



Exeter City Council

A meeting of **EXETER CITY COUNCIL** will be held at the **GUILDHALL, HIGH STREET, EXETER** on **TUESDAY 16 JULY 2024**, at 6.00 pm, at which you are hereby summoned to attend.

If you have an enquiry regarding any items on this agenda, please contact Mark Devin, Democratic Services Manager on 01392 265477.

The following business is proposed to be transacted:-

	Pages
1 Minutes	
To approve and sign the minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 23 April 2024, the Annual Council Meeting held on 14 May 2024 and the Extraordinary Council meetings held on 28 May 2024 and 10 June 2024.	3 - 30
2 Official Communications	
3 Public Questions	
Details of questions should be notified to Democratic Services at least three working days prior to the meeting - by 10am on Thursday 11 July 2024.	
Details about speaking at Council to be found here: Public Speaking at Meetings .	
To receive minutes of the following Committees and to determine thereon:-	
4 Planning Committee - 29 May 2024	31 - 34
5 Strategic Scrutiny Committee - 6 June 2024	35 - 40
6 Exeter Harbour Board - 13 June 2024	41 - 46
7 Combined Strategic Scrutiny & Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee - 18 June 2024	47 - 48
8 Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee - 27 June 2024	49 - 56
9 Executive Committee - 4 June 2024	57 - 62
10 Executive Committee - 9 July 2024	
The minutes of the meeting will follow and will be tabled at the meeting.	To Follow
11 Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order No. 8	
A plan of seating in the Guildhall is attached as an annex.	

Date: Monday 8 July 2024

Bindu Arjoon
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

Tuesday 23 April 2024

Present:-

The Right Worshipful the Lord Mayor Councillor Kevin Mitchell (Lord Mayor)

Councillors Asvachin, Atkinson, Begley, Bennett, Bialyk, Branston, Denning, Ellis-Jones, Foale, Fullam, Hannaford, Harvey, Holland, Jobson, Ketchin, Miller, Mitchell, M, Moore, D, Parkhouse, Patrick, Read, Rees, Sheridan, Snow, Sparling, Vizard, Wardle, Warwick, Williams, R and Wright

Apologies:-

Councillors Allcock, Knott, Leadbetter, Williams, M and Wood

Also Present

Chief Executive, Director Corporate Services, Director Finance, Service Lead Legal Services, Director of Culture, Leisure and Tourism, Democratic Services Manager and Democratic Services Officer (PMD)

26

MINUTES

The minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 20 February 2024 were moved by the Leader, Councillor Bialyk, and seconded by Councillor Wright taken as read, approved and signed as correct, with one minor amendment to Minute No. 10.

The minutes of the Ordinary meeting of the Council held on 20 February 2024 and of the Extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 21 March 2024 were moved by the Leader, Councillor Bialyk, and seconded by Councillor Wright taken as read, approved and signed as correct.

27

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Lord Mayor advised that he had attended the following:-

- the opening of the Vbranch House outdoor accessible area and sensory path;
- the Children's Hospice South West Jailbreak Fundraising event where as Lord Mayor, he presided over sentencing the prisoners to pay bail of £999;
- the King's Squad Passing Out Parade at the Royal Marines Commando Training Centre;
- the retirement reception for Inspector Simon Arliss, where he presented him with a Lord Mayor's Commendation Award;
- the 2nd Anniversary of the Devon Ukrainian Association and Conversation Café;
- the Exeter Hindu Cultural Centre Holi Celebration; and
- the launch of the Women's Rugby World Cup event.

He further advised that he had hosted a charity talk by local Historian, Dr Todd Gray – where £1,200 was raised for the Lord Mayor's chosen charity, FORCE Cancer Charity.

The Lord Mayor bade farewell to the Members who would not be standing in this year's City Council elections as well as those who had already left, namely Councillors Richard Branson, Barbara Denning, David Harvey, Andrew Leadbetter, Zion Lights, Martin Pearce, Amy Sparling, Steve Warwick and Emma Morse. He expressed the thanks of the Council to them and wished them well for the future. He then invited Members who would not be standing in this year's elections to say a few words if they so wished:-

- Councillor Harvey conveyed how honoured and privileged he had been to serve as a Member for eight years;
- Councillor Warwick looked back on his previous roles as a Councillor in Surrey and in Liverpool as well as Exeter and implored all Members to fight for Local Government;
- Councillor Sparling thanked everyone who had voted for her as well as all Exeter City Council officers she had been working with and the members of the community in St David's; and
- Councillor Denning highlighted the need to take Local Government seriously.

