

COUNCIL FORUM MEETING
Thursday 3rd December 2015

PRESENT – Councillor H. Akhtar (*in the Chair*), Councillors Ali, Bateson, Brookfield, Browne, Casey, Connor, Cottam, Desai, Entwistle, Evans, Gee, Groves, Gunn, Hardman, Harling, Hollings, Hussain S., Jan-Virmani, Kay, Khan M., Khonat S., Lee, Liddle, Mahmood A., Mahmood Q., Maxfield, McFall, McKinlay, Mulla, Nuttall, O’Keeffe, Oates, Patel, Pearson J., Rigby C., Rigby J., Riley, Roberts, Shorrocks, Sidat, Slater Jacqueline, Slater John, Smith D., Smith J., Surve, Talbot, Tapp, Taylor, Vali, Whalley, Whittle and Wright.

RESOLUTIONS

43. Notice Convening Meeting

The Chief Executive read out the notice convening the meeting.

44. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Tony Humphrys, Julie Slater, Karimeh Foster, David Foster, Zamir Khan, Parwaiz Akhtar, Iftakhar Hussain, Mike Johnson, Julie Daley, Abdul Rehman and The Mayor, Councillor Faryad Hussain.

45. Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest received.

46. Council Forum

The Chief Executive advised that four questions from members of the public had been received as follows:

From Matthew Mahoney, Ouseburn Road Blackburn to the Executive Member for Environment:

Every year residents of Ouseburn Road are plagued with many antisocial fires between the 1st and the 6th November on the council owned field between Ouseburn Road and Scotland Bank Terrace in Blackburn. This year we have suffered numerous fires and the Fire Brigade was called out 4 times to extinguish the fires and the Council's Trash the Trash service twice to remove the fire debris and associated fly tipping.

The environmental impact is severe. Serious and long term damage creating an eyesore to a green space that is maintained throughout the year by the council. Air pollution as this year a wheelie bin was set alight and fly tipping dramatically increases in an area already blighted by regular fly tipping.

These antisocial fires are very dangerous and are left unattended throughout the night and the day creating a real risk of serious injury. Children and young people being most at risk as they use the field to walk to and from school.

These fires cause great distress to local residents whether they be young families, the elderly or those with disabilities who feel very vulnerable to have such sustained antisocial behaviour of nightly fires, large unruly groups and daily fly tipping taking place on their door step. Imagine what it is like to be frightened to go out of your own house.

The Council and Fire Brigade should not have to bear the cost of extinguishing the fires and cleaning up the mess in these times of reduced budgets. This is a serious issue which need resolving as it is having a detrimental effect on local residents. The council has a duty of care to protect residents from fire hazards, toxic fumes and environmental damage on council owned land. Therefore I would like to save the Council and Fire Brigade money, reduce antisocial behaviour, keep the field green and importantly ensure the safety of people by meeting with the appropriate officers to look at practical solutions to avoid this happening in future years. I would recommend:

- 1. For the Council to use its combined knowledge and experience to install a temporary barrier on the field from the 1st to the 6th November.*
- 2. To install 'no fires allowed' signs on the field.*

The Executive Member for Environment, Councillor Jim Smith, gave a response to the question and supplementary question arising.

From Karen Barker Feildens Farm Lane, Mellor Brook, to the Executive Member for Culture Leisure and Young People:

Mr Martin Eden has put forward a proposal that Daisyfield Pool remain open, but with a substantial reduction on the working week. (As per letter from Kate Hollern attached) Staff at Daisyfield state this is to be 15 hours per week Wed to Fri 4pm to 9pm. This is not good news. On pure economy of scale it will surely result in the eventual closure of the building as it is nothing more than a mere run down of facilities and reduction in the number of people/groups using this pool.

Would it not be possible and indeed better to look at charging all users via membership (similar to the £15 per month previously advertised) for the facilities to enable a wider use of the building encompassing all the existing users (most already have signed to say they are prepared to pay) and indeed encouraging new groups if any quiet times exist to ensure a future for the building rather than just getting ready for an asset transfer?

The Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Young People gave a response to the question and supplementary question arising.

From Mrs Gillian Munroe Durham Road Blackburn to the Executive Member for Culture Leisure and Young People:

Should the Council decide on the reduced opening hours, and then discover that there is insufficient capacity within the opening hours offered by the new pool would it be possible to amend the proposed opening times of Daisyfield in particular the morning sessions.

The Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Young People gave a response to the question and supplementary question arising.

From Mr McCarthy Hozier Street Blackburn to the Executive Member for Culture Leisure and Young People:

May I, on behalf of the users of the threaten swimming pools in Blackburn, please put forward the following questions for consideration and reply

If we consider the closure of Shadsworth (4 to 6 lanes) and Daisy field (4 to 6 lanes). Meaning a loss of 8 to 12 lanes. Then look at the other pools we gain an extra 2 in Blackburn, whilst losing 8 to 12 lanes. Darwen has up to 8 lanes. But Darwen pool was always a pool in its own right. Sport England was commissioned to make a study (at what cost in money?) They reported back that the affected pools were about requirements. Once we close these pools they are lost for ever and at some time in the future they will have to be replaced. We know that the pool in town cost £13.5m, and the council put in £8.5m, under another lease agreement it seems. (We didn't learn from the bus station lease fiasco, then?)

Should we not be keeping these pools, knowing 8 to 12 lanes do not go in to 2 lanes, so saving money in the long term? If we have more pool space than Sport England thinks we should have. Is that not being to our credit and worth preserving?

The Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Young People gave a response to the question and supplementary question arising.

47. Motions submitted under Procedure Rule 12

The Chief Executive announced that one Notice of Motion had been submitted under Procedure Rule 12 as follows:

This Council notes with grave concern the threat to public services cuts and the impact of these cuts on BWD residents.

In November, after a June announcement and September consultation, the government finally confirmed that there will be a 6.2% in-year cut to the Local Authority Public Health Grant in England. This means that Blackburn

with Darwen has to find £931,000 of cuts to the public health services of local residents in the last 4 months of this year. To order such a cut three quarters of the way through the financial year is a very inefficient way to manage the health of the nation and illustrates the contempt with which local government is held by the current national government.

In addition, it has recently been announced that the government is proposing to change the Public Health Grant Formula from 2016/17. This will change the basis on which Local Authority Public Health Grant is calculated. The formula is very complex – but results in rural areas being allocated a greater share than previously. One consequence is that deprived and mainly urban areas generally lose out. The reformulation will mean that Blackburn with Darwen with its high levels of deprivation loses £2.6m, Wokingham in Berkshire, one of the wealthiest boroughs in the country, gains £1m. and the borough with some of the worst health outcomes in the country, Blackpool, will lose about £6m.

Governments have choices and this current government is choosing to move resources from the poorer parts of the country to the richer parts as a mechanism for rewarding its supporters. Since the Second World War, successive governments, Conservative and Labour, have seen the reduction of inequality as a major objective of public policy – this has now been reversed and we have a government that unashamedly does not care about growing inequality in the country. Indeed it deliberately chooses policies that make inequality predictably and preventably worse.

This Council asks both the Chief Executive and the Director of Public Health to write to the Secretary of States for Health and the Treasury to ask for these cuts to be reversed.

Moved by Councillor Mohammed Khan.

Seconded by Councillor Phil Riley.

On moving the Motion, Councillor Mohammed Khan moved an amendment to the Motion by insertion of the following – after ‘Treasury’ in the final paragraph, insert “both Members of Parliament”. This amendment was accepted by Council and there then followed a debate on the Motion.

Councillor Jamie Groves moved that there be a recorded vote, which was seconded by Councillor John Roberts.

There then followed a recorded vote as follows:

For

Councillors: Akhtar (H), Bateson, Brookfield, Browne, Casey, Desai, Entwistle, Evans, Groves, Gunn, Harling, Hollings, Hussain, Jan-Virmani, Kay, Khan, Khonat, Liddle, Mahmood (A), Mahmood (Q), Maxfield, McFall, McKinlay, Mulla, Nuttall, Oates, O’Keeffe, Patel, Riley, Roberts, Shorrock, Smith (D), Smith (J), Surve, Talbot, Taylor, Vali, Whalley, Whittle, Wright.

Against

Councillors: Ali, Connor, Cottam, Gee, Hardman, Lee, Pearson, Rigby (C), Rigby (J), Slater (Ja), Slater (Jo), Tapp.

Councillor Sidat was not present at the time of the vote.

The Motion was therefore carried.

RESOLVED – That the Motion be carried.

