

## MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

4 March, 2021 at 7.30 pm via MS Teams

The Worshipful the Mayor (Councillor E Gill ) in the chair.

Members of the Council present      Councillors M Adams, A Alderson, D Anderson-Bassey, J Broadhead, T Burton, I Chaudhri, D Clarke, D Cotty, M Cressey, S Dennett, R Edis, J R Furey, E Gill, L Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey, M Harnden, M Heath, C Howorth, J Hulley, N King, R King M Kusneraitis, S Lewis, S Mackay, M Maddox, I Mullens, A Neathey, M Nuti, J Olorenshaw, N Prescott, P Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi, S Walsh, D Whyte, S Whyte, M Willingale and J Wilson

Members of the Council absent:      Councillors M Brierley and B A Clarke.

### 465    MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor made her announcements.

### 466    MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 9 February ,2021 were confirmed and signed as correct record.

### 467    APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor B Clarke

### 468    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared

### 469    **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 12**

**Question 1: From Aileen Owen Davies, a local resident:**

**“In view of the now undisputed climate emergency and the recognised need by the Government for more tree cover, can the Council tell me what targets they have set for increasing the tree cover in Runnymede?”**

Cllr Heath, Deputy Leader of the Council, responded as follows:

*‘You may be aware that Surrey County Council have set a plan to plant 1.2 million trees by 2030 and they have asked all Boroughs to help them achieve this. Runnymede are now working with Surrey County Council on a Joint Renewable and Tree Cover Assessment. We have identified potential sites with relevant GIS data and this has been provided to SCC for assessment. This is positive news and will be funded by SCC.*

*RBC are also seeking future opportunities in conjunction with our existing policies and Local Plan. So for example we have looked at our Planning policies.*

*Under Policy EE1 it states that development proposals ‘Contribute to and enhance the quality of the public realm and/or landscape setting through high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes.*

*And the supporting text states that*

*“Development proposals will need to consider the impact on existing trees and other vegetation and should include measures to enhance their role through retention, additional or replacement planting.”*

*We will be seeking this in planning applications.*

*Just as importantly as adding new trees is the protection of our existing trees:*

*Para 7.64 in the Natural Environment section of our Local Plan sets out our intention to protect trees in the Borough through development. ‘Trees and woodlands form part of the Green infrastructure network and help define our areas’.*

*The Council has the power to protect trees through the use of Tree Preservation Orders. I recently used such in my own ward and encourage other members and the public to identify trees we should protect.*

*Finally, I would add that I have been introduced by my colleagues Cllr Chaudhri and Cllr Howorth to the proposal to create a Field of Memories within Runnymede which involves a tree being planted for lives lost in the COVID 19 pandemic. So, we are exploring all sorts of innovative ways in which we can have more trees. We are extremely lucky that Surrey is the most wooded country in the UK and that we will be adding to that.’*

*In response Mrs Owen Davies asked what the Council strategy was to increase the total carbon absorbing tree cover.*

*Cllr Heath reiterated the new Local Plan Policy to add and protect trees. The Council had recently appointed a new Tree Officer and stated that if any person sees removal of trees, they should contact the Council or their Councillors as it was important to protect the trees we have as well as planting more trees.*

**Question 2: From Deb Long, a local resident:**

**The policy SD7 Sustainable Design which I have queried some points thereon:  
Bullet point 2: 'Opportunities to achieve net gains in biodiversity and greening' The fact that your contractors are still using glyphosates doesn't sit well with enhancing biodiversity. The budget contractors spend on glyphosates could be used for wildflower rewilding. Please explain what was meant by 'pushing back' on glyphosates, also where are these opportunities for net gains in biodiversity, have you examples? It appears there is no budget for wildflower planting, and it is being delivered by developers when it's clearly not usually their priority, Developers are geared to maximum profit gain.**

Cllr Heath, Deputy Leader of the Council, responded as follows:

*‘Planning does not deal with the specific matter of glyphosates but since the new Local Plan was adopted, we have been requesting developers provide biodiversity enhancements in their developments and we have been securing these by imposing planning conditions.*

