



## Committee and Date

Council

25 February 2016

## COUNCIL

**Minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2015**  
**In the Council Chamber, Shirehall, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, SY2 6ND**  
**10.00 am - 12.50 pm**

**Responsible Officer:** Karen Nixon  
Email: karen.nixon@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 252724

### **Present**

Councillors Ann Hartley (Chairman) and Malcolm Pate (Leader)  
Councillors David Lloyd (Speaker), Steve Charmley (Deputy Leader), Peter Adams, Andrew Bannerman, Nicholas Bardsley, Tim Barker, Charlotte Barnes, Joyce Barrow, Thomas Biggins, Vernon Bushell, Gwilym Butler, John Cadwallader, Karen Calder, Dean Carroll, Lee Chapman, Anne Chebsey, Peter Cherrington, Ted Clarke, Gerald Dakin, Steve Davenport, Andrew Davies, Roger Evans, John Everall, Hannah Fraser, Richard Huffer, Tracey Huffer, Vince Hunt, Jean Jones, Simon Jones, Heather Kidd, Nic Laurens, Christian Lea, Amy Liebich, Robert Macey, Jane MacKenzie, Chris Mellings, David Minnery, Pamela Moseley, Alan Mosley, Cecilia Motley, Peggy Mullock, Peter Nutting, Kevin Pardy, William Parr, Vivienne Parry, John Price, Malcolm Price, David Roberts, Keith Roberts, Madge Shingleton, Jon Tandy, Robert Tindall, Dave Tremellen, Kevin Turley, David Turner, Arthur Walpole, Stuart West, Claire Wild, Brian Williams, Leslie Winwood, Michael Wood and Paul Wynn

### **65 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chief Executive reported that apologies for absence had been received from Mr T Bebb, Mr A Boddington, Mrs P Dee, Mr D Evans, Mr N Hartin, Mr J Hurst-Knight, Mr R Hughes, Mr M Kenny and Mrs T Woodward.

### **66 DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

Mr C Mellings declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 19; as a Board Member of Shropshire Housing.

## 67 MINUTES

Arising thereon:

At Minute 52, Report of the Portfolio Holder for Business, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning, Mr A Bannerman highlighted that paragraph 7.2. of the report incorrectly stated that the investment by Shropshire Council through the Arts Revenue Grant leveraged £100,000 in other grants and income. This was inaccurate by a factor of 10; the Arts Revenue Grant actually leveraged nearly £1 million, which was confirmed by the Head of Finance. Subject to this clarification it was

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2015, as circulated with the agenda papers, be approved and signed as a correct record.

## 68 ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Chairman's Engagements

68.1 The Speaker referred Members to the list of official engagements carried out by the former Chairman and himself since the last meeting of the Council held on 24 September 2015, which was circulated at the meeting.

### Paris

68.2 It was noted that a formal note of support had been sent to the Mayor of Paris, by the former Chairman, following the recent terrorist attacks in the city.

### Christmas

68.3 The Speaker reminded everyone that they were invited to join him in the Foyer at the conclusion of the meeting for a glass of mulled wine before lunch was served in the Column Restaurant.

## 69 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL AND DEPUTY SPEAKER

It was proposed by Mr B Williams and seconded by Mrs K Calder that Mrs A Hartley be elected Chairman and Deputy Speaker of the Council to serve until the Annual Meeting of the Council scheduled to be held on 12 May 2016.

There were no other nominations

**RESOLVED:** That Mrs A Hartley be elected Chairman and Deputy Speaker of the Council and hold office until the Annual Meeting of the Council scheduled to be held on 12 May 2016.

The Chairman and Deputy Speaker then subscribed her Declaration of Acceptance of Office and was invested with the Chairman's Badge of Office.

After thanking the Council for the great honour it had bestowed upon her, Mrs Hartley stated that she would work to bring back civic pride in Shropshire; it was a beautiful county within which to live and work and she was proud to act as its' ambassador. The Chairman also recognised Shropshire Council's amazing workforce, from the Chief Executive down; who were all immensely loyal and worked tirelessly for the Council. They were a key resource without which there would be no Shropshire Council.

## 70 ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

It was proposed by Mr S Charmley and seconded by Mr S West, that Mr M Pate be elected Leader of the Council to serve until the Annual Meeting of the Council in 2017.

There were no other nominations.

**RESOLVED:** That Mr M Pate be elected Leader of the Council to hold office until the Annual Meeting of the Council in 2017.