48. Medium Term Financial Strategy and Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Review 2015/16

A report was submitted which provided an update on the ongoing Medium Term Financial Strategy and which outlined a proposed change to the Councils MRP (Minimum Revenue Provision) Policy.

Council Forum in September 2014 received details of the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the predicted budget position for 2015-2018. Council agreed a range of advance budget savings proposals for early implementation to assist in setting a balanced budget for 2015/2016 at Finance Council in March 2015 and in making further savings in the following two years.

Since then the Chancellor has continued to indicate that there would be further spending cuts in the public services until 2020 as he aimed to generate a budget surplus by that date.

Following the Emergency Budget announcements made in the summer after the General Election, and consistent with the budget monitoring reports to Executive Board this year, there was a number of areas that were likely to now increase the budget shortfall further. These included:

- further anticipated reductions in central government funding, i.e. above those already forecast in specific grants such as Public Health Grant which has already been subject to a late in-year cut of £1M in 2015/16.
- continuing pressures across demand-led services and Adult Social Care in particular and
- continuing Welfare, Education and NHS reforms.

In March 2015 Finance Council approved the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy for 2015-16.

Over the past few months the MR Policy charge to the income and Expenditure Account had been reviewed as part of the wider review of the key components of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The findings of the review were that a change to the policy would provide a simplification of the

calculation, a smoothing of the cost by using a straight-line rather than a reducing-balance basis whilst maintaining a prudent payment profile which was in fact of shorter duration.

It was proposed to amend the MRP policy, with immediate effect from 2015-16, for all existing capital expenditure financed from debt up to 2007/08 and all new Government-supported borrowing arising in 2007/08 and thereafter, to spread the cost evenly over 50 years (i.e. at 2% per annum). This shortened the timeframe for ultimate repayment and, as a consequence of re-polling the payments themselves, results in significant reductions in cost in earlier years i.e. reductions of £1.73 million in 2015/16, £1.59 million in 2016/17 and £1.46 million in 2017/18. Costs would start to increase slightly from 2032/33, and more materially a few years later, with the highest increase compared to the current MRP Policy being around £0.75 million from the 2050s.

Though there would be higher costs in later years, the overall profile remained prudent and shorter in duration.

This proposal, though not directly aligned to any of the four specific options outlined in the DCLG Guidance issued when MRP was introduced was clearly in line with the overriding principle that all councils should make prudent provision to redeem debt liability over a period which was reasonably commensurate with that over which the capital expenditure was estimated to provide benefits. A number of other local authorities had made equivalent changes to their MRP Policy both last year and this year.

As the Autumn Statement was awaited (and the Local Government Finance Settlement) MTFS forecasts had been continually revised. This would require a further comprehensive review of the allocation of resources across the Council. This included detailed reviews of all expenditure and income budgets, contractual commitments, property holdings and staffing structures. These would be set in the context of the Council's statutory responsibilities, risks and corporate priorities.

A further update of the MTFS would be provided to Council Forum in January or Finance Council in March 2016 pending receipt of the funding settlement anticipated in December.

RESOLVED –

- That the update on the emerging MTFS is noted; and
- That the Council recommend to approve the proposed change to the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy for 2015-16, so that existing capital expenditure financed from;
 - a) debt up to 2007/08 and

- b) from Government-supported borrowing arising in 2007/08 and thereafter, is paid over 50 years on a straight-line basis i.e. in equal repayments over the period.

49. Leisure Review

A report was submitted which provided an update on the progress made on the Leisure Review, reporting the outcome of the consultation process which was approved at Council Forum on 1st October 2015 and presenting proposals and recommendations for changes in leisure provision as a consequence of undertaking the Leisure Review.

The consultation process took place from 2nd October 2015 to 31st October 2015. The public consultation progressed in two formats, a questionnaire and public meetings.

The consultation questionnaire was made available at Daisyfield Pools and Shadsworth Leisure Centre and on the Council's website. Additionally, questionnaires were also sent to schools, clubs and groups that represented users and their needs.

Public meetings took place at Shadsworth Leisure Centre on 20th October 2015 and at Little Harwood Community Centre on 22nd October 2015. The dates and times for the public meetings were advertised in the leisure centres, the libraries and on the Council's website. The aim of these public meetings was to collect as much intelligence from local people, partners and organisations on the value of their local swimming pool facility, to explore the possibility of it being operated differently, and what the anticipated impact could be if swimming pools were to close.

