OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION
HELD ON MONDAY, 15 APRIL 2019
(FROM 5.30 PM – 7.23 PM)

PRESENT: Councillor Philip Broadbank in the Chair. Councillor Margaret Atkinson, Councillor Bernard Bateman MBE, Councillor Trevor Chapman, Councillor Jim Clark, Councillor Sam Gibbs, Councillor Michael Harrison, Councillor Pat Marsh, Councillor Nigel Middlemass, Councillor Ann Myatt, Councillor Victoria Oldham and Councillor Norman Waller.

In Attendance: Councillor Mike Chambers, Cabinet Member for Housing and Safer Communities

Late Arrivals: None.

Early Departures: None.

124/18 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES:
Notification had been received that Councillor Trevor Chapman was to act as substitute for Councillor Tom Watson; Councillor Jim Clark was to act as substitute for Councillor John Mann; Councillor Sam Gibbs was to act as substitute for Councillor Sue Lumby and Councillor Michael Harrison was to act as substitute for Councillor Nick Brown.

(5.31 pm)

125/18 – DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:
There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

(5.31 pm)

126/18 – MINUTES:
The Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 4 March 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

(Nine Members voted for the motion and there were three abstentions)

(5.32 pm)

127/18 – EXEMPT INFORMATION:
There were no exempt information items.

(5.32 pm)

128/18 – PUBLIC ARRANGEMENTS- QUESTIONS:
There were no questions to consider under Standing Order 27.

(5.32 pm)

CRIME AND DISORDER MATTERS

129/18 – NORTH YORKSHIRE POLICE UPDATE:
The Chair welcomed the Neighbourhood Police Inspector for Harrogate Rural, Inspector Steve Breen, to the meeting to provide an update to the Commission on the work of North Yorkshire Police within the district. A written update had been
provided which gave details on County Lines, fraud, burglaries, child sexual/criminal exploitation, events and staffing.

The Chair thanked the Inspector for a very detailed and thorough report. Inspector Breen highlighted some of the key areas of the report, specifically County Lines. The issue around County Lines was an on-going problem however the Police had seen some success in recent operations with arrests and convictions. One particular individual who had been wanted for arrest across the north of England had recently been arrested. Inspector Breen confirmed that the incident that had taken place in the Valley Gardens on 13 April 2019 was nothing to do with County Lines.

Councillor Marsh questioned why members of the public were being asked to get more information on potential drug dealing instead of the police coming to investigate. Inspector Breen explained that this was not normal procedure but as the police received over 30,000 calls a month, there was a need to prioritise responses and as such an on-street drug deal may not be as high a priority as a road traffic accident. Councillor Marsh also made reference to the possession of bladed weapons as detailed in the report. Inspector Breen stated that Stop and Search was arguably the best way to prevent knife crime however the reduction in the number of front line police officers had meant the number of Stop and Searches had fallen. North Yorkshire Police were also working hard to educate young people on the dangers of knife crime.

In response to a question from Councillor Bateman Inspector Breen explained that the Police were criticized no matter where they placed mobile speed camera vans. The main locations for the vans were accident hotspots. However residents could request, via an online form, to have a mobile speed camera van positioned in a certain spot. Councillor Middlemass expressed concern about Heavy Goods Vehicles speeding on Kingsley Road. Inspector Breen encouraged Councillor Middlemass and the residents of Kingsley Road to use the online form to bring this to the attention of the Police.

Councillor Oldham raised a question in relation to the Community Message text message service and why it sometimes seemed to take a long time for information to be passed on through the service. The Inspector explained that this depended on a number of issues, such as when the crime was reported and which officer was dealing with the incident. He encouraged people to use social media as a way of communicating details of local crime more effectively.

Inspector Breen gave an update on 2 in 1 burglaries in response to a question from Councillor Marsh. The Police had been involved in an engagement campaign where they gave advice to residents who were likely to be targeted in the burglaries due to their high performance vehicles. The Police had also advised potential victims of 2 in 1 burglaries to purchase faraday bags/purses to prevent outside signals copying the code from cars keys.