The Leader subscribed his Declaration of Acceptance of Office and then thanked the Council for the honour it had bestowed upon him. He stated that times were changing and that in the difficult times ahead it would be challenging and he assured that he was working with the three Shropshire MPs to get a better share of funding for rural areas in the future. He said his style of working would be different to that of his predecessor; it would be more inclusive and he firmly believed that transparency and consensus were important. He also highlighted that he believed the Council's staff were its most important resource. In conclusion, he looked forward to working together to improve things in Shropshire.

On behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group Mr R Evans conveyed his congratulations to Mr Pate and said how pleased he was to hear the acknowledgement by Mr Pate about the excellent work by the Council's staff. He also hoped to be able to get more access to the workings of the Council and he particularly urged the Leader to review the Scrutiny process again.

For the Labour Group, Mr A Mosley said he looked forward to working with Mr Pate to change the culture and atmosphere at the authority in a more transparent and consensual way. He urged the end of ip&e and better budget setting and was pleased to see the end of the former dictatorial cabinet regime. He said he supported the Leader and would help in improving things for the residents of Shropshire.

The Independent Group representative Mrs M Shinton congratulated Mr Pate on his appointment and expressed the hope that all Groups would work together for the improvement of a better Shropshire.

Responding, the Leader thanked everyone for their comments and reiterated that he hoped to deliver change and a new way of doing things.

## 71 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

### 71.1 Petitions

The Speaker advised that two petitions, each bearing more than 1,000 signatures had been received requesting a debate under the Council's Petition Scheme. Each petitioner was given 5 minutes to open the debate and outline their case, after which there was a debate by Members;

- a. Petition Against the Cuts in Arts Funding – this was introduced and amplified by Mr Mike Layward of Disability Arts in Shropshire (DASH). He started by thanking the Council for not cutting funding for arts services completely, unlike some local authorities. He stressed the economic, social and cultural benefits that arts funding created and urged the Council to support the arts in Shropshire which in turn gave them more leverage to seek financial support from other organisations.

The matter was then debated with contributions from Mrs C Motley, Mr A Bannerman, Mrs M Shingleton, Mrs H Kidd and Mr G Butler who all supported the petition and the many benefits the arts brought not only to the economy but to the quality of people's lives; young and old and those with learning and special needs.

In response Mr S Charmley, Portfolio Holder for Business Growth, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning thanked Mr Layward for his contribution and praised the way the various arts organisations worked with the Council for the benefit of the community and he very much hoped this collaborative way of working would continue. There was no doubt there were difficult times ahead for all and accordingly he proposed that the Council should take no further action.

- b. Petition calling for Shropshire Council to work with Teme Leisure and Community Groups to develop a sustainable future for the SpArC Centre, Bishops Castle – Ms S J Walls.

This petition was introduced and amplified by Ms Kate Evans of Sparc. Ms Evans was passionate about the centre which had been in existence since 1974; it was a small facility, but it was a flagship for the local community and greatly valued. Its membership continued to grow and it was widely used by local people. The next nearest pool was over 15 miles away. The centre provided health benefits, afterschool swimming lessons, a meeting place and it was even used for shows. In conclusion Ms Evans stressed the importance of the centre and urged the Council to work with others to keep the centre open.

The matter was then debated with contributions from Mrs C Barnes and Mrs H Kidd who both supported the petition.

In response, Mr S Charmley, Portfolio Holder for Business Growth, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning thanked Ms Evans and said it was in everyone's interests to develop a sustainable future for this facility. Various options would be looked at

such as the Community option or transferring to the Town Council, and therefore at this stage he proposed that the Council should take no further action.

## 71.2 Public Questions

The Speaker advised that eight public questions had been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 15 (a copy of the report containing the detail of the questions and the relevant formal responses is attached to the signed minutes);

### Public Question 1

Received from Mrs J Brand and answered by Mr S Charmley, Portfolio Holder for Business Growth, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning regarding the work of ip&e and its future.

By way of a supplementary question Mrs Brand asked what the Council intended to do about the misuse of money that had been put into ip&e and the reported police investigations.

The Portfolio Holder replied that there were no police investigations into ip&e. A cross party Working Group had been set up to review ip&e and this was hoped to conclude relatively quickly.

### Public Question 2

Received from Mr D Kilby, Secretary of The Shropshire Playing Fields Association and answered by Mr S Jones, Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport, concerning river safety measures on the towpath between the Greyfriars Bridge and the Weir at Sydney Avenue, Castlefields, Shrewsbury.