The Lord Mayor thanked everyone for their comments and gave a special mention to Councillor Branson, currently the Father of the Chamber and a long-standing personal friend of his.

28

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Lord Mayor reported the receipt of five questions from members of the public.

Question from Mrs Cynthia Thompson

Was a preferred access near IKEA shown on the Masterplan for the proposed St. Bridget's Nursery Development and if so, what advice was presented by a Planning Solicitor to the Planning Committee re. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 Sections 2023-2025 for possible Statutory means of achieving this access?

The Leader gave the following response:

"The Newcourt Masterplan (November 2010) shows a primary route from the A379 heading south-east, which has now become Newcourt Way. A secondary route then is shown heading south-west from this primary route (in the approximate area where the roundabout onto Ikea Way has been built) which links into the St Bridget's Nursery land.

The Masterplan was not adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. The adopted Exeter Core Strategy (February 2012) does not require development to be in full accordance with the masterplan as it is only indicative of the final development. This was a position recommended by the Planning Inspector when assessing the Core Strategy, leading to paragraph 12.13 of the Core Strategy which states that 'The development of this area should have general regard to guidance contained within the Newcourt Master Planning Study.

No advice was given directly to the Planning Committee by the Council's solicitor regarding a statutory means of achieving this connection. The sections cited refer to powers to override easements or other rights in the land.

The Council is unaware of whether there are easements and other rights benefitting adjoining land that need to be overridden in order for the development to progress. In any event these powers can only be invoked where the Council are considering using their powers of Compulsory Purchase.

The developer has not approached the Council about it using its compulsory purchase powers so as to overcome any rights of light, easements, or restrictive covenants by virtue of s203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. This is probably because the developer believed that it had an adequate alternative access scheme.”

In a supplementary question, Mrs Thompson asked if, in future, such information would be provided. The Leader replied that advice would be sought on the subject.

Question from Mr Alan Conibere

The full ramifications and cost to Exeter taxpayers following the collapse of Exeter City Living will not be realised until the evaluation and sale of acquired Council land is completed. Are you any further forward with that process and what is the Councils current assessment of net loss of this failed project.

The Leader gave the following response:

“The process of scaling back the Company was completed on 27 March. ECL made a cash payment of £1.4m towards the loans and transferred assets to a value of £4.3 million to the Council, including the land at Clifton Hill additionally the Council has made a statutory repayment of debt of £441,000 leaving a total of £3.95 million to be written off.

The £3.95 million has been financed using a mixture of capital receipts and reserves earmarked for capital purposes meaning that there will be a saving of around £288,000 in the General Fund from 2025/26 rising to £400,000 once the sale of Mary Arches has completed.”

In a supplementary question, Mr Conibere asked for the Leader’s view on the assessment that the process had lacked transparency. The Leader disagreed with this assessment, adding that transparency had been observed throughout.

Question from Mr Ian Frankum

On 20th Feb Cllr Foale responding to a question, stated his & ECC’s intention to provide air quality data in Exeter from the new monitor’s more frequently than the statutory requirement. A recent Fol answer from ECC stated data on AQ would be made available in September (for 2023) for the annual report. Which is correct?

The Leader asked Councillor Foale, Portfolio Holder for Corporate & Democratic Services and Environmental Health, to answer Mr Banyard’s question. Cllr Foale gave the following response:

“Our answer remains the same as per the question previously posed by Mr Frankum at Ordinary Council on 20 February 2024. The new monitors are now operational and are being verified to make sure that reliable data is being obtained.

Exeter City Council will report on the data from the new sensors, as well as our existing monitoring network, as part of our annual Air Quality Status Report. This is

produced to a timetable set by DEFRA and has to be submitted to them for approval before it is published. The report is typically published in September each year.”

Mr Frankum asked a further question, which the Lord Mayor remarked did not address the answer just given. Mr Foale reiterated that he stood by his statement from 20 February 2024.

Question from Carol Finning

Since the removal of some dog poo bins in September by this council the "Grit Bin" in Hamlin gardens has become full of discarded dog waste, have council listened to public feedback and replaced any of those that you removed?

The Leader asked Councillor R Williams, Portfolio Holder for Place and City Management, to answer Ms Finning’s question. Cllr R Williams gave the following response:

“We had a review carried out on the impact of the removal of litter bins and the changes to our street cleansing regimes and in a few locations, where standards have dropped or the need became apparent, we have reinstated litter bins. If you would like to read the review, it is openly available as it was [presented to the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee on 1 February](#). This process of monitoring and review will continue. New requests for bins will continue to be assessed as per our usual process and littering can be reported via our website at [Report littering - Exeter City Council](#).