*Indeed Objective 9 of the Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the Borough’s biodiversity, habitats and species and to contribute to net gains in biodiversity. The Monitoring framework at Appendix A of the Local Plan sets out the indicators which will be monitored. We can send you that document if you like.*

*As planning permissions have 3 years to be implemented, it is too early in the lifetime of the Local Plan to ascertain the success of the policy, but we are collecting information as we go forward.*

*Our planning policy team have also commissioned a special guidance document on blue and green infrastructure and when this document is adopted, we will be able to promote this to developers and residents with ideas about achieving biodiversity enhancements.*

*In regards to wider use of glyposates we endeavour to minimise the use of weed killer wherever we can. So, for example we use manual weed control (hand weeding or hoeing) in our flower and shrub beds in the staffed parks. We have also discussed alternatives to chemical weed control on hard surfaces with our ground's maintenance contractor, but a conclusion has yet to be reached because progress has been hampered recently by the pandemic. It will be pursued.*

*With regard to wildflowers, the Council has adjusted its maintenance regime at several of its roadside verges over recent years to create small wildflower meadows – Barrsbrook Farm Road in Chertsey, Dudley Close in Addlestone and Ridgemoor Road in Englefield Green. In addition, there are larger wildflower meadows in some of its open spaces - Homewood Park and Bourne Meadow in Chertsey, Hythe Park in Egham, Marshall Place in New Haw and on part of Thorpe Green. But the most notable site is Chertsey Meads which covers 71 hectares (175 acres) and the meadow there supports more than 400 plant species (including 19 species identified as scarce in Surrey and 4 identified as rare in Surrey), 116 species of birds (of which 12 are Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority species and 22 are on the Birds of Conservation Concern Red list) and 789 invertebrate species that have been recorded on the site, including 23 Nationally Notable species and 8 Red Data Book species.*

*We will do everything we can to rid the use of chemicals in our management and maintenance programmes and as we are currently looking at Grounds Maintenance options going forward this will be a key consideration.'*

Ms Long asked if the budget will be increased for this work and Cllr Heath stated that the Council would be looking at its entire grounds maintenance contract and that whilst the overall budget will not be increased it might be possible to redirect more funding to this area of work.

**Question 3: From Steve Ringham, a local resident:**

**In 2019 Friends of The Earth surveyed and scored borough councils in the UK and produced a league table. The detailed methodology is in the published document, but here is a summary of the criteria:**

**The issues scored are: household energy efficiency; eco-heating; renewable energy; proportion using public transport, cycling or walking; electric vehicle chargers; lift-sharing; tree cover; and reuse, recycling and composting of household waste.  
(Link to document:**

**<https://policy.friendsoftheearth.uk/download/league-table-local-authority-performance-climate-change> )**

**Runnymede scored 72% - 6th place by score out of 15 score groups and the same as about 40 other councils. 92% being the highest score. By comparison Spelthorne was in the bottom cohort with only 40%.**

**As you may know, Spelthorne has declared a climate emergency, Runnymede has not. One take-away from this report could be that such declarations can be worthless without concrete actions to back them up. So I would like to offer my congratulations to the council and it's staff on the work done so far in this matter and to achieve the score they did.**

**However, this score actually only placed Runnymede in the median for all councils. And in it's summary of the report, Friends Of The Earth opined that:**

***“All local authorities, even the best performing, need to do much more if climate catastrophe is to be averted. The government needs to provide them with the powers and resources to do so, and it needs to do much more itself. All local authorities should adopt an ambitious local climate action plan. And they should join with Friends of the Earth and others in urging more government action. Each local authority should declare a climate emergency as a sign of political intent.”***

The Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill is currently in Parliament.

Website: <https://www.cebill.uk/>

This is a cross-party bill, supported by 98 MPs across the political spectrum. But as yet, no Conservative MPs.

It offers a real opportunity to put Climate Action at the heart of everything our government does. It will protect our bio-diversity, and it will legally oblige the UK to take responsibility for its greenhouse gas emissions throughout our economy and our supply chain. It will oblige the UK to contribute fairly to climate mitigation consistent with limiting global temperatures increase to 1.5°C, as we signed up to in the Paris Agreement. It will give councils and citizens a means to hold our government to account for any failures to protect us from any avoidable harm from Climate Change

But there is a real danger that it will be deliberately run out of debate time by the Leader of The House of Commons, in order to suppress it. Because if passed, it will hold the Prime Minister and Government of the day legally responsible for failure to protect this country against the worst

So this is not yet another question about declaring a Climate Emergency. That has been asked of this council back in December 2020. And it would be wonderful if this council decided to show political intent to the outside world. It is, however, related to the demand contained in Friends Of The Earth’s report.