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Kilby asked if the Portfolio Holder was still confident that safety measures along the river were being applied efficiently and effectively at all times. He had great concerns along this particular stretch of river and asked the Portfolio Holder to work with him to remedy this and provide safe passage for young children to access the Castle Walk play area from their new homes as a matter of urgency.

The Portfolio Holder replied that officers worked closely with the Environment Agency and monitored this area regularly. They were currently liaising with landowners about the gates on their land. He also stated that he could not stop people climbing over locked gates. He understood the 106 agreement had been signed and he knew of no further action the Council could take at this stage.

### Public Question 3

Received from Mr P Phillips and answered by Mrs A Hartley, Portfolio Holder for Children's Services, regarding the withdrawal of joint-use funding and the knock on effect this would have on primary schools.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Phillips acknowledged that the funding had been withdrawn by central government and not the Council. He urged the Council to look at locality responses bearing in mind that schools were all different in nature

and size and that different areas had different priorities and required different facilities.

The Portfolio Holder noted Mr Phillips' request and replied that the 'Big Conversation' was currently underway and was open to all localities to feed into. She also said that it had been the Forum's decision to put the funding into education services rather than leisure facilities.

*Public Questions 4, 5, 6 and 7 were taken together by the Speaker as they all related to the SAMDev and the Old Oswestry Hillfort site. Supplementary questions were asked as follows;*

#### Public Question 4

By way of a supplementary question Mr J Waive, HOOH, said that in his view, the process was characterised by a lack of transparency and disregard. He asked if this was the standard of localism spirit that the Council wanted and would things be done differently in future.

#### Public Question 5

By way of a supplementary question Dr R Pope, whose specialism was hillforts and the wider heritage sector, asked if the Council was confident, given the amount of publicity, that damage could be done to the hillfort.

#### Public Question 6

By way of a supplementary question Mr T Malim asked if Council was confident that the Inspector's report was sound.

#### Public Question 7

By way of a supplementary question Dr G Nash asked if the Council was happy to build housing on the hillfort area, where the landscape was recognised as a World War 1 trench area.

The Portfolio Holder thanked everyone for their supplementary questions (questions 4,5,6 and 7) and assured that the Council would not want to do anything to the detriment of the Oswestry Hillfort; this had been reflected in an original decision to remove two sites from the Plan. He referred to an aerial photograph, courtesy of the local press, on the screen in the Council Chamber, to explain where the two sites had been removed and the location of OSW004 and confirmed that no development would be allowed on the area shown within the photograph.

The Portfolio Holder was disappointed that the objectors had never acknowledged the action taken by the Council. In relation to the SAMDev inspection process he stated that the Inspector had had a full session on Oswestry including the Hillfort. The objectors, applicant and the Council were all given an opportunity to provide their evidence. The Inspector had also attended site visits to see for herself and understand the landscape and visual impact.

Following this, the Inspector had confirmed the removal of two of the sites retaining OSW004. He referred to page 4 of the SAMDev Report (5.6 vi). The Inspector had endorsed the development strategy for Oswestry and in particular supported the

Council's position that, subject to the incorporation of the design principles agreed between Historic England and the Council that the development of site OSW004, north of Whittington Road would lead to less than substantial harm to the Old Oswestry Hillfort.

The Portfolio Holder referred to correspondence from Richard Buxton Solicitors received that week, which had been circulated to all Council Members for their information. He explained that the Council was in an awkward position; if it removed the code OSW004 at this stage then the Council would be legally challenged by the landowner whose site had been through the formal process. He would therefore be recommending to Council later in the meeting that the recommendations in the Report be approved and agreed with the Inspector.

#### Public Question 8

Received from Mr D Cooper and answered by Mr M Pate, Leader, regarding a possible Community Governance Review involving Bridgnorth Town and Tasley Parish.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Cooper, Mayor of Bridgnorth, asked Council to take into account the fact that Bridgnorth Town Council had asked to meet with Tasley Parish Council 3 months before submitting their formal application.

Mr Pate noted this and replied that this matter would be discussed in more detail, later in the agenda (item 14).

## 72 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The Speaker advised that the following seven questions had been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 15 (a copy of the report containing the detailed questions and their formal responses is attached to the signed minutes).

- (i) Received from Mr A Mosley and answered by Mr M Price, Portfolio Holder for Regulatory Services, Housing and Commissioning (Central) about the Housing and Planning Bill.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Mosley asked what the Council proposed to do given the proposed changes in legislation.