Our Teams will then be able to reactively respond and clear the littering, as well as document the report for our monitoring process.”

Question from Neil Martin

At April’s ECC Executive meeting, Item 6, Appendices 4 & 5 highlighted a risk to projected Car Parking Revenues.

The comments stated reasons as, “Commuters working from home during the week” and “Reductions in Commuter parking”; it also referred to a reduction of 10% in city centre footfall. What analysis, data or evidence was used to support those statements?

The Leader gave the following response:

“The statement regarding a reduction in commuter parking is extrapolated from our parking ticket sales. Data available includes the type and duration of tickets sold, the time of purchase and the location chosen. All of these data sets, give an indication of the purpose of the visit and are compared to similar historical data.

Footfall data is provided by InExeter on a weekly basis, which shows daily, weekly, and monthly footfall trends in comparison with previous years. InExeter have footfall cameras located on Magdalen Road, Cathedral Yard, Fore Street, Sidwell Street, High Street (Next & Guildhall) and Queen Street. The Net Zero & Business service have historical footfall data going back to 2016.”

In a supplementary question, Mr Martin asked if the Council agreed that the increased recorded traffic on East Wonford Hill, Pinhoe Road and other roads was the result of displacement from the failing Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme. In his reply, the Leader declined to draw such conclusions and advised that all data

was being collected by Devon County Council and would be made available at the proper time.

29

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 19 FEBRUARY 2024

The minutes of the Planning Committee of 19 February 2024 were presented by the Deputy Chair, Councillor Asvachin, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee of 19 February 2024 be received.

30

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Planning Committee of 25 March 2024 were presented by the Deputy Chair, Councillor Asvachin, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee of 25 March 2024 be received.

31

AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 6 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee of 6 March 2024 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Wardle, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 9 (Informing the Audit Risk Assessment)**, Councillor Moore asked what action would be taken to review the Council's processes to help officers be aware of potentially fraudulent attempts to influence decision-making. Councillor Bialyk acknowledged the seriousness of any attempt of fraud and stressed that interference with the democratic process was unacceptable from anyone. He advised that he would consult with solicitors and the Chief Executive and bring a report back at the appropriate time.

In respect of **Minute No. 6 (Interim Annual Auditor's Annual Report on Exeter City Council 2021/22 and 2022/23)**, Councillor Moore prompted the Leader for an update on the arrangements for the appointment of representatives to all relevant Council-connected companies and charities. In his response, Councillor Bialyk remarked that the minute in question was that of a meeting he did not attend; however, he endeavoured to provide Councillor Moore with an answer at the earliest opportunity.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee of 6 March 2024 be received.

32

LICENSING COMMITTEE - 19 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Licensing Committee of 19 March 2024 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Asvachin, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Licensing Committee held on 19 March 2024 be received.

33

EXETER HARBOUR BOARD - 11 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Harbour Board of 11 March 2024 were presented by the Chair, Councillor R Williams, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 76 (Harbour Revision Order Update)**, Councillor Bennett sought confirmation from Councillor R Williams that the Harbour Board budget would feature on future Harbour Board agendas as a standing item. Councillor R Williams clarified that the Harbour Board budget details were submitted to the Audit & Governance Committee – and therefore already in the public domain – would be circulated for information with Harbour Board agendas.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Harbour Board held on 11 March 2024 be received.

34

STRATEGIC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 14 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee meeting of 14 March 2024 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Atkinson, and taken as read. She placed on record her thanks to the recently departed Democratic Services Officer Sharon Sissons for her help with administering the committee.

In respect of **Minute No. 17 (Ethical Advertising and Low Carbon Framework)**, Councillor Sparling expressed concern that the next opportunity for review of the Policy would not be before April 2025 and asked for an update. Councillor Atkinson reminded her of the agreed process; Councillor Bialyk offered to speak to the Chief Executive and see if this could be speeded up.

In respect of **Minute No. 12 (Portfolio Holder report)**, Councillor Hannaford enquired about the future of Exeter Safe Space initiative following loss of funding and what Exeter Council could do to keep it going. The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Culture and City Centre Strategy explained that, while Exeter Safe Space had been funded as part of Safer Streets 4, work was taking place behind the scenes within the Community Safety Partnership towards a September 2024 reopening. She also clarified that this was not in the remit of Exeter City Council.

