 January, 27 March and 28 March 2018, be received.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

Chairman
Date