In response the Portfolio Holder thanked Mr Mosley for his question and confirmed that he too was not happy with some of the proposals, but assured that challenges to the Bill were being made through the Local Government Association and various other avenues. He undertook to report back on progress with these challenges in due course.

- (ii) Received from Mrs V Parry and answered by Mr S Jones, Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport about parking in Ludlow.

There was no supplementary question.

- (iii) Received from Mr R Evans and answered by Mr S Charmley, Portfolio Holder for Business Growth, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning (North) about ip&e

By way of a supplementary question Mr Evans asked when would a public meeting be held to allow people to ask questions about ip&e and more importantly, to enable the Council to regain the good reputation he considered it had recently lost.

In response the Portfolio Holder stated that a Working Group had been set up to review ip&e as the new Council went forward.

- (iv) Received from Mr R Evans and answered by Mr D Turner, Portfolio Holder for Resources, Finance & Support and IT about the quality of Shropshire Council's information technology.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Evans stressed the urgency of improving the situation and asked what the value was of the external contract and whether there was financial provision in the budget to cover this.

In response the Portfolio Holder said that he would obtain the contract figure after the meeting and report back directly to Mr Evans.

- (v) Received from Mr A Mosley and answered by Mr M Pate, Leader about ip&e.

By way of a supplementary question Mr Mosley asked when the first meeting of the independent Working Group that had been set up to review ip&e would be held. He very much welcomed this move and looked forward to getting involved. Mr Mosley also asked for an assurance that all options would be looked at.

In response the Leader confirmed that the group hoped to meet in January 2016 and confirmed that all options would be considered.

- (vi) Received from Mrs V Parry and answered by Mr S Jones, Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport about Fixed Penalty Notices in Ludlow.

By way of a supplementary question Mrs Parry asked for a formal response to a letter from Ludlow Town Council about Fixed Penalty Notices, that had been sent three months previously.

In response, the Portfolio Holder said that he knew nothing of the letter and assured that income from fines was utilised in accordance with Council policy.

- (vii) Received from Mr M Kenny and answered by Mr S Jones, Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport about air quality in Shropshire.



There was no supplementary question.

### 73 RETURNING OFFICER'S REPORT

The Leader, Mr M Pate, presented a report by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, advising that Ms Amy Jane Liebich had been elected as Councillor to represent the Belle Vue ward on Thursday 13 November 2015 and that Mr Nicholas Julian Laurens had been elected as Councillor to represent the Meole ward on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015.

### 74 REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HEALTH

It was proposed by Mrs K Calder, Portfolio Holder for Health and seconded by Mr D Carroll that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

Mrs A Chebsey, Mrs T Huffer and Mr G Dakin left the room whilst this matter was being considered.

Mrs Calder presented and amplified her report and expressed her sincere thanks to all officers and members involved for their excellent contribution to the Health Portfolio. She also responded to questions, queries and concerns raised by members, including Mrs H Kidd, Mr A Mosley, Mr P Cherrington, Mrs P Moseley, Mrs V Parry and Mr R Evans.

In introducing her report to Council, the Portfolio Holder for Health, assured that a clinically led, sustainable decision would be reached in respect of Future Fit and the location of A&E services; it was not about money. Mrs Calder also stated that Shropshire Council recognised that Future Fit had to be clinically lead and that it would support the clinical outcomes of Future Fit in order to provide the safest and best option for Shropshire residents.

The Portfolio Holder undertook to circulate a copy of a SATH report to all Members following the meeting.

Specifically in response to criticism from Mr A Mosley about the Future Fit programme, the Portfolio Holder stated that Shropshire Council had been very consistent in expressing its support of the clinical outcomes of Future Fit and supporting the best outcome for Shropshire as a whole. Future Fit was just 'paused' at the moment to get the best for Shropshire and she was happy with that. Mrs Calder also undertook to get back to Mr Mosley after the meeting with more detail regarding Future Fit.