In respect of **Minute No. 18 (Forward Plan of Business and Scrutiny Work Plan)**, Councillor Read sought clarity on the correct process for inviting external speakers to Scrutiny Committee meetings, stressing the need for a uniform approach across all committees. Councillor Atkinson explained the process which involved SMB, stressing that this was an agreed procedure. She added that it was also possible for a proposal to be put forward to the committee in question but stressed the importance of prioritising witnesses with evidence-based expertise. While she acknowledged it was always possible to formally review the process, she felt that it worked well.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee held on 14 March 2024 be received.

35

CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 28 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee of 28 March 2024 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Vizard, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee held on 28 March 2024 be received.

36

STRATA JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 13 FEBRUARY 2024

The minutes of the Strata Joint Scrutiny Committee of 13 February 2024 were presented by Councillor Patrick and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 26 (Appointment of Nominated Representatives)**, Councillor Read sought clarity on the legal grounds on which representatives could be nominated as substitutes, noting that this was not standard practice for Exeter City Council. The Leader replied that the Constitution was clear that the Strata Joint Scrutiny Committee was a shared committee.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Strata Joint Scrutiny Committee held on 13 February 2024 be received.

37

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - 5 MARCH 2024

The minutes of the Executive of 5 March 2024 were presented by the Leader, Councillor Bialyk, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 39 (Review of the Corporate Risk Register)**, Councillor Rees asked when the Executive were expecting to see fewer items flagged as red on the Risk Register. The Leader replied that the red risks helped the Executive identify areas that needed to be addressed as a matter of priority; he also argued that a Risk Register with all indicators on green had no credibility.

Councillor Moore asked the Leader about risks associated with the Exeter Development Fund, namely the proposal for the Council and other institutions in the city to put property assets into a new vehicle set up for investment by pension companies to enable property speculation and investment in infrastructure. The Leader remarked that the minutes at hand merely noted the Risk Register but advised that he would be prepared to find the appropriate forum to have this discussion.

In respect of **Minute No. 40 (Householder's Guide: Design of Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Adoption)**, Councillor Ketchin felt that the document presented should be visited to incorporate green policies. Councillor Moore agreed with him and proposed an alternative recommendation as follows:-

“To refer this draft SPD back to the planning team to review this policy with a view to removing planning barriers to reducing carbon emissions, protecting and enhancing nature and addressing the climate crisis in line with the Council’s corporate objectives of Net Zero 2030 and tackling the environmental crisis.”

Members speaking in favour of the alternative recommendation made the following comments:-

- there were mechanisms that the Council could use to help people make greener choices more easily; and
- Exeter City Council should seize the opportunity to go further than the national guidance.

Speaking against the alternative recommendation, the Leader praised the amount of work carried out by the Planning team and stressed the importance of taking the emotional out of the debate.

The alternative recommendation was moved by Councillor Moore, seconded by Councillor Read and, following a vote, the alternative recommendation was lost.

The Leader then moved and Councillor Wright seconded the substantive recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 41 (Tree and Woodland Strategy 2023-33)**, Councillor Ketchin pointed out two factual inaccuracies and asked for these to be amended or removed. The Leader replied that any inaccuracies in the minutes would be addressed at the next meeting of the Executive. The Lord Mayor clarified that the minutes at hand reflected what had been said at the meeting, regardless of whether what had been said was accurate or not. The Leader suggested that a post-meeting note could be appended to the minutes in question.

Councillor Ketchin went on to make the following points:-

- the Council needed to identify where trees could be planted and tree loss needed to be factored in;
- Devon County Council's tree planting policy focused on rural planting;
- funding was key; and
- sustained political intent was needed.

Councillor Moore proposed an additional recommendation as follows:-

"To prepare a five-year budget for the implementation of the action plans set out in the strategy. The budget should set out the likely allocation by the Council in the Medium-Term Financial Plan, any funding gap in Council funds for this work falling under Council responsibilities and also the level of anticipated contributions from third parties, as yet unidentified."

She explained that:-

- she was keen that trees should be planted earlier than when they needed to be replaced;
- it was clear that the budget was insufficient; and
- the additional recommendation would take some effort to implement but should be seen as an investment.

Speaking in favour of the additional recommendation, Councillor Hannaford felt that the figure of £800 to plant a tree was an exaggeration and made further reference to:-

- the issue around the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA);
- community fruit orchards; and
- the street tree planting initiative in London.

Conversely, Councillor Harvey felt that the additional recommendation was a knee-jerk reaction and made the following observations:-

- the strategy started a long time ago and was one of three that needed to be seen together; and
- the fact that Exeter City Council now has a tree team should be celebrated.

