



Committee and Date  
COUNCIL  
  
9 December 2010  
  
10.00 a.m.

Item  
  
**3**

## MINUTES

OF

MEETING OF SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL

HELD ON 11 NOVEMBER 2010  
AT 12 NOON

PRESENT:

Mr P Adams  
Mrs B J Baker  
Mr T Barker  
Mr K R Barrow  
Mrs J B Barrow  
Mr T Bebb  
Mr M Bennett  
Mr W Benyon  
Mr T Biggins  
Mrs K Burgoyne  
Mr V Bushell JP  
Mr G Butler  
Mrs A Caesar-Homden  
Mrs K D Calder  
Mr S Charmley  
Mrs A M Chebsey  
Mr J E Clarke  
Mr G L Dakin  
Mr S Davenport  
Mr A B Davies  
Mr T Davies  
Mrs P A Dee  
Mr J T Durnell

Mr D W Evans  
Mr R A Evans  
Mr E J Overall  
Mr J A Gibson  
Mr J B Gillow OBE  
Mr N J Hartin  
Mrs E A Hartley  
Mr R Huffer  
Mrs T Huffer  
Mr V J Hunt  
Mr J Hurst-Knight  
Dr J E Jones  
Mrs J Jones  
Mr S P A Jones  
Mr J M W Kenny  
Mrs H M Kidd  
Mr C J Lea  
Mr D G Lloyd MBE  
Mr C J Mellings  
Mrs C M A Motley  
Mrs M R Mullock  
Mrs E M Nicholls  
Mr M J Owen JP

Mr W M Parr  
Mrs E A Parsons  
Mr M G Pate  
Mr P F Phillips  
Mr M T Price  
Mr K Roberts  
Mrs D M Shingleton  
Mr J Tandy  
Mr M Taylor-Smith  
Mrs R T D Taylor-Smith  
Mr R Tindall  
Mr G F Tonkinson  
Mr A E Walpole  
Mr S J West  
Mr M Whiteman  
Mrs C Wild  
Mr B B Williams RD  
Mr J M Williams  
Mr L J P Winwood  
Mr M L Wood  
Mrs T Woodward  
Mr P A D Wynn

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725

## 84. APOLOGIES

The Chief Executive reported apologies for absence had been received from Mr R Hughes, Mr D J Minnery, Mr A N Mosley, Mr P A Nutting, Mr D W L Roberts and Dr M Winchester.

## 85. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

- (a) Mr C J Mellings declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 - (Changes to Staff Terms and Conditions) because of his wife's employment by the Council.
- (b) Mrs B J Baker declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 9 because of her husband's employment by the Council.
- (c) Mrs C Wild declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 because of her partner's employment by the Council
- (d) Mr K Roberts declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 because of his wife's employment by the Council.
- (e) Mrs A M Chebsey declared a personal interest in Item 9 as a member of UNITE.
- (f) Mr M Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 as a Unison member and Vice-Chairman of the Shrewsbury Branch.
- (g) Mr J E Clarke declared a personal interest in Item 9 as a member of Unite.
- (h) Mr V Bushell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 9 as a member of Unite.

## 86. MINUTES

### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2010 be approved and confirmed as a correct record.

## 87. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### (a) Chairman's Engagements

The Chairman referred members to the list of official engagements carried out by himself and the Speaker and Vice-Chairman since the last meeting on 30 September 2010, which had been circulated at the meeting.

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--

## 88. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Speaker announced that three questions and a statement had been received in accordance with Procedural Rule 14 from Ms V. Dampuré, Mr D Baker and Mr M Dawes, as well as a request to make a statement from Ms P Middleton. As neither Ms Dampuré or Mr Baker were able to attend the meeting their questions and the replies from the Partnership Working, Performance and Productivity and the Children and Young People's Portfolio Holders, respectively, had been tabled.

(a) Ms V Dampuré asked the following question:

'The Big Society may be represented by charities, social enterprises, community interest companies (CICs) and other voluntary groups. How many CICs are there in Shropshire and does the Council give rate relief to them?'