**RESOLVED:** That the contents of the report of the Portfolio Holder for Health be noted and approved.

## 75 SETTING THE COUNCIL TAXBASE FOR 2016/17 AND VIREMENT

It was proposed by the Leader, Mr M Pate, and seconded by Mr S Charmley that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

### **RESOLVED:**

- a) That in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by Shropshire Council as its Council Tax taxbase for the year 2016/17, as detailed in Appendix A, totalling 104,912.48 Band D equivalents be approved.
- b) That the continuation of the Council's current localised Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme in 2016/17 be noted. The scheme was attached at Appendix B.
- c) That the exclusion of 10,986.82 Band D equivalents from the taxbase as a result of localised Council Tax Support be noted.
- d) That the continuation of the discretionary Council Tax discount policy of 0% in respect of second homes (other than those that retain a 50% discount through regulation as a result of job related protection) be noted, as well as the inclusion of 672.72 Band D equivalents in the Council Tax taxbase as a result of this discount policy.
- e) That the continuation of the discretionary Council Tax discount policy of 50% for up to 12 months in respect of vacant dwellings undergoing major repair, i.e. former Class A exempt properties, and the resulting exclusion of 106.39 Band D equivalents from the Council Tax taxbase be noted.
- f) That the continuation of the discretionary Council Tax discount policy in respect of vacant dwellings, i.e. former Class C exempt properties, of 100% for one month, i.e. effectively reinstating the exemption, and then a 25% discount for the remaining five months and the resulting exclusion of 195.11 and 264.36 Band D equivalents respectively from the Council Tax taxbase be noted.
- g) That the continuation of the "six week rule" in respect of vacant dwellings, i.e. former Class C exempt properties be noted.
- h) That the continuation of the discretionary power to levy a Council Tax premium of 50% in relation to dwellings which have been empty for more than two years and the resulting inclusion of 228.94 Band D equivalents in the Council Tax taxbase be noted.
- i) That a collection rate for the year 2016/17 of 98.5% be approved.
- j) That a virement of £1.382m from Corporate Resources to Adult Services as detailed in Section 11 be approved.

## 76 TREASURY STRATEGY 2015/16 - MID YEAR REVIEW

It was proposed by the Leader, Mr M Pate, and seconded by Mr S Charmley, that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the contents of the report of the Head of Finance, Governance and Assurance be received and approved.

## 77 ADOPTION OF SITE ALLOCATIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT (SAMDEV) PLAN

It was proposed by Mr Malcolm Price, Portfolio Holder for Regulatory Services, Housing and Commissioning (Central) and seconded by Mr T Barker that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, and recommendations contained therein be received and agreed.

In introducing the report, the Portfolio Holder said that the Inspector had endorsed the development strategy for Oswestry and had in particular supported the Council's position that, subject to the incorporation of the design principles agreed between Historic England and the Council, that the development of site OSW004, north of Whittington Road would lead to less than substantial harm to the Old Oswestry Hillfort.

Regarding the correspondence from Richard Buxton Solicitors received earlier that week (dated 12 December 2015) – Members had all received a copy – Mr Price read out the Council's formal response as follows;

“The Council has received a letter dated 14 December 2015 from solicitors acting for HOOH (Hands off Old Oswestry Hillfort), which had been circulated to Members of Council directly.

The Council has taken Counsel's advice in relation to the contents of the letter. It is considered that the real concern contained in the letter relates to the view reached by English Heritage (now Historic England). If it was thought that there was anything unlawful about how English Heritage reached its view, a judicial review application could have been made in respect of that but that was not done. Having carefully considered the letter, it is not considered that there are any lawful grounds raised to suggest that site OSW004 should be removed from SAMDev prior to adoption or that SAMDev should not be adopted.

There does remain a risk that the threat to mount a challenge under s113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 may be followed through. However that could realistically only be an application to quash the inclusion of site OSW004 rather than an application to quash SAMDev as a whole.”

Mr Price also explained that the Council was 'between the devil and the deep blue sea' and was 'damned if we do and damned if we don't': If the code OSW004 were to be removed at this stage then the Council would be legally challenged by the landowner whose site had been through the formal process. He therefore

recommended to Council that the recommendations in the report be supported and agreed with the Inspector.

Mr Price said that in 5.4 of the report - the Inspector concluded that the SAMDev Plan was sound, positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy and legally compliant and provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the County. He also asked Members to note the other key findings in 5.6 which included ...' is consistent with the NPPF' and that the Inspector had not added or deleted any additional sites.

Also that the Inspector has established a definite method for calculating the five year land supply standing at 5.53 years.

Mr Price also asked Members to note the other key findings in 5.6 which included '... is consistent with the NPPF and to note that the Inspector had not added any additional sites or deleted any.'

The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the Planning Policy Officers for their excellent work in providing the Council with a sound SAMDev Plan where many other councils had failed; one of only 40 Councils in the Country to have a Core Strategy SAMDev in place. He also thanked the members of the LDF cross-party working group for their challenge, support and questioning throughout the whole process, and also acknowledged thanks to Town and Parish Councils for their involvement in the process.