A total of 395 questionnaires were received in response to the consultation on the Leisure Review. The questionnaires were analysed by an independent organisation and the report was available as background papers to this report. The key messages from the analysis of the questionnaires were outlined in the report submitted.

The public meeting at Shadsworth Leisure Centre was attended by 32 members of the public and the public meeting at Little Harwood Community Centre was attended by 53 members of the public. The key messages from the public meetings were outlined in the report submitted.

As a result of the public meetings, the Council subsequently received expressions of interest from two different local organisations that attended the public meetings and wished to become involved in the operation of Shadsworth Leisure Centre and Daisyfield Pools.

Blackburn Centurions Swimming Club has submitted an expression of interest to the Council to take on a 'license to operate' exclusive use of the swimming pool at Shadsworth Leisure Centre. The club would relocate their

club sessions from other pool facilities and concentrate their activities at Shadsworth Leisure Centre.

The report submitted gave further details of the proposals.

The Council could continue to operate these leisure facilities on reduced opening hours between 5.00pm and 9.30pm from Monday to Friday; which equates to 22.5hrs of opening. The reduced opening hours would enable the majority of the existing dry side users to continue to use the facilities so that the centre could maximise income whilst minimising operating costs.

The Council had received a proposal from a local company which provided a range of aquatic activities, programmes and lessons across Pennine Lancashire and further afield. The company wish to take on a 'license to operate' Daisyfield Pools. The organisation has proposed to create a charitable organisation to operate the centre and provide a pool programme to meet local community needs.

The organisation which has submitted the proposal has some experience of operating aquatic programmes in Blackburn and they have good local knowledge of the communities across Blackburn.

However, there has not been sufficient time since the public consultation ended and the proposal was submitted for the Council to fully consider and assess the financial and operational implications of the proposal and affect an asset transfer of the facility.

As part of the consultation process, the Council also advertised the opportunity to manage one or both Leisure Centres at nil cost to the Council on the NW CHEST website and as a result of this advert; and had received expressions of interest from two private sector leisure operators.

However due to the lack of time available since the consultation period ended; it has not been feasible to embark on a procurement process with these two companies and seek bids for the operation of Shadsworth Leisure Centre and Daisyfield Pools.

It was therefore proposed that the Council could work in partnership with the Centurions swimming club and the Dance school to jointly operate the facilities at Shadsworth Leisure Centre on reduced opening hours.

This would enable the Centre to remain open to the public at the busier evening times and operate at nil costs to the Council.

The Council could continue to operate Daisyfield Pool on significantly reduced opening hours to minimise operating costs and maximise income by retaining the most popular casual swim sessions within the pool programme alongside a reduced public swim lesson programme.

Alongside this, it was suggested that the Executive Member for Culture, Leisure and Young People and the Director of Environment and Leisure could be authorised delegated powers to undertake the work necessary to asset transfer the building(s) in 2016/17 to achieve the overall saving of £731,000 attributed to the Leisure Review.

If the aforementioned proposals were approved the operating subsidy for Daisyfield Pools would reduce from £422,000 to £71,000, a saving of £351,000.

There then followed a debate where the Executive Member for Leisure, Culture and Young People moved that a recorded vote be undertaken which was seconded by Councillors John Roberts. This was agreed by Council, the results of which were as follows;

For

Councillors: Akhtar, Bateson, Brookfield, Casey, Connor, Desai, Entwistle, Evans, Groves, Gunn, Hardman, Harling, Hollings, Hussain, Jan-Virmani, Kay, Khan, Khonat, Liddle, Mahmood (A), Mahmood (Q), Maxfield, McFall, McKinlay, Mulla, Nuttall, Oates, O’Keeffe, Patel, Rigby (J), Riley, Roberts, Shorrocks, Smith (D), Smith (J), Surve, Talbot, Taylor, Vali, Whalley, Whittle, Wright.

Abstain

Councillors: Browne, Cottam, Gee, Lee, Pearson, Rigby (C), Slater (Ja), Slater (Jo), Tapp.

Councillors Ali and Sidat were not present at the time of the vote.

The vote was carried in favour of the recommendations in the report.