The Leader thanks Councillor Harvey for his comments and further advised that, while he would be voting against the additional recommendation, he would be discussing its contents with Scrutiny Chairs. He added that the substantive recommendation should be recognised as a commitment.

Councillor Moore moved and Councillor Ketchin seconded the additional recommendation and, following a vote, the additional recommendation was lost.

The Leader then moved and Councillor Wright seconded the substantive recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive held on 5 March 2024 be received and, where appropriate, adopted.

38

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - 9 APRIL 2024

The minutes of the Executive of 9 April 2024 were presented by the Leader, Councillor Bialyk, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 46 (Overview of General Fund Revenue Budget 2023/24 – Quarter 3)**, the Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 47 (2023/24 General Fund Capital Monitoring Statement – Quarter 3)**, Councillor remarked that the Capital Budget was behind schedule in terms of delivery, which she warned could result in a substantial underspend; she asked the Leader if additional capacity was being built to address this. The Leader replied that the Director Finance had explained to the Executive Committee the reasons why there had been any rolling forward and what the current situation was; he further advised that he would have to seek the Director's advice on the next steps to take.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations and, following a vote, the recommendations were carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 48 (2023/24 HRA Budget Monitoring Report – Quarter 3)**, the Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations and, following a vote, the recommendations were carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 49 (The Household Support Fund – Scheme 5)**, the Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 50 (Climate Adaptation Strategy for Devon, Cornwall and Isles of Scilly)**, Councillor Parkhouse praised the strategy and remarked that it was the first of its kind in the region.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations and, following a vote, the recommendations were carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 51 (Council Health and Safety At Work Policy)**, the Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried unanimously.

In respect of **Minute No. 53 (Council Health and Safety At Work Policy)**, Councillor Mitchell remarked that this was a new approach for Exeter City Council and asked when this would be reviewed. The Leader replied that a review would take place at the appropriate time, adding that he was reluctant to commit to a time schedule at this stage. He did, however, confirm that any review would be brought to the Executive and then to Full Council.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendation and, following a vote, the recommendation was carried unanimously.

In respect of **Minute No. 54 (Exeter Plan: Full Draft Consultation Reporting)**, Councillor Vizard stressed the importance of good public consultation and asked the Leader for any comments on how the process had been received so far. The Leader highlighted:-

- the complex approach to consultation; and
- how some other authorities should have consulted too.

Members made the following comments:-

- it was important for all Members to be engaged;
- a detailed schedule of Member engagement was essential; and
- dates of the Exeter Plan workshop must be announced as soon as possible.

The Leader stressed the importance of the Planning Member Working Group meetings and clarified that:-

- this was a resident-led consultation;
- while it was important to hold discussions with the relevant people, Members would not be rewriting the Exeter Plan; and
- Exeter needed both an urban design and a mix of accommodation types.

Councillor R Williams praised the work of the planning officers and urged all Councillors to attend Planning Member Working Group meetings.

In respect of **Minute No. 55 (Wonford Community Wellbeing Hub)**, Councillor Asvachin welcomed the report and urged officers to find £7m as soon towards the project. Councillor Denning offered wholehearted support for the recommendations and welcomed the fact that residents of St Loyes as well as Wonford would have their own community hub, adding that the project would help people in the community. Councillor Moore welcomed the fact that the scheme was moving forward; however, she felt that the report should include a recommendation with a preferred option by the community.

The Leader explained that:-

- this was a high-priority project;
- if Exeter City Council could bring the project forward, it would; and
- it was essential to engage with the community in any governance structure.

The Leader moved and Councillor Denning seconded the recommendations and, following a vote, the recommendations were carried.

In respect of **Minute No. 56 (Live And Move Sport England Place Partner 2025-2028)**, Councillor Harvey asked why, if tending an allotment was considered a physical activity, allotment fees were being put up. The Leader replied that allotment charges had been discussed at great length, that the increases would be phased over two years and that, in the main, allotment holders were satisfied.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations and, following a vote, the recommendations were carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive held on 9 April 2024 be received and, where appropriate, adopted.

The Leader proposed, and the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Culture & City Centre Strategy seconded, that Councillor K Mitchell be nominated as Lord

Mayor Elect for the 2024/25 Municipal Council year, and Councillor Knott be nominated as the Deputy Lord Mayor Elect for the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED that Councillor K Mitchell be nominated as Lord Mayor Elect for the 2024/25 Municipal Year and that Councillor Knott be nominated as the Deputy Lord Mayor Elect for the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

40

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER
NO. 8**

In accordance with Standing Order No. 8, the following question was put by Councillor Hannaford to the Leader:-

“Can the Executive Member please update council in the ongoing maintenance and future of the Northbrook Swimming Pool?”