Mr Gwilym Butler, the Portfolio Holder for Partnership Working Performance and Productivity and Customer Service replied:-

'There are 31 Community Interest Companies (CICs) based in Shropshire and registered with the Regulator of Community Interest Companies. Two of the 31 CICs work only in the Shrewsbury area. There is an additional CIC operating in Telford only. Further information is available from <http://www.cicregulator.gov.uk/index.shtml>

CICs are not eligible for rate relief in the same ways as charities. Instead, they can in certain circumstances apply for discretionary rate relief. The Council recently reviewed its policy on this. To be eligible, CICs need to prove they are established 'not for profit'. Applications are considered on a case by case basis.'

(b) Mr D Baker asked the following question:

1. Para 9 p3: pressures acute as pupil population continues to fall. I would be grateful if some explanation could be given to reconcile this with Mr Taylor's statement last summer that Primary Schools would reach their minimum number of students next year and Secondary Schools would so in 2014.
2. Para 20: I would be interested if you could confirm that a contributory factor to this "legacy of competition" was the proposal in January 2008 to close 24 Primary Schools.
3. Para 22: I would be grateful if a requirement could be added specifically for a Community Impact Assessment.
4. I would be grateful for comments on the significance of analysing out of catchment area pupils.
5. Why do the effective closure dates for Secondary Schools now appear to be a year late?

Mrs Aggie Caesar-Homden the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People's Services replied:

1. Shropshire pupil numbers have, on average fallen by 500 per annum, for the last five years. This equates to a dedicated schools grant funding reduction of £10m. The funding gap between the dedicated schools grant received from the Department for Education and the amount needed to fund our 157 Shropshire maintained schools is over £1m each year. The decline in Primary pupil numbers entering their first year of schooling is likely to stabilise in 2011. However, the Reception year is still slightly smaller than the year Six numbers leaving primary schools, therefore further decreases in Primary pupils numbers are projected between 2010 and 2011. The number of unfilled or surplus Primary places is predicted to increase to 14% next year. The Government recommendation is for local authorities to maintain surplus places no greater than 5% across all maintained schools. Secondary numbers are now falling rapidly, so the overall number of pupils in Shropshire schools is reducing quickly, placing acute pressures on budgets. In the second half of this decade, numbers are expected to begin to recover, but numbers are not forecast to exceed the 2006 levels in the foreseeable future, and so pressure will remain on budgets. In addition, numbers are not declining evenly across the county and the rise will also be more pronounced in some areas than in others. This is why the proposed review would be intended to take place on an area basis.
2. The proposal of the Administration of the former Shropshire County Council was to undertake a review of 22 individual schools which may have led to school closures. The proposed vision and school organisation policy for Shropshire Council has been shaped and informed by the findings of the Independent Policy Commission, a cross party group of councillors from all political parties and most importantly the input and views of headteachers, governors, staff, parents, pupils, partners, local town and parish councils and members of the public. This policy is new and very different. The proposal is to review educational provision on an area by area basis recognising the diversity, mix and range of educational needs within our county. There is no link between any "legacy of competition" and the previous proposal. The competition referred to in the report reflects the culture of educational targets and school performance league tables, which combined with parental choice and the availability of more school places than pupils to fill them, creates a competitive tension between some schools.
3. All Council policies are subject to a Community Impact Assessment. This will involve looking at the role and place of each school within its local community and how it provides not only education, and extended services before and after the school day for pupils and families, but also how it is currently used as an asset to serve the needs of the community. Any impact of change in terms of school provision will therefore need to be assessed in terms of the impact on its use as a facility by the local village, town or market town it serves. In the event of any proposal to close a school, the decision making body (usually the Council's Cabinet) is given specific guidance by the Department

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725

for Education on the factors to be taken into account. This includes the impact on the community of the loss of the school as a service, the effect on travel, the effect on community cohesion and the effect on access to education. The Council will also undertake an environmental impact assessment for each and every proposal that emerges.

4. The criterion refers to the analysis of both in and out of area pupils. It is recognised that good schools are an important resource within their local areas. Where schools are mainly providing services to pupils who live in their area this is an important measure of demand, and an indication of support for the school from within the community. Of course, there are reasons why schools can have a high proportion of out of area pupils. This may reflect the availability of unfilled spaces and/ or parental demand for particular schools where free home to school transport does not apply. This is why this review is proposed to be conducted on an area basis, so that all such factors can be fully explored.
5. It is important to note that no decisions have been taken to close any school. It is, however, prudent to plan for closures should this be one of the outcomes of the review process. Although it is possible to close a secondary school within a year of a decision being taken, for example where a school is judged by Ofsted to be unsatisfactory, there may be education consequences to this course of action. One such consequence could be the difficulty in making sure that all pupils in their first year of a GCSE course are able to follow the same set of subjects from the same exam boards at their new schools. It therefore might be preferable for pupils and staff if the closure is phased over two years. This allows pupils to complete their exam years in the schools in which they started them, while pupils starting secondary education, or starting exam courses, would do so in the successor school(s) to the closing school.