RESOLVED –

1. That the results of the consultation process involving the general public and stakeholders be noted;
2. Agree the proposals for changes in leisure provision as a consequence of the consultation process having been carried out;
3. Work in partnership with local organisations to jointly operate the facilities at Shadsworth Leisure Centre on reduced opening hours and operate the centre at nil costs to the Council;
4. Continue to operate Daisyfield Pools but on significantly reduced opening hours to minimise operating costs and maximise income and reduce the subsidy from £422,000 to £71,000, a saving of £351,000; and
5. Delegate authority to the [Director of Environment and Leisure] in consultation with the Executive Member for Leisure, Culture and

Young People under delegated powers to undertake the work necessary to asset transfer the building(s) in 2016/17 to achieve the overall saving of £731,000 attributed to the Leisure Review.

50. Adoption of Blackburn with Darwen Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies

A report was submitted which presented the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies for adoption, incorporating the changes set out by the Planning Inspector following independent public examination.

Copies of the draft Plan proposed for adoption, which comprised of a written statement and policies' maps, had been made available in each of the political group rooms, in the Executive Members' room and on the Council's website.

Members were reminded that

- in a report to Council Forum on 07 November 2013 two options were presented:
 - i. Progress the Local Plan Part 2 to adoption as expediently as possible; or
 - ii. Delay progress on the Local Plan.
- On consideration of this report, including the case presented for each of the options, the decision was made to progress preparation of the plan to adoption.

The Council has prepared its Local Plan in 2 stages/parts.

In January 2011 the Council adopted its Core Strategy. The Core Strategy which set out a 15 year (2011-2026) strategic framework for achieving the Council's growth agenda was in effect Part 1 of the Local Plan. Local Plan Part 2 was a complementary document; it provided more detail on specific land allocations for different purposes including employment and housing, it set out the infrastructure requirements for the successful delivery of the identified sites and development management policies for the determination of planning applications.

The examination process was now complete. The Council had received the Planning Inspector's report on his assessment of the plan.

The Inspector considered that with the recommended main modifications set out in the appendix to his report Local Plan Part 2 was sound, legally compliant and capable of adoption.

The recommended modifications predominantly related to matters discussed at the examination hearings and did not alter the overall strategy or the scale

of development proposed to secure delivery of the Council's corporate ambitions for economic growth and transformation. A summary of the main issues and details of the Inspector's recommendations was set out in the report.

The Local Plan Part 2 was therefore presented to Council Forum for adoption under Section 23(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

RESOLVED – That the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, up to 2026, incorporating the recommended main modifications set out in the appendix to the Inspector's report dated 26 October 2015 be adopted.

51. Combined Authorities

Members received a report which outlined the findings of the Governance Review undertaken for Lancashire and set out the next steps and recommendations.

In October 2014 Council Leaders indicated their wish to develop closer collaborative working across Lancashire on economic related matters and to explore the options in this regard. In order to determine whether the existing arrangements were effective or would benefit from change the Leaders asked that a Governance Review be undertaken.

The Governance Review attached to the report was the culmination of considerable collective work by the Lancashire Councils to understand the best way forward for joint working. The review explores three questions: Where are we now? Where do we want to be? How will we get there?

As part of this review Leaders developed ambitions for Lancashire, as set out in the document.

These were:

- Prosperous Lancashire – a Lancashire that is recognised as a destination of choice, to invest in, do business in, live or visit;
- Connected Lancashire – digital and transport connectivity to promote inclusive growth;
- Skilled Lancashire – a skilled workforce to meet the demands of employers and future business growth;
- Better Homes for Lancashire – better living standards for residents with good quality homes and a wide housing offer;
- Public services working together for Lancashire – integrated public services at the heart of local communities giving everyone the opportunity for a healthier life.

In addition with a population of 1.5 million, Lancashire should be a key contributor to the Northern Powerhouse and UK plc.

An options appraisal was undertaken and consideration was given to arrangements including – enhanced status quo, Joint Committee, Economic Prosperity Board, Integrated Transport Authority, Combined Authority.

A Combined Authority offered the strongest governance model to attract freedoms and flexibilities from the Government and would enable a cohesive approach across Lancashire to a range of issues including developing better and broader skills provision, including entry level skills; more co-ordinated infrastructure planning with improved use of resources; more co-ordinated approach to housing provision; more co-ordinated approach to business growth. Given Lancashire's diversity, a 'one size fits all' approach was unsuitable and some issues were best tackled on a sub-level footprint or themes relevant to a cluster of authorities across Lancashire.