The Leader gave the following response:-

“Maintenance and capital repairs to Northbrook continue to take place both proactively and reactively. A built facilities report for leisure has been commissioned and will be shared at Council when complete.”

In a supplementary question, Councillor Hannaford asked the Leader for firm reassurances that the future of Northbrook Swimming Pool was safe and secure. The Leader replied that no decision had been taken to close it.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 8, the following question was put by Councillor Hannaford to the Leader:-

“Can the Executive Member please update the Council about the ongoing maintenance and refurbishment of the empty Council owned properties in the Buddle Lane & Newman Road estate, including a timetable of the works, and when we anticipate that families can move back in again?”

The Leader asked Councillor Denning, Portfolio Council Housing Development and Support Services, to answer Councillor Hannaford’s question. Councillor Denning gave the following response:-

“The project was to demolish and rebuild 18 Council houses, and 12 of the 18 properties were completed and let in early 2023. This leaves only 6 properties still to be completed, once funding is in place. In the meantime, all site security fencing and all remaining scaffolding is inspected weekly and the Council has engaged a security company who carry daily and nightly random patrols, they also report back on any issues found. Any report issues are being dealt with promptly. The Housing Team keep in contact with the displaced residents and continue to offer them support and alternative accommodation given the delays in completing these properties.”

In a supplementary question, Councillor Hannaford asked if the Portfolio Holder agreed that it was high time that funding was put in place to get these properties open again. Councillor Denning replied that, if funding were found, the properties in question would be open again, adding that permission had been given to the Section 106 Officer to start the process once funding was available.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 8, the following question was put by Councillor Hannaford to the Leader:-

“Can the Executive member please update council in the ongoing maintenance and refurbishment of the Riverside Leisure Centre, including the reroofing works?”

The Leader gave the following response:-

“Maintenance and capital repairs to the Riverside also continue to take place both proactively and reactively. Reroofing could take place alongside the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme to allow the centre to be more energy efficient.”

In a supplementary, Councillor Hannaford asked the Leader for a timescale of when the roof would be waterproof. The Leader replied that this would happen as soon as possible but added that a plan was required first.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 8, the following question was put by Councillor Moore to the Leader:-

“Now we have reached the end of the financial year what is the cost, or latest estimated cost, to the Council resulting from the closure of Exeter City Living both in terms of lost income to the Council, and the outstanding debt liability?”

The Leader gave the following response:-

“The process of scaling back the Company was completed on 27 March. ECL made a cash payment of £1.4m towards the loans and transferred assets to a value of £4.3 million to the Council, including the land at Clifton Hill additionally the Council has made a statutory repayment of debt of £441,000 leaving a total of £3.95 million to be written off. The £3.95 million has been financed using a mixture of capital receipts and reserves earmarked for capital purposes meaning that there will be a saving of around £288,000 in the General Fund from 2025/26 rising to £400,000 once the sale of Mary Arches has completed.

In overall terms the loss of income is estimated to be £112,000 as reported in the budget pressures for 2024/25.”

41

SENIOR LEADERSHIP REVIEW

The Leader presented the report on the revised senior leadership structure, which had been updated following consultation and feedback with affected officers and outlined the consultation outcomes and proposed new job descriptions and salaries. Members noted that the Council had approved the draft business case for consultation in February 2024 as part of the Organisational Change Policy.

The Leader invited Members to raise any questions with the Chief Executive, who responded as follows:-

- there was an earmarked reserve set aside to meet any redundancy costs, which had been developed by the previous Chief Executive & Growth Director for undertaking a senior leadership restructure and had been increased to ensure the process was undertaken fairly and equitably;
- the earmarked reserve for redundancy costs were just over £1 million, to ensure there would be no significant impact to the revenue budget and where it was not used, the restriction around the earmarked reserve could be lifted for repurposing elsewhere;