This was an extremely important document for Shropshire that had been a long time in the making and for that reason he stated he would like all of Council to support the recommendations.

Mr Price pointed out at Section 5.8, that once the Plan was adopted, there was a six week period for any legal challenge to be made.

Mrs C Wild declared an interest and left the room whilst this matter was being considered.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:**

- a) That Council adopts the draft SAMDev Plan in the form which was submitted to the Secretary of State on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2014, as amended to reflect the Inspector's recommended modifications (see pre-adoption Plan attached, together with the accompanying policy maps available on the Council's planning policy web pages – a paper copy of these documents has also been placed in the Members' library);
- b) That responsibility be delegated to the Head of Economic Growth and Prosperity in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory Services, Housing and Commissioning (Central) to make any additional minor editorial corrections prior to publication.

## 78 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS

It was proposed by the Leader Mr M Pate and seconded by Mr S Charmley that the report and the revised recommendation, which read as follows and was circulated at the meeting, should replace the original recommendation;

“That the request from Bridgnorth Town Council to carry out a Local Governance Review with regard to its boundary with the Parish of Tasley be refused and that the possibility of undertaking a Community Governance Review in respect of Bridgnorth Town Council be considered again after the ordinary elections of Councillors due to be held in May 2017.”

**RESOLVED:** That the report and the revised recommendation be approved.

## 79 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

It was proposed by the Speaker, seconded by the Chairman and

**RESOLVED:** That the following appointments to committees be confirmed:

### Audit Committee

The appointment of Mrs P Moseley to replace Mr M Williams.

### Young People’s Scrutiny Committee

The appointment of Mr N Laurens to replace Mr D Turner.

### Planning Committee

The appointment of Miss A Liebich to replace Mr J Tandy.

## 80 MOTIONS

The following motion was proposed by Mrs P Moseley and duly seconded by Mrs J Mackenzie:

“This Council believes that:

The Trade Union Bill 2015-16 (which last month received its first reading in the House of Lords following its passage through the House of Commons) contains measures which, if it becomes law, will compromise the positive relationship which currently exists between the Council and the trades unions which represent their members in the workplace. For example, the bill will potentially remove discretion from local authorities to determine at a local level the amount of facilities time possible, and whether to allow union membership subscriptions to be deducted from salaries via payroll, which is currently the case at this Council.

This Council therefore RESOLVES:

To recognise the positive contribution which trades unions and their members make to the workplace, the commitment of all our staff to the delivery of public services, and the constructive local relationship which exists between employer, employees and trades unions. Hence, it further resolves to express its opposition to the Trade Union Bill, and also to seek to retain its own locally agreed employment relations strategy, and to maintain its autonomy.”

Mr B Williams proposed an amendment, which was seconded by Mrs C Wild, to amend the motion to read as follows;

“This Council recognises the positive contribution which trades unions and their members make to the workplace, the commitment of all our staff to the delivery of public services, and the constructive local relationship which exists between employer, employee and trades unions.

Therefore the Council welcomes the government’s actions to bring greater democracy to the trade union movement.”

After debate and on being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion was carried with a large majority of Members voting in favour.

Mrs P Moseley had a right of reply and in making this she said she noted the various comments made, but said in putting concerns into context there were few strikes in the public sector in Shropshire and therefore she did not believe it was fair to ignore the first part of her motion. She also commented that she viewed the Council’s staff as its greatest asset.

The substantive motion was then put and was duly carried.

## 81 **REPORT OF THE SHROPSHIRE AND WREKIN FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

It was proposed by Mr S West and seconded by Mr M Price that the report of the Shropshire and Wrekin Fire and Rescue Authority, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, be received and noted.

In presenting the report, Mr S West was pleased to highlight that the Authority was now in a much healthier financial position.

**RESOLVED:** That subject to the foregoing the report of the Shropshire and Wrekin Fire and Rescue Authority be noted.

## 82 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED:**

That in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, and Paragraph 10.4(3) of the Council’s Access to Information Procedure Rules, the public and press be excluded during consideration of the following item.

**83 LAND AT RADBROOK (EXEMPTED BY CATEGORY 3)**

The Council received an exempt report by the Head of Customer Support and Assets, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, seeking approval for the sale of Council land at Radbrook.

**RESOLVED:** That the exempt report and recommendation contained therein be approved.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date: .....