Councillor Marsh asked Inspector Breen about the impact of the UCI Road Race Championships on crime and policing levels. Inspector Breen explained that the Police were expecting an increase in crime over the competition week simply due to the increased number of people in Harrogate however no additional community
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policing would be brought in for the event. Work was already on-going with several other bodies to best prepare for the event.

In response to a question on PCSO abstractions, Inspector Breen explained that many PCSO’s had left the job to become Police Constables. Others had left because they didn’t see a future career in the PCSO field. Inspector Breen explained that the original role of PCSO’s had all but evaporated and PCSO’s were now expected to do the work of Police Constables and even Detective Constables. Councillor Marsh stated that there was a great need for community policing. Inspector Breen agreed but explained that it was harder to do with fewer officers however there was a move to increase the number of special constables and volunteers. He requested that communities help the police and each other by engaging on social media.

The Chair thanked Inspector Breen for his attendance at the meeting.

(5.33 pm – 5.58 pm)

130/18 – HARROGATE DISTRICT COMMUNITY SAFETY GROUP UPDATE:
The Chair welcomed Councillor Mike Chambers, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Safer Communities and Julia Stack, the Community Safety and CCTV Manager, who submitted a written report providing an update to the Commission on the Harrogate District Community Safety Group (“the Group”.)

Councillor Chambers introduced the report and informed the Commission that he was pleased with the work the Group was doing in trying to keep communities safe. The Group were working on a number of initiatives in order to keep on top of the issues in the Harrogate District.

In response to a question from Councillor Harrison, the Council’s Community Safety Officer, Helen Richardson, explained the partnership project that was being undertaken to tackle the issue of begging in Harrogate Town Centre. Begging had increased in Harrogate in recent months and there was strong public support for giving money to the beggars. The aim of the project was to encourage people to donate electronically to a fund instead of giving to an individual. The project was still under development and the Group were exploring working with the Two Ridings community foundation who could distribute the funds to those in need. This method of donation would educate both those making the donation and those receiving the donation. There had been a number of press articles which had helped to raise awareness and would assist as the project concept develops.

Councillor Marsh asked a question in relation to homeless people sleeping in Harrogate Town Centre. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Safer Communities explained that many organisations were working in partnership to help homeless people, especially the Housing Options Team at Harrogate Borough Council. Procedures were in place to offer assistance. The Community Safety & CCTV Manager explained that the hostels run by the Council had specific rules that prohibited the taking of drugs and the consumption of alcohol. Some of the homeless people could not conform to these rules and as such chose to sleep on the street.

Councillor Chapman asked what the difference was between Acceptable Behaviour
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Contracts and Criminal Behaviour Orders. The Community Safety & CCTV Manager explained that Acceptable Behaviour Contracts were not legally binding and were normally given to younger people. The contracts were informal arrangements and were usually lead by PCSO’s. Criminal Behaviour Orders resulted from a criminal offence. They had specific conditions and if those conditions were breached, the offender could be arrested and potentially be imprisoned.

In response to a question from Councillor Oldham on the impact of mental health issues on the work done by the Community Safety Hub, the Community Safety & CCTV Manager explained that it was very challenging to deal with the mental health cases. The Focus Pathway meant that once a month a meeting of the Group was dedicated to mental health cases and the mental health team from the hospital & other mental health services were in attendance at these meetings. Whilst the work was challenging, there had been some success stories and case studies had been produced.

Councillor Marsh queried how the Group would cope when mental health services in Harrogate ended and residents would have to travel to Darlington for help. Inspector Breen from North Yorkshire Police explained that the Police already experienced difficulties in dealing with residents in crisis due to mental health issues. Under the law residents suffering from a severe mental health issues should not be taken into police custody unless they are an imminent danger to themselves or someone else. He also explained that it was potentially dangerous to leave distressed individuals with family members. The Community Safety & CCTV Manager expressed concern about the closure of mental health facilities in Harrogate.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Safer Communities and the Commission expressed their pride at the work being done by the Community Safety Group and thanked them for their hard work on difficult issues.