- the structure proposals had been developed around the Council's existing priorities and should there be any changes to the Council's priorities, a report on the cost implications and any likely structural changes would be brought forward. The proposed structure in the report would provide efficient and effective management of the current statutory and discretionary priorities;
- the proposals approved by Members in February 2024 were developed through working with the LGA and the Council's current priorities. Following the meeting in February, the Chief Executive had consulted with Directors and the Operational Management Board (OMB), through a series of face meetings and through submitted feedback. The consultation information had been considered by the Chief Executive and LGA to bring forward structure amendments for Members' approval;
- it would not be standard practice to consult with the whole organisation on a leadership restructure but to focus on the staff affected and the process of appointing Directors. Once appointed, the Chief Executive and Directors would consult with OMB members individually;
- it was intended that the difference from the cost reduction would be put toward a management development programme to invest in the proposed cultural changes;
- there were essential posts, currently sitting at the service lead level, which would also need to be invested in for the proposed new structure;
- there was an intention to undertake a pay review and work was being undertaken to develop a benchmarking system with other authorities, both from CIPFA recommended and neighbouring authorities with proposals from that work being presented to SMB and Members;
- there was a set procedure for calculating redundancy payments for staff leaving the Council. The Council followed the Organisational Change Policy to maintain openness, transparency and fairness and consistency in how it engaged with affected staff;
- the Council's current service delivery was very good and the intention was to continue striving to make improvements to delivering services more efficiently; and
once appointed, the new senior leadership team would lead the work in embedding the agreed values and behaviours.

The Leader, in moving the recommendations, made the following points:-

- he had been collaborating closely with the Chief Executive over a period of time on the restructure and there had been excellent consultation work undertaken with Directors and OMB;
- it was important to move the process on, but equally, it was important to ensure staff were treated with dignity and that the process was not delayed;
- the process had been undertaken correctly, through consultations with staff, trade union and discussions with the LGA for the Director level and evaluations made on job roles;
- the cost of the redundancies would be managed within the earmarked reserve;
- staff would not be denied their entitlements and the Council would do what it had to, to honour pay reviews and settlements, as agreed between the trade unions; and
- he commended the report and advised that details of the financial information would be discussed in the Part 2 report.

Councillor Mitchell, as co-Leader of the Progressive Group, made the following points:-

- he shared the aspirations of the Leader, but had concern about rushing the process to ensure permanency for any future administrations post-election;
- the Council was previously informed that a report would be presented in May, following consideration by the Executive, to allow opposition leaders the opportunity to ask questions on the matter.
- full Council was not the forum for a debate on the process and there had been no prior information provided before recommendations were presented to Members; and
- the report should have been taken to a combined scrutiny meeting to allow all Members the opportunity to raise questions and discuss the implications, before being considered by the Executive and Council.

Councillor Moore, as co-Leader of the Progressive Group, made the following points:-

- she welcomed the opportunity for Members to ask questions to the Chief Executive;
- the references in the report to having a balanced portfolio and coordinated corporate approach to services was welcomed;
- she expressed concern on the changes to the timeline, procedure and process outlined in the report presented to Members in February 2024;
- there was concern raised by the auditors about process for appointing senior staff
- the clarifications on redundancy and entitlement were welcomed, but requested a commitment that any deviation from the policy would require the matter to be brought back to Council for approval; and
- she would not be supporting the recommendations for noting.

During debate, Members made the following comments:-

- thanks were made to the Chief Executive for the report and for confirming the earmarked reserves and transparency of the process;
- an enquiry was made into the £370,000 payment to the former Chief Executive, with an apparent lack of transparency and scrutiny in the past;
- the proposals provided reassurance in providing more transparency going forward, in regard to redundancy and being in a statutory format; and
- the Chief Executive had shown a commitment to the role and assurance was sought that there would be no secondments outside of full-time roles.

In summing up, the Leader addressed Members' comments as follows:-

- it was important to not delay the process for the benefit and fairness of the Directors and OMB staff who were affected by the re-structure;
- the £370,000 payment consisted of salary and final exit payment, which was a saving on any redundancy payment and there had also been saving made on the post of Deputy Chief Executive;
- should the earmarked reserves go over budget, the matter would be brought back to Council; and
- he commended the report and was confident that the proposed re-structure proposals were the right course of action.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendation and following a vote, the recommendation was carried.

RESOLVED that the Council note:-

- (1) the outcome of the consultation with affected officers;
- (2) the final proposed structure;
- (3) the job descriptions for the proposed new posts;
- (4) the timescale for implementation of the new structure;
- (5) that a detailed report containing the proposed salaries for the Strategic Management Board and Operational Management Board and an Equality Impact Assessment costs would be shared as a Part 2 item, including a number of detailed recommendations; and
- (6) that the cost of the proposed new structure was less than the cost of the existing structure.