I must repeat however that no decision has been taken to close any Shropshire school at this stage. Each local area review of schools in the next period of consultation, which begins on 29 November 2010, will allow schools and stakeholders to assess the educational, demographic and financial pressures in their areas and consider how, by working together, these can be best tackled for the benefit of Shropshire learners of all ages and ability, fairly and to a consistently high standard across the county.

- (c) The Speaker then invited Mr Dawes to put the following questions with regards to the debate at the Cabinet meeting held on 13 October 2010 to the meeting:
1. How can you reconcile the email you sent me offering us full flexibility in timing of debate allowance when you then insisted on only 20 minutes which prevented full discussion of this most contentious topic?
  2. Why were we promised that the meeting would be held in the Council Chamber (Shropshire Star 11th September) but in fact it was in the

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--

very small Committee Room which prevented full engagement by our community in the debate who had travelled in force to witness this first hand?

3. Why was the local member not allowed to make his statement in public like everybody else?

The Leader of the Council, Mr Keith Barrow, replied:

1. I explained that I would be flexible to ensure everyone who wished to speak had the opportunity to do so. I did make it clear, however, that it would not be helpful if the same discussion and points raised at the scrutiny meeting were repeated, as these had already been made to Council representatives. The public speakers did manage to make their comments within the actual time given for such matters and therefore there was no need to go beyond the 20 minutes allocated for public questions and speaking.
2. I am not aware of any promises made to anyone that the Cabinet Meeting would be held in the Council Chamber. It was explained that there would be a live feed from the Shrewsbury Room, where Cabinet meetings are held, to the Council Chamber. This was to allow those persons who could not be seated in the Shrewsbury Room to watch and hear proceedings live. This was reported, I understand, in the Shropshire Star on 11 October 2010. The Shrewsbury Room on this occasion was opened up and included another room, in my judgement, was not therefore a small room. Members of the local community did, therefore, see and hear the debate fully, as it occurred.
3. The local member wished to comment on issues which were best dealt with in confidence (in part 2 of the meeting). The local member did not at that time, and indeed has not since, indicated to me that he was unhappy with this approach.

Mr Dawes then made a number of further points relating to his disbelief at a number of claims made by the developers relating to heat supply to the college and church and asked by way of a supplementary question how the Council could possibly justify its proposal to sell land to the biomass developers in these circumstances.

Replying, Mr Barrow stated that he would provide a written reply.

- (d) The Speaker then invited Ms Middleton to make the following statement:

At last month's Cabinet meeting, councillors displayed not only great ignorance of the implications for Bishop's Castle if the plant is built there, but also utter contempt for those of us who have spent so much time on the issue at great personal sacrifice. The Councillors do not realise that many local people opposing the Biomass Power Project, myself included, have personal connections with its directors and their families.

I am a resident and Town Councillor of Bishop's Castle. I let residential and commercial properties in the town and I work in my father's family business, Gwythers' shoe shops, established over five generations towns on the Welsh border and my family has also farmed in the area for generations. Every day I am in contact with members of the public and believe me, I know that the majority of the population vehemently opposes the plant. I regularly read the Farmers' Weekly.

It is not a pleasant situation that we find ourselves in opposition, but the majority of people in the area, are united against this plant, primarily because we are aware of the risks it poses to our community's health. The decision to sell to the developers demonstrates a complete lack of engagement by Cabinet members with residents and existing businesses.

Until nearly four years ago, I was very interested in biomass as an energy source, but I have radically changed my views and I must contradict other statements made by your Cabinet.

Why is the plant "Good for the whole county? Even experts at the AONB could not support the scheme. Local farmers are not interested in being committed to growing switchgrass. Elsewhere, it is being grubbed up in order to grow more lucrative crops of corn.