(5.58 pm – 6. 25 pm)

SCRUTINY MATTERS AND REVIEWS UNDERTAKEN BY THE COMMISSION

131/18 – UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR POLICY:
The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager submitted a written report on the Council’s Unacceptable Behaviour Policy (UBP.) The report provided information to the Commission in response to a proposed future item of work by a member of the public. The UBP was attached to the report at Appendix A with the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman Guidance and Policy on the management of unreasonable complainant behaviour attached at Appendix B and C respectively.

The member of the public that proposed the future item of work, Mr Peter Lilley, was given five minutes in which to explain to the Commission why he wanted the Unacceptable Behaviour Policy to be reviewed. He stated the following:

As far as the Unacceptable Behaviour Policy is concerned, I think the first thing to say is that there’s an enormous difference between having a policy – and the way that policy is imposed.
This policy has only been imposed twice in the last two years and since I am one of the two people on whom the policy has been imposed, I thought it might be helpful if I just briefly summarized the circumstances of my experience. Mr Sampson emailed me on November 21, 2018 attaching the Unacceptable Behaviour Policy and told me that my contact and communications with Council officers and members was now such (as he put it) that he was obliged to inform me that my behaviour was unacceptable and that the Council would be placing restrictions on my contact with officers.

In a nutshell, his explanation for imposing the UBP was that I make “unreasonable demands” on officers. He gave the example of me sending of what he called “excessive and duplicate emails” (by which he means I sometimes write to more than one officer; or even to both officers and councillors). He also specifically criticised my conduct at a meeting of the Audit & Governance committee which had taken place two days previously where I had raised my voice in objection to being banned from asking a Public Question relating to the Council’s funding of The Local Lotto.

Mr Sampson also accused me of making defamatory statements on social media. He offered me no opportunity to dispute or deny any of his allegations before the policy was imposed. However, I certainly provided a response; arguing that if council officers adopted a rather more helpful attitude, it wouldn't be necessary to ask a question more than once.

I also suggested that his report on my alleged conduct at the A&G meeting was based almost entirely on unattributed comments, hearsay and innuendo. And with reference to my social media postings, I completely refuted his allegation that I make defamatory statements. Indeed, I took issue with him for a statement of his own when he said: “Your personal attacks are unnecessary and flagrant attempts to bully and intimidate council officers…….” Is this really an appropriate comment from the Council’s Chief Executive? I don’t think so.

There were really only two conditions to the policy. First, I was advised that council officers would no longer be corresponding with me on various matters including, interestingly, the funding of The Local Lotto.

Also, all my communications with the Council had to go through Jennifer Norton or, in her absence, Rachel Bowles. Mr Sampson said the policy would be reviewed on January 14.

On January 17, he said the policy was being extended. His decision seemed to be based entirely on two tweets I’d posted on my Twitter account which he deemed to be “personal attacks.” Or, as I would see it, me exercising my democratic right to express an opinion.

On February 13, Mr Sampson emailed me to say the policy had been lifted – but gave no reason why. It appears to have been imposed to try and stop me asking awkward questions. But surely that’s not what the policy is there for?

Just a few other quick points:

- I think the policy is far too long and rambling. I think you need to look at formulating a much more concise policy and really think about what purpose it’s there to serve.
- I note in point 11.2 of the UBP it says the policy was approved by the management board on July 21, 2016 and is due to be reviewed every three years, so this seems ideal timing to completely rip up the policy and come up with something a lot better.
- In the guidelines from the Local Government Ombudsman, it makes the important point that just because people are persistent complainants, it
doesn’t necessarily mean they are unreasonably persistent complainants. People can be persistent when they feel they’re constantly being fobbed off by council officers.

- The LGO also encourages councils to offer complainants a meeting. Look for ways to explore an amicable solution. I’ve had dealings with Mr Sampson for 7.5 years. He has never once introduced himself to me. And never once (even during the 4.5 years of the Turkish Baths dispute) never suggested a meeting.

Councillor Gibbs thanked Mr Lilley for his contribution. He then moved the recommendation as stated in paragraph 2.0 of the report that a review of the Unacceptable Behaviour Policy should not be included in the Commission’s work programme. Councillor Gibbs explained that the UBP was standard throughout other Councils and was written in accordance with the guidance provided by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. He also stated that the Commission had more important topics on their work programme such as the homelessness strategy and the carbon reduction strategy. In seconding the motion, Councillor Middlemass informed the Commission that the policy had only been used twice in the past two years and was consistent with the Ombudsman’s guidance. As such he saw no reason to review the policy and agreed with Councillor Gibbs that the Commission had more important issues to scrutinise.