Having considered the economic evidence, the ambitions for Lancashire and the current decision making arrangements, the Governance Review concluded that a Combined Authority provided the best opportunity for Lancashire to achieve its potential.

The Lancashire Leaders, at their meeting on 1st September 2015 accepted, in principle, the recommendations of the Governance Review to form a Combined Authority.

In order to establish a Combined Authority a scheme had to be prepared which sets out the membership, decision making arrangements, scrutiny arrangements etc. The draft scheme was appended to the report submitted.

Some of the existing Combined Authorities had also negotiated further devolution deals with the Government to gain additional and greater powers and devolved funding for their area. While there was a close link between Combined Authorities and greater transfer of powers, functions and funding, it was important to note that they were separate issues and subject to negotiation. The Government would not impose arrangements in any form.

A devolution deal, and any freedoms or associated responsibilities would need the agreement of the constituent members of the Combined Authority.

The Governance Review and the report sought to agree the establishment of a Combined Authority, which would bring benefits to Lancashire as outlined in the Review by strengthening the partnership working across the county. A similar report was going to other councils throughout November and December.

Lancashire Leaders would meet again in January to consider any adjustments which may need to be made to the scheme.

A six week public consultation would be undertaken in January/February 2016 with stakeholders, residents, businesses, community groups, neighbouring areas etc invited to put forward their views on the proposals.

Having given consideration to the outcome of the public consultation, those authorities who wished to form a Combined Authority would submit a proposal to the Secretary of State for consideration which may include devolution proposals for freedoms, flexibilities and powers to help the Combined Authority drive forward Lancashire's ambitions alongside demonstrating the robust governance structures to be put in place outlined in the draft scheme.

RESOLVED THAT -

1. The contents of this report be noted;
2. The contents of the Lancashire Governance Review and recommendation therein be noted;
3. The contents of the draft Scheme for a Combined Authority be noted;
4. Blackburn with Darwen Council agree to take part in the public consultation in January/February 2016 which will seek views on the formation of a Combined Authority for Lancashire;
5. The Council agree to consider the feedback from the public consultation and note that following this, those authorities who wish to form a Lancashire Combined Authority will submit a proposal to the Secretary of State for consideration;
6. The Council agree in principle to becoming a constituent member of the Combined Authority for Lancashire; and
7. The Council give final consideration to becoming a constituent member of a Lancashire Combined Authority at a Council meeting in the New Year.

52. Policy and Corporate Resources Committee

The Chair of the Policy and Corporate Resources Committee presented an updated report on the work of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the report of the Policy and Corporate Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted.

53. Reports of Executive Members with Portfolios

Council Forum received and considered reports of the Leader and Executive Member with Portfolios. These were considered as follows:

The Leader, Environment, Leisure, Culture and Young People, Neighbourhoods, Housing and Customer Services, Regeneration, Resources, Schools and Education, Health and Adult Social Care and Children's Services.

The Executive Member for Children’s Services, Councillor Maureen Bateson, in submitting her report verbally reported that the Adolescent Support Unit had recently been inspected and had been judged as outstanding in each category, and that Appletrees had also recently been inspected – the results were still waited, but positive feedback was anticipated.

Councillor Jim Smith, Executive Member for Environment thanked Councillors for positive feedback on the Clear All Policy relating to back streets and advised he would pass on the thanks of the Council to staff.

RESOLVED – that the reports of the Leader, Environment, Leisure, Culture and Young People, Neighbourhoods, Housing and Customer Services, Regeneration, Resources, Schools and Education, Health and Adult Social Care and Children’s Services be noted.

54. Year Planner 2016/2017

Further to the submission of the Draft Year Planner to the Council Forum meeting on 1st October 2015, an updated version was submitted for approval.

RESOLVED – that the updated Year Planner for 2016/17 be approved.

55. Questions from Members under Procedure Rule 11

The Chief Executive announced that one question had been received under Procedure Rule 11 as follows:

Question from Councillor Don McKinlay to the Leader of the Council:

“Regarding the Government’s proposal anti trade union legislation, does it have any part to play in a modern society like Great Britain?”.

A response to the question was provided by the Leader of the Council.

Signed at a meeting of the council
on the day of
(being) the next ensuing meeting of the Council) by

MAYOR