It has been widely reported for months, that there is a drastic shortage of woodchip for biomass energy predicted in the UK, from 2012.

The Cabinet's decision to accept the tender for the site flies in the face of the Council's and the Government's own policies established long before "The Big Society"; "to protect the diverse character and quality of the landscape through careful and sensitive development control", to conserve the small market towns like Bishop's Castle, and to retain the beauty and character of the district.

LEADER in the Shropshire hills, committed to "improving the well-being of people in and around the Shropshire hills by building on a sense of place and attachment to the landscape."

Guidelines from DEFRA advocate taking into account scientific uncertainty as well as public attitudes and values and Shropshire Council claims to encourage our communities to be "more vibrant, cohesive and residents to take personal and collective responsibility for their wellbeing".

If biomass power is a benefit for the community, there would be no need for meetings behind closed doors nor commercial sensitivity. We are prepared to continue to oppose it by any means. You, the members of this Cabinet, have a duty of care to the people you represent; you are not obliged to sell the land to the developers. We will hold you personally responsible for environmental damage and harm to the health of our community.

Mrs Middleton concluded by adding that:

I am a member of the Bishop's Castle Group, Bishop's Castle Civic Society and have recently become a Town Councillor. I have lived in the Bishop's Castle area for 52 years.

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--

In the years that the local authority has been dealing with the biomass application, Bishop's Castle has lost the opportunity for at least three new enterprises on the site. The coalyard is an established business seeking to expand and as part of their own development, Webhampers had intended to build two starter units, but local planning officers insisted on such a high-spec design that their own building swallowed up the money they would have spent on the two smaller units. This means that the town has lost more jobs than the biomass plant would have created, even before the town knew of the development.

## **99. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

The Speaker announced that no questions had been received from members before the deadline set in Procedural Rule 15.

## **100. NEW SHROPSHIRE SCHOOLS VISION AND ORGANISATION POLICY**

It was proposed by Mrs A J Caesar-Homden and seconded by Dr J E Jones that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

Mrs Caesar-Homden indicated that she was delighted to commend to the new vision for Shropshire learners and the new school organisation policy, principles and criteria for Shropshire Council. This was the product of many months of hard work and consultation involving staff and governors, Diocese, parents, pupils, members of the public, local authority officers and members of local town and parish councillors as well as Shropshire councillors. She thanked personally everyone who had made an invaluable contribution to this process.

She also reminded Council that many of the key recommendations of Neil Kinghan's Independent Policy Commission report, published back in July 2009, had formed the basis of our work. His principal recommendation had been that the Council should adopt a new vision and one which addressed the needs of learners in both the Primary and Secondary schools sector. He also recommended that the local schools funding formula was reviewed as part of this process. Mrs Caesar-Homden expressed pleasure that members of the School Forum had worked closely with officers to undertake this work. She also reported that Cabinet would be provided with a funding formula report early next month having consulted with School Forum on 25th November. Consultation on the Formula would run concurrently with the next stage of the school organisation review process.

She stated that vision and policy would help the Council, its schools and partners to shape and deliver high quality, accessible, and an affordable education system fit for our children and young people today and for future generations. She continued by also stating that the success in doing this had been achieved by working together at a number of levels which would be continued in the coming months.

She also reminded Council that a cross party task and finish group chaired by the Leader of the Council and including lead Members from the respective Opposition Groups, Roger Evans for the Liberal Democrats and Dr Jean Jones, Labour, along with the Chief Executive and two respective Directors of Children and Young

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--



People's Services, had taken an overview and been involved throughout the process. This group continued to meet on a monthly basis.

Regular reports had also been provided for Scrutiny Committee where members had helped to develop the policy as well as challenge findings and recommendations at every stage. Most importantly the recommendations that are contained in this report had been formed and amended as a result of consultation and feedback from the people that have the greatest stake and involvement in delivering high quality teaching and learning in Shropshire. Our headteachers, governors, Diocese, pupils, parents and partners.

In referring to the demographic, educational and financial challenges faced by our schools Mrs Caesar-Homden also commented that these were particularly acute in the sparse and rural parts of the county as the pupil population continued to fall and the level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) reduced accordingly. In aggregate terms the DSG has fallen by £10m in the last five years. The Council therefore faced a £1m funding gap each year and this impacted on every child in every Shropshire school. The national economic situation and reductions in public expenditure levels added further pressure to the situation. She emphasised that one particular comment has been repeated many times throughout the consultation period, namely that no change is not an option.