Councillor Bateman in supporting the motion stated that the Chief Executive must be able to protect his employees. Councillor Waller also supported the motion and had no concerns over the use of the UBP.

Councillor Marsh expressed some support for the comments made but had concerns regarding the use of the UBP. She stated that just because a resident is persistent in their complaints, it does not make them unreasonable. Councillor Marsh also had concerns that Councillors were not consulted prior to the Chief Executive implementing restrictions on a resident under the UBP. Whilst acknowledging that Council staff needed to be protected, Councillor Marsh did not think the UBP should cover tweets directed at Council Officers from members of the public.

In response to a question from Councillor Harrison, the Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager confirmed that neither of the residents that had been subject to the UBP had appealed to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. Councillor Harrison stated that Councillors were informed when the policy was implemented and he expressed his support for the motion as the UBP was in line with other Councils; any restrictions that had been in place had now been lifted; no complaints had been received by the Ombudsman and the work programme had higher priorities.

Councillor Middlemass added that it was unreasonable to ask the Chief Executive to consult 40 Councillors before taking a decision to protect his employees.

Councillors Marsh and Oldham queried whether the review of the UBP could be put on the work programme as a low priority or whether the Commission could receive an annual update on the use of the Policy. Councillor Harrison explained that all polices were reviewed as part of a schedule and as such the UBP did not need to be subject to a further review.
In summing up, the Chair stated that there was an appeals process in place for residents who felt the UBP was being used incorrectly. The review would take up a lot of officer time and the Chair felt that the officer time could be better spent.

**RESOLVED:**

That a review of the Unacceptable Behaviour Policy is not included in the Commission’s work programme.

(Nine members voted for the motion and there were three abstentions.)

(6.25 pm – 6.46 pm)

**132/18 – CODE OF CONDUCT REVIEW - DRAFT SCOPE:**

The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager submitted a written report that summarised the work previously considered by the Commission on the Code of Conduct and provided a draft scope for the review. The Commission had previously agreed to undertake a “review of the way the Council handles Code of Conduct complaints including the operation of the Officer Code of Conduct and the relationship with a no-blame culture.” The draft scope had been attached at Appendix A to the report.

The member of the public that proposed the future item of work, Mr Peter Lilley, was given five minutes in which to explain to the Commission why he wanted the Code of Conduct to be reviewed. He stated the following:

*I have to say I’m not over-impressed with Mr Codman’s scoping of this proposed review.*

*There doesn’t seem to be a lot there; and it doesn’t really seem to reflect the proposition I made to this committee in October 2018.***

*One of the key points I made concerned the role of the Head of Legal & Governance/Monitoring Officer and the amount of power and influence held by that single individual who appears to me to be almost completely unaccountable.*

*She has the power to make decisions in respect of the conduct of all other officers and all councillors. And yet never seems to have to account for her own conduct.*

*We’re told she’s entirely independent and impartial; yet the Council’s management structure seems to indicate that she reports to both the Director of Corporate Affairs and Chief Executive; and to some extent the Leader of the Council. So if there was ever a conduct complaint against any of those three individuals, how would she ensure that the complaint was dealt with entirely impartially?***

*The so-called Independent Person has no power to overrule the Monitoring Officer. And to my astonishment (and I think this will surprise you as well) I have a letter from the Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman (dated March 9) which says quite clearly: “The Ombudsman is not an appeal body. We cannot question whether a council’s decision is right or wrong simply because the complainant disagrees with*
That for me raises the hugely important question: if the LGSCO cannot question decisions made by a council’s monitoring officer, who can?

And why is Harrogate Council’s legal department still telling residents that if they’re unhappy with a decision they can complain to the Ombudsman? What is the point when it’s a complete waste of time?

I think there have also been inconsistencies in the decisions made by the monitoring officer; in that on some occasions she decides a Code of Conduct complaint should be referred to a standards panel while on other occasions she decides not to.