42 **Local Government (access to Information act 1985 - Exclusion of Press and Public**

43 **Senior Leadership Review**

(The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 9.49 pm)

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNUAL COUNCIL

Tuesday 14 May 2024

Present:-

The Right Worshipful the Lord Mayor Councillor Kevin Mitchell (Lord Mayor)
Councillors Allcock, Asvachin, Banyard, Begley, Bennett, Bialyk, Darling, Foale, Fullam, Haigh, Harding, Holland, Hughes, Hussain, Jobson, Ketchin, Knott, Miller, Mitchell, M, Moore, D, Palmer, Parkhouse, Patrick, Pole, Read, Rees, Rolstone, Sheridan, Snow, Vizard, Wardle, Williams, M, Williams, R, Wood and Wright

Apologies:-

Councillors Atkinson, Ellis-Jones and Wetenhall

Also Present

Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer, Service Lead Legal Services, Democratic Services Manager, Democratic Services Officers (PMD and LS)

1

ELECTION OF THE LORD MAYOR

RESOLVED on the nomination of Councillor Wright seconded by Councillor M. Mitchell, that Councillor Kevin Mitchell be elected Lord Mayor of the City for the ensuing Municipal Year.

The Lord Mayor was invested with his Chain of Office, made his Declaration of Acceptance of Office, took the Chair and returned thanks.

2

APPOINTMENT OF THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR

RESOLVED on the nomination of Councillor Bialyk, seconded by Councillor Patrick, that Councillor Paul Knott be appointed Deputy Lord Mayor of the City for the ensuing Municipal Year.

The Deputy Lord Mayor was invested with his Chain of Office, made his Declaration of Acceptance of Office and returned thanks.

3

VOTE OF THANKS

RESOLVED that the Council record its appreciation and thanks in respect of Councillor Tess Read, who had served as the Deputy Lord Mayor, and also to the Deputy Lord Mayor's Consort. Councillor Rees spoke of Councillor Read's ability to see the best in people and to seize every opportunity to meet new people, including representing the city at a number of events.

The retiring Deputy Lord Mayor returned thanks.

4 **ELECTION OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND CONFIRMATION OF THE DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

Councillor Bialyk was appointed as Leader of the Council. Councillor Bialyk confirmed the appointment of Councillor Wright as Deputy Leader.

RESOLVED that Councillor Bialyk be elected as Leader of the Council and Councillor Wright as Deputy Leader.

5 **APPOINTMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

The Leader of the Council confirmed his nominations for Portfolio Holders and Executive membership as circulated.

RESOLVED that the Council's Executive be appointed as follows for the ensuing Municipal Year:-

Bialyk, P.	Leader
Wright, L.	Deputy Leader and Corporate Services & City Centre
Vizard, M.	Climate, Ecological Change and Communities
Asvachin, M.	Housing, Homelessness Prevention and Customer Services
Wood, D.	Leisure Services & Healthy Living
Williams, R.	City Management
Allcock, N.	City Development
Foale, R.	Arts, Culture & Tourism

6 **APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES**

Alternative options had been submitted by the Labour and Progressive Groups in respect of the Chairs of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee, the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee and the Audit and Governance Committee.

A vote was taken on each of the nominations where it was **RESOLVED** that:-

- Councillor Parkhouse be appointed at the Chair of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee;
- Councillor Pole be appointed at the Chair of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee; and
- Councillor Wardle be appointed at the Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee.

RESOLVED that the membership of Committees etc., Chairs and Deputy Chairs and Independent Persons, as shown at the Appendix to these minutes, be approved.

(The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and closed at 7.52 pm)

Chair

EXETER CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE, SCRUTINY AND OTHER COMMITTEES: 2024/25

EXECUTIVE (8)

Bialyk, P.M. (Leader)	Foale, R.
Wright, L. (Deputy Leader)	Vizard, M.
Allcock, N.J.	Williams, R.T,
Asvachin, M.Y.	Wood, D.

PORTFOLIO HOLDERS (8)

Bialyk, P.	Leader
Wright, L.	Deputy Leader and Corporate Services & City Centre
Vizard, M.	Climate, Ecological Change and Communities
Asvachin, M.	Housing, Homelessness Prevention and Customer Services
Wood, D.	Leisure Services & Healthy Living
Williams, R.	City Management
Allcock, N.	City Development
Foale, R.	Arts, Culture & Tourism

CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (14)

Parkhouse, J.C.M. (Chair) *	Hussain, J.
Rees, C (Deputy Chair) *	Miller, M.
Begley, J.	Moore, D.
Darling, D.	Patrick, S.
Fullam, A.	Pole,L.
Harding, R.	Read, T.
Holland, P	Wardle, A.J.

STRATEGIC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (14)

Pole, L. (Chair) *	Knott, P.
Mitchell, M. (Deputy Chair) *	Moore, D.
Atkinson, Y.	Palmer, T.
Ellis-Jones, J.