Headteachers, chairs of governors and local Elected Members would receive from officers on Friday 12th November school data that matches the published criteria in Appendix B. This would allow data to be checked for completeness and accuracy. Checking data at this stage would, Mrs Caesar-Homden pointed out, allow time to be best served by schools working together in their local area meetings to consider proposals to address the challenges faced in their local area. A number of schools have embarked on this work already and she recommended that local Members, acting as community leaders, were involved in this work too.

In conclusion Mrs Caesar-Homden reminded all Members of the financial imperative to act and that some tough decisions had to be taken but there was a vision and policy that had received wholesale support from schools and stakeholders as a mechanism for this. She stated that the Council owed it to their pupils, their schools and themselves to tackle this now. Referring to the need to assess the impact of any proposed changes on individual learners, the local community and our local environment she undertook to ensure that officers completed a thorough impact assessment for each and every consideration as new proposals emerged.

Finally she advised that the next stages of the process were set out from page 6 of the report. Subject to Council approval, she undertook to bring a report to Cabinet on 24 November that set out the areas where the educational, financial and demographic pressures were most intense and to seek approval to embark on a programme of local area reviews.

Mr N J Hartin stated that the process which had been undertaken to date was considerably better than that used in 2008. It had been more inclusive and had provided more opportunity for public involvement. His Group had taken a full part in the successful cross party working and this would continue. But while there was a lot to welcome in the report, the Liberal Democrats as a group had continuing concerns over the future cost of school transport and the methodology which was to be used in undertaking community impact assessments. His Group would have liked to have

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--

seen this information sooner and because it was not available, they would abstain, rather than vote in support of the vision.

Mr P F Phillips stated that this was the fifth time that the issue of school closures had been raised during his membership of the Council. The Policy Commission could see no educational reason why the existing schools network should not be maintained if funding was sufficient. There was a presumption that school closures would only happen as a last resort and the Council had a statutory duty to preserve diversity and choice in education. He predicted that with the current funding levels, between and 12 and 15 primary, or possibly two secondary schools, would need to close. However, because he had faith in the Administration to deliver its vision, he would abstain rather than vote against the report. Mrs H M Kidd and Mr R A Evans also reinforced the positive comments about the inclusive nature of the process, but expressed their concerns about the way in which the community impact studies would be undertaken, given the need to protect and sustain other community facilities. They also emphasised the significant increase in school transport costs which could result and drew attention to the rising number of out of area enquiries for places in Shropshire schools. Reference was also made to the sharing of staff in small rural primary schools which both generated savings and additional employment.

Mr J E Clarke referred to the successful amalgamation of two primary schools within his division which had been achieved despite significant opposition from both within and outside the immediate catchment area. He thanked the previous Portfolio Holder and the former Director of Children and Young People's Services for their courage in delivering the new school and furthering the educational opportunities of local children. Mr M Williams also spoke in support of the report adding that the previous 20 years was a litany of missed opportunities where hard decisions had been avoided. It was now necessary for all parties to agree that such failures could not be repeated. Presently, there were 22,900 school places but only 19,670 pupils and the position would continue to deteriorate each year. This resulted in a disproportionate allocation to some schools at the cost of others and valued individual pupils in one area at £2,800 and £6,800 at a time when some schools held unspent budgets of approximately £7 million. It was essential for the Council to put its support behind the new, fairer funding formula later this year and end such discrepancies.

Mr L Winwood and Mr M Whiteman advised that change was now essential to end all the uncertainty about educational provision. The vision set a challenging timetable, but the sooner the Council decided to get started, the better.

Mr A Walpole said that he understood the reservations and concerns some members had expressed but everyone had to be aware of the financial constraints affecting the Council which had to be balanced against community needs. Thought also needed to be given to what other developments were occurring. He added that academy status was now a realistic prospect for some schools and it was no longer a simple case of the Local Education Authority controlling the educational landscape.