What I would like to know, is, regardless of Climate Emergency declarations, will the council show itself to be forward-thinking, progressive and mindful of its duties to do the best for its residents, by publicly signing up to, supporting and promoting the CEE Bill. And in turn, ask Dr Ben Spencer, our MP for Runnymede, in the strongest possible terms, to add his support for the bill and do his best to ensure the bill can complete its passage through Parliament?’

Cllr Heath, Deputy Leader of the Council, responded as follows:

*‘From the scoring I am pleased that Runnymede is doing ok but we clearly can do more and will do more. The Friends of the Earth summary states that all local authorities should adopt an ambitious local climate action plan and I am pleased to say we are doing that and our strategy will be out shortly. The Council has cut carbon emissions by 60% and we have other projects in progress. The forthcoming Climate Change conference will raise the profile and encourage more to be done.*

*I cannot speak for a democratic body by saying here tonight that this Council will sign up, support and promote the CEE Bill. I can say I will ask members of the Climate Change Member Working Party to have a look at the Bill and whether they feel it is something they want to put forward for the Environment and Sustainability Committee on which to vote if they feel it has merit. I can of course ask Dr Spencer to consider the Bill as well and will send him an email this evening for his opinion.’*

Mr Ringham asked to be kept informed of progress on this matter and dates of any meetings when the matter would be considered. Cllr Heath confirmed that the Democratic Services Manager would do this.

**Question 4: From Vanessa Kane, a local resident:**

The Corporate Head of Law and Governance read out the following question on behalf of Ms Kane:

**Has the Council produced a Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document? This was due this month (Feb) to provide more detailed information in terms of how new developments can contribute towards the delivery of Green & Blue Infrastructure (GBI) in support of the Local Plan's vision.**

Cllr Willingale, Chairman of the Planning Committee, responded as follows:

*'It is regrettable that due to staff shortages the completion of the SPD has been delayed. An external consultant had been employed to work on the final drafting of the SPD. The Planning Policy team is producing a Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document and the project has been reprogrammed following a restructuring of work priorities within the team. The current timetable being worked to for this project is set out as follows:*

<i>Council to return comments</i>	<i>26<sup>th</sup> March</i>
<i>Consultant to return final draft for checking</i>	<i>23<sup>rd</sup> April</i>
<i>Council to make final comments (if necessary)</i>	<i>7<sup>th</sup> May</i>
<i>Consultant to return final draft for consultation</i>	<i>28<sup>th</sup> May</i>
<i>Draft SPD to Member Working Party</i>	<i>Mid-June 2021</i>
<i>Draft SPD to Planning Committee</i>	<i>July 2021</i>
<i>Consultation of draft SPD</i>	<i>Aug-Sept 2021</i>
<i>Response to representations by the Council and Consultant. Amend draft SPD as necessary and return final SPD to Council</i>	<i>Oct 2021</i>
<i>SPD to committee for adoption</i>	<i>Nov 2021</i>

In response Ms Kane asked if there would be public consultation prior to adoption of the SPD.

Councillor Willingale confirmed that public consultation would take place between August and September and that the Statement of Community Involvement listed out the methods of communication.

470 **PETITIONS**

No petitions had been submitted by Members of the Council under Standing Order No 19.