Surely ALL serious complaints should come before a standards panel and that the decision shouldn’t be made by one officer alone? And it’s not only me saying that: I’m sure you’ll all be aware of the report on Local Government Ethical Standards published in January by the Committee on Standards in Public Life. It recommends that all local authorities should maintain a standards committee which could also include independent members (i.e. non-councillors) although they wouldn’t be able to vote.

The report also recommended that councils should develop an organisational culture which encourages the highest possible standards of conduct.

Two other very brief points:

First, I believe HBC’s existing rules relating to the conduct of councillors are much clearer and also potentially much more punitive than those governing the conduct of officers – and particularly, the Council’s most senior officers.

Secondly: I thought Mr Codman was going to come back to this committee having done some research into the origins of the “No Blame” culture. He’s mentioned it a lot in his scoping – but he hasn’t provided any details.

I would urge this committee to do a bit of delving about the no blame culture because as far as I’m aware, it has never been discussed by councillors, let alone approved. Also, if you work in any other job and mess up you’re, quite properly, expected to take responsibility for your actions; so I don’t see why it should be any different just because you work for the Council.

The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager explained to the Commission that they had already received a detailed report on the Members Code of Conduct and the role of the Monitoring Officer and Independent Person, this also included an explanation of a ‘no blame’ culture. The scope before Members at this meeting covered the Officers Code of Conduct and the relationship with a no-blame culture.

Councillor Bateman informed the Commission that he had been through the standards procedure and had no concerns regarding the current arrangements.

In response to Mr Lilley’s comment that no other organisation had a no-blame culture, Councillor Myatt explained that the NHS had a no-blame culture. Councillor Middlemass also explained that the aircraft industry operated a no-blame culture. In
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no-blame culture organisations there was still accountability of actions by individuals but there was also a focus on reporting and learning from mistakes so that they could be prevented from occurring again.

Councillor Gibbs thanked the Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager for a very thorough report. He also wished to record his thanks to the senior officers at the Council for the way in which they managed standards issues. He then moved that the report be noted and that the Commission did not continue with the Code of Conduct review. Councillor Bateman seconded the motion.

Councillor Marsh stated that she would not be supporting the motion because she considered that a no-blame culture meant officers were not held to account. Councillor Marsh also explained that she did not know how to complain about officers and as such the review was necessary. The scope that had been set out by the Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager was appropriate and would allow for a proper review. Councillor Marsh stated that Councillors were accountable and therefore officers should be too.

In supporting the motion Councillor Waller expressed the view that Members of the Commission were too focused on the no-blame culture and that he was confident that officers would be dealt with in an appropriate way if they made genuine mistakes.

Councillors Harrison and Middlemass both offered their support for Councillor Gibbs’ motion.

In summing up the Chair explained that he believed the scoping of the review to be right and that he wanted to continue with the review in a task and finish group.

RESOLVED:

That (1) the Commission do not continue with the Code of Conduct Review; and

(2) the report be noted.

(Nine Members voted for the motion and three against)

(6.46 pm – 7.02 pm)

133/18– REVIEW OF STANDING ORDER 27 PUBLIC ARRANGEMENTS - QUESTIONS:
The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager submitted a written report on Standing Order 27 Public Arrangements – Questions. The report provided information to the Commission in response to a proposed future item of work by a member of the public. The Standing Order was attached to the report at Appendix A and a comparison with the Council’s CIPFA nearest neighbours on public questions was attached at Appendix B.

The member of the public that proposed the future item of work, Mr Peter Lilley, was given five minutes in which to explain to the Commission why he wanted Standing
Order 27 Public Arrangements – Questions to be reviewed. He stated the following:

I brought this matter to your attention because over the last few months I’ve encountered a number of problems when submitting Public Questions. Indeed, I’ve been getting the impression that the legal department has been actively trying to obstruct me.
I’ve been told my question is too long – when much, much longer questions have been allowed.
I’ve been told that the question isn’t really a question.
I’ve been told a question was potentially defamatory as it was construed as criticising the legal department.
And twice now I’ve been banned from asking a question on the grounds that I’d asked a similar question within the previous six months which contravenes the current Standing Orders.
Two points on that:
First, I would argue it’s perfectly reasonable to ask a question again if one didn’t receive a satisfactory answer first time round. Because, as you know, members of the public aren’t permitted to ask follow-up questions.
But also, on two previous occasions the legal department did allow me to ask similar questions within a six-month period. So once again we have this issue of inconsistency.
I’ve asked both Ms Norton and Mr Sampson to provide me with an explanation. Neither of them will. Is that acceptable. I don’t think so.
I think the Standing Orders relating to the asking of Public Questions needs updating.
The Council currently gives the impression of reluctantly offering the facility. That’s something it’s required to do by law – but actually hates the idea of being questioned and held to account.
My view is that if more questions were asked and received direct answers the Council would actually operate so much more efficiently and effectively. The Council seems to spend a lot of its time trying its hardest NOT to answer questions.
I think you should look at setting a word count for questions or perhaps allowing questioners to speak for up to a minute. Or up to two minutes.
And I think it’s really important that members of the public should be able to ask a follow-up question as I believe that could help prevent residents from being fobbed off with a non-answer.
I also think you should be allowed to ask a spontaneous question. At the moment, you have to submit questions at least 48 hours in advance which gives council officers plenty of time to come up with an evasive answer.
I also think that answers should be put together by the councillor to whom it’s addressed. It shouldn’t be written for them by officers.
Public Questions are an opportunity for members of the public to hold their elected representatives to account. Therefore the question should be answered by the councillor.

In response to a question from Councillor Middlemass on who should decide whether a question is adequately answered, Mr Lilley stated that the questioner should be the one to decide. Councillors Middlemass and Harrison expressed concern that this approach could never work as it was entirely subjective and could lead to the questioner submitting the same question multiple times simply because
they did not like the answer.

The Chair asked Mr Lilley whether he would expect an immediate response to a spontaneous or supplementary question. My Lilley accepted that written answers may sometimes have to be provided.

Councillor Harrison explained that, whilst public questions had been introduced in order to involve the public in meetings, the main purpose of questions at Council meetings was for Councillors to question the Executive and Committee Chairs.

Councillor Marsh explained that she was grateful that this subject had been brought before the Commission as it had allowed her to see how other Council's operate public question schemes. Councillor Marsh wanted the Commission to consider the issues of supplementary and spontaneous questions and time limits.

Councillor Gibbs agreed with Mr Lilley that more questions from members of the public are a positive thing. However Councillor Gibbs felt the current rules as set out in the standing order were very clear and any changes could lead to ambiguity. He therefore moved the recommendation as set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report that stated further work/ a review of the Council’s Standing Orders that relate to the asking of Public Questions should not be undertaken. Councillor Atkinson seconded the motion and stated that there were over 150,000 voters in the Harrogate District and there had only been one complaint regarding the public questions process. It was therefore not necessary to review the Standing Order.

Councillor Bateman stated that submitting questions in advance of the meeting was preferable as it allowed the responder to do research and therefore provide a thorough answer.

Councillor Broadbank questioned whether questions were adequately answered by the Executive and Committee Chairs. Councillor Marsh commented that, out of the group surveyed, twelve Councils allowed supplementary questions.

**RESOLVED:**

That further work/ a review of the Council’s Standing Orders that relate to the asking of Public Questions is not undertaken.

(Nine Members voted for the motion and three against)

(7.02 pm – 7.20 pm)

134/18 – **FEEDBACK FROM OTHER COMMITTEES AND EXTERNAL BODIES:**

The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager updated the Commission on the work being done by the Customer Services task and finish group. The results from the customer services feedback survey had been received and would be discussed by the group. A report back from the task and finish group would be provided at the June meeting of the Commission.

(7.20 pm – 7.21 pm)
The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager submitted a written report presenting the current draft Work Programme for the Commission. The Chair advised that the meeting in May was to be cancelled and that a workshop would take place in June to set the programme for the next municipal year.

(7.21 pm – 7.22 pm)

Members considered the latest Forward Plan of key decisions. The Scrutiny, Governance and Risk Manager advised that several items that were on the forward plan when the agenda for the meeting was published have since been removed as the decisions had been taken and the matters had not been called-in for scrutiny.

(7.22 pm – 7.23 pm)