Councillor Mrs C Wild stated that the children of Shropshire were everyone's future and the vision provided an opportunity for all groups to work together to get things right. The Leader, Mr K R Barrow, concurred with these sentiments, adding that Shropshire's children should be placed at the centre of this debate. The cross party working had been very effective and he thanked Mr R A Evans and Dr J E Jones for their contributions to the development of the vision and the Portfolio Holders, Mrs C J Motley and Mrs A J Caesar-Homden, for their leadership of the process.

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725
--

Mr Barrow also stated that the suggestion that between 12-15 primary schools would close was inflammatory and expressed his regret that the Liberal Democrat Group planned to abstain when they had contributed significantly to the production of the vision for the future which now needed to be delivered.

Responding, Mrs Caesar-Homden emphasised that the vision was not putting large schools against small ones. Neither was it about school closures, but it was about producing top class educational opportunities for Shropshire children. There was no school closure list.

She concluded by thanking Mrs Motley and the officers for their assistance in creating the vision and invited the Liberal Democrats to join other members in delivering the best possible outcomes once the data sets were available.

**On being put to the vote, the motion was carried with a very large majority in favour to 7 abstaining.**

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the outcomes of the consultation contained within the report, including amendments set out in paragraph 22 and Appendix B, be noted and approved.
- (ii) That the recommendations approved by the Cabinet on 10 November 2010, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be approved.
- (iii) That the next stages of the school organisation process and timetable, as outlined in Appendix C to the report, be noted and approved.

## **101. APPOINTMENT OF CORPORATE DIRECTORS**

**RESOLVED:**

That, the appointment of Mr T McCabe as the Corporate Director of Places and Mr D Taylor as the Corporate Director of People be confirmed.

## **102. CHANGES TO STAFF TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

It was proposed by the Leader and seconded by Mrs E A Hartley that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

Mr Barrow advised that the report sought member approval for changes to staff terms and conditions relating to financial compensation for severance of employment and reimbursement for business travel by staff. These were intended to ensure savings estimated at £1 million in 2011/12 and future years.

These changes were similar to those adopted by many other councils and took account of the particular needs of Shropshire's workforce. There had been full consultation and formal negotiation with the relevant unions and staff had also been consulted.

Mr R A Evans stated that the introduction of a new flat rate payment for business travel for all car users of a maximum of 40p per mile was already a problem in the voluntary sector and could result in financial hardship for those essential users earning less than £20,000 per annum.

Mrs H M Kidd asked whether the number of pool cars for use by essential users would be increased? She reiterated the difficulties currently being experienced in recruiting voluntary drivers at this mileage rate, stating that staff should not be asked to subsidise the cost of providing Council transport. Mrs E A Parsons expressed concern over the length of the consultation period adding that two four week periods was too short before bringing in such significant changes from 1 January 2011, particularly as the Council had failed to reach agreement with all of the unions affected. It seemed as if they had been told what would be and, while the sums quoted may sound reasonable, they were not generous. The introduction of new terms and conditions could have been considered over a longer period given the impact that these would have on staff morale. She could not therefore support the introduction of the proposed changes.

Mr J Tandy asked for the matter to be referred back in order that the Council could seek agreement with all of the unions. There also appeared to be some confusion over the removal of the facility for essential users to have car hire costs paid and clarity would be helpful to all parties. Dr J E Jones and Mr M Williams concurred with these views, adding that it appeared as if public sector workers were being targeted when they had contributed massively to public wellbeing. It also appeared that the unions had correctly stated that the consultation had been incomplete and unsatisfactory. The report should have contained much more detail about the impact that these changes would have and the consequences for all Shropshire's communities.

A number of other members took a contrary view with regard to travel allowances, particularly as the 40p limit was the tax free level set by HMRC.

Replying, the Leader advised that the length of the consultation period had previously been agreed with all of the relevant unions. He concluded by adding that there was a need to find savings approaching £76 million during the next 3/4 years. The proposed saving of £1 million in this way translated to 100 council jobs and faced up to the current financial reality.

**On being put to the vote, the motion was carried with a very large majority and 7 members abstaining.**

**RESOLVED:**

That the proposed changes to the Council's staff UK, foreign and travel policy and to the redundancy and compensation policy, together with the process and timetable for implementation, be approved in order to ensure the realisation of the financial benefits arising from these changes as quickly as possible.

(The meeting closed at 1.30 p.m.)

SPEAKER : .....

DATED : .....

Contact: Richard Thomas – 01743 252725