471 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER 13**

**Question from Councillor S Whyte to the Leader of the Council**

**Recycling of Tetra Paks**

**'Tetra Paks, such as cartons used for juices, soups and other liquids, are not currently collected by Runnymede Borough Council from the doorstep and yet 65% of councils across the country do operate this facility, including our close neighbours in Surrey Heath. Runnymede Borough Council have provided this facility previously, but it has been withdrawn for a number of years.**

**Whilst it is possible for individual households to collect the cartons and take them to a recycling facility, such as Lyne Recycling Centre, it would help to increase our recycling rates, reduce landfill and also reduce the number of car journeys, if they were collected from the doorstep.**

**Does the Leader agree with me that Runnymede Borough Council should look into collecting Tetra Paks from the doorstep as soon as possible, to increase our recycling rates, reduce car journeys and reduce the number of unnecessary cartons sent to land fill?'**

Cllr Prescott responded as follows:

*'Having sought comment from colleagues at SCC (the waste disposal authority) and the Corporate Head of Environmental Services on the collection and disposal of Tetra Pak's across Surrey the current position with respect to Runnymede is as follows:*

*Unfortunately due to its composition (Tetra Pak is made up of several layers) it is very difficult to separate at a MRF (Mixed Recycling Facility), this currently results in it being sent to EFW (Energy from Waste e.g. incineration) Therefore it is not currently recycled and is not financially viable at this time to add this as a target material within the kerbside collection of DMR (Dry Mixed Recycling).*

*Tetra Pak and cartons can however continue to be recycled at the CRC sites within Surrey as these are dedicated collection points for reprocessing'.*

*Runnymede like other of the authorities in Surrey is directed by SCC as to where it takes its DMR and at this point in time as explained above, the designated MRF does not accept Tetra Pak's.*

*In seeking clarification of the Surrey Heath position I am informed by JWS (Joint Waste Solutions) who manage their contract that the DMR contract in the joint contract areas is again managed by SCC (with the exception of Mole Valley). Historically, when the boroughs managed their DMR contracts individually, the contracts in Woking and Elmbridge for instance prohibited the acceptance of cartons/Tetra Pak, whereas SHBC had a different re-processor which accepted this material. Today, SHBC DMR is sent to a different processing facility than the other areas. There is a difference in the messaging provided to residents in the joint contract areas to reflect these differences.*

*As they can't be accepted as part of the kerbside mix, Woking and Elmbridge residents can take their cartons to bring banks within the borough, which are managed by Ace UK, as well as the CRC's.*

*It is understood that cartons are likely to be included in the scope of materials in the future Resource and Waste Strategy, and that the consultation regarding material acceptance and consistency is likely to continue again in the summer.*

*Should I hear more re Surrey Heath I will provide a further update and consult with the Chairman and Vice- Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee on possible options as part of review of the Recycling Strategy.'*

*Cllr S Whyte asked for the matter to be kept under review and commented that many residents were unaware they could take the cartons to the Community Recycling Centres.*

*Cllr R King suggested that supermarkets would be more convenient locations for recycling points for cartons.*

*Cllr Gillham stated that the way forward had to be guided by the new Environment Bill which had unfortunately been delayed. Cllr Gillham noted the concerns expressed by Cllr Whyte and would raise the matter at Surrey Environment Partnership meetings whenever the opportunity arose.*

472 **PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF MAYORAL SELECTION**

**RESOLVED that –**

**The nomination of Councillor Elaine Gill for the office of Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 be confirmed.**

473 **PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF DEPUTY MAYORAL SELECTION**

**RESOLVED that –**

**the nomination of Councillor Margaret Harnden for the office of Deputy Mayor for the Municipal Year 2021/22 be confirmed.**

474 **ADOPTION OF RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)**

Council considered a recommendation from the Planning Committee which had met on 10 February 2021 regarding the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

Some Members commented on the list of minimum communication methods specified in para 1.29 of the SCI and emphasised the importance of using methods above and above the minimum, and methods other than social media to consult residents. It was suggested that meetings of the Community Planning Panel and Development Forum should be held. Other methods apart from those shown in bold in para 1.29 should be used to assist those persons who did not have internet access and while the offices were closed due to Covid.

In response, Cllr Willingale, Chairman of Planning Committee, confirmed that the methods shown in bold in the SCI were a minimum for all consultations and met the tests of legal soundness, but a detailed Communications Strategy, which would be the key tool to identify routes of communication, would be reported to the Infrastructure MWP on 15 March for Member consideration and input, and suggestions from Members were welcomed thereon. Cllr Willingale reassured Members that innovative ways of communication would be considered and that the minimum methods would not be the only methods employed.

**RESOLVED that-**

**the Statement of Community Involvement be ADOPTED, with a commencement date of 5 March 2021.**

475 **ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/22**

Council considered a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee which had met on 25 February 2021 regarding approval of the Annual Pay Policy Statement 2021/22

**RESOLVED that –**

**The Annual Pay Policy Statement 2021/22, as reported, be adopted.**

**476 ADOPTION OF REVISED EQUALITY POLICY**

Council considered a recommendation from the Corporate Management Committee which had been held on 25 February 2021 regarding adoption of a revised Equality Policy

The Leader of the Labour Group, Cllr Neathey welcomed the Policy which was something that the Council should take a lead on. Cllr Neathey also issued a personal statement on anti-semitism and an apology to Jewish residents in the borough for the past lack of action by the Labour Party to address anti-semitism.

Cllr Anderson-Basseby referred to a company which helped organisations to become more inclusive and he had forwarded details to the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council. Cllr Prescott stated that this would be given further consideration by the Health and Wellbeing MWP. Consideration would also be given to briefing sessions on Equalities for Members.

Council unanimously supported adoption of the revised Policy and-

**RESOLVED that -**

**The revised Equality Policy, as reported, be adopted.**

**477 MINORITY GROUP PRIORITY BUSINESS**

No items of Minority Group Priority business had been registered under Standing Order 23.

**478 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME – ADOPTION**

Council approval was sought for i) the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2021/22, with effect from 1 April 2021, ii) the composition of the Selection Panel and authority to commence the recruitment process for the Independent Remuneration Panel to undertake the triennial review of Members' Allowances, and iii) commencement of the review in October 2021.

The Council was required further to the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 to agree a scheme of Members' Allowances for the year 2021/22 and in doing so, give due regard to the recommendations made by the report of the Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Councillors, whose latest report was published in early 2019.

The current Scheme had been put in place following a triennial review of Members' Allowances by the Independent Remuneration Panel in 2019. In accordance with the decision of Full Council on 7 March 2019, the Basic Allowance would be increased by RPI in 2021/22 and the Special Responsibility and Co-optee Allowances would similarly be increased.

In line with the normal practice, the Council was recommended to revoke the existing scheme and adopt the amended scheme of Members' Allowances as reported. This was moved and duly seconded.

The next scheduled triennial review of the Members' Allowances Scheme by the Independent Remuneration Panel would commence in or around October 2021. This Panel consisted of five persons who represented residents' associations, business, voluntary sector, education and health. Four of the current panellists could serve for a further term if they wished and, so far, two of them had indicated they were willing to continue. However, a replacement Business panellist would need to be recruited as Councillor Adams who was a panellist before he became a Councillor could no longer sit on the Panel. A replacement Education panellist would also need



to be recruited as the previous panellist was no longer eligible. A response was still awaited from the current Health panellist.

In line with previous practice, interviews of the candidates would be undertaken by a Selection Panel. The Selection Panel would be advised by the Corporate Head of Law and Governance, as the Monitoring Officer, and consist of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Standards and Audit Committee and the Leader of the Council. At the last review the Leader of the RIRG also sat on the Panel being the only other minority group at that time. However, since that time there were now more minority groups on the Council, and it was suggested that a total of 2 members be drawn from all the minority groups. To have a representative from all groups would make the Panel unwieldy.

As previously requested by Members, the Panel would review the level of special responsibility allowances paid to Members with special responsibilities and also in particular for the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Standards and Audit Committee, for the Deputy Leader of the Council and for the Group Leaders other than the Leader of the Council.

Cllr D Whyte raised concern that Councillors were in receipt of other remuneration which was not openly disclosed on the Council's website. Cllr Whyte wished to move an Amendment that there should be full disclosure of all remuneration on grounds of transparency and that the Members Allowances scheme be amended to include all payments to Members including, but not limited to remuneration for membership of Member Working Parties.

The CHLG advised Council that the Amendment could not be accepted as the payments made in respect of Member Working Parties did not form part of the Members Allowances Scheme but fell under a separate scheme. Whilst the payment of allowances for membership of Member Working Parties was mentioned in the Council's Statement of Accounts, the CHLG would give consideration as to how greater transparency could be given to this information and would report back to Members thereon by 31 March 2021.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that Members received no other payments than the Members Allowances and payments for MWP membership.

The Labour Group considered that in the current challenging financial situation facing the Council and its residents that it could not support the increase in Members Allowances and moved an Amendment that the Allowances be reduced as set out below which was a reflection of previous pay awards to staff:

Allowance Type	Apr 2021-Mar 2022	
Basic Allowance	1	£3,905
Mayor	2	£3,905
Deputy Mayor	3	£976
Leader of Council	4	£7,810
Deputy Leader of the Council	5	£1,953
Political Group Leader other than Leader of Council	6	£2,929
Chairman of Planning Committee	7	£6,834
Chairman of Corporate Management Committee	8	£3,905
Chairman of Environment & Sustainability Committee	9	£3,905
Chairman of Housing Committee	10	£3,905
Chairman of Community Services Committee	11	£3,905

Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Select Committee	12	£3,905
Chairman of Licensing Committee	13	£3,905
Chairman of Regulatory Committee	14	£1,953
Chairman of Standards & Audit Committee	15	£1,288
Chairman of Englefield Green Committee	16	£976
Vice Chairman of Planning Committee	17	£4,556
Vice Chairman of Corporate Management Committee	18	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Environmental & Sustainability Committee	19	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Housing Committee	20	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Community Services Committee	21	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Standards & Audit Committee	22	£488
Vice Chairman of Licensing Committee	23	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Select Committee	24	£1,953
Vice Chairman of Regulatory Committee	25	£976
Member of Planning Committee other than Chair & VC	26	£2,278
Member of Corporate Management who are NE to any other SA	27	£976
Chairman of Joint Committee	28	£3,905
Vice Chairman of Joint Committee	29	£1,953

The Leader of the Council stated that the Members Allowances were not a salary so it would be inappropriate to link them to staff pay awards. The majority of Members considered that it should be left to Members individual discretion as to whether they took their full Allowances. Other Members mentioned that the Runnymede Scheme of Allowances was low compared with other Councils in the South East and that the payment of allowances removed a potential barrier to a person becoming a Councillor and avoided deterring existing Councillors from effectively fulfilling their full role. Some Members also considered lowering of allowances would create a barrier for those persons on low incomes who wished to stand as a Councillor and could result in a council membership which was not reflective of the community it served.

A requisition that the voting on the Amendment be recorded under Standing Order 25.2 was made by Councillor R King, and the voting was recorded as shown below:

*For (2): Councillors R King and Neathey.*

*Against (33) Councillors Adams, Alderson, Anderson-Bassey, Broadhead, Burton, Chaudhri, D Clarke, Cotty, Cressey, Dennett, Edis, Furey, Gill, Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey, Heath, Howorth, Hulley, N King, Kusneraitis, Lewis, Mackay, Maddox, Nuti, Olorenshaw, Prescott, Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi, Walsh, Willingale and Wilson*

*Abstentions (4): Councillors Hamden, Mullens, D Whyte and S Whyte*

### **The Amendment was lost**

The voting on the original Motion was recorded as follows;

*For (33) Councillors Adams, Alderson, Anderson-Bassey, Broadhead, Burton, Chaudhri, D Clarke, Cotty, Cressey, Dennett, Edis, Furey, Gill, Gillham, J Gracey, T Gracey, Heath, Howorth, Hulley, N King, Kusneraitis, Lewis, Mackay, Maddox, Nuti, Olorenshaw, Prescott, Snow, J Sohi, P Sohi, Walsh, Willingale and Wilson*

*Against (4): Councillors R King, Neathey, D Whyte and S Whyte*

*Abstentions (2): Councillors Hamden and Mullens,*

**The Motion was passed and it was -**

**RESOLVED that:**

- i) the existing Members' Allowances Scheme be revoked as from 31 March 2021 and the Members' Allowances Scheme, as reported, be adopted for the year 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022;**
- ii) the composition of the selection panel (Chairman or Vice- Chairman of Standards and Audit Committee, Leader of the Council and 2 Members representing the minority groups (tbc)) be approved; and**
- ii) the recruitment process for the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to undertake the triennial review of Members Allowances be commenced; and the review by the IRP commence in October.**

(The meeting ended at 9.48 pm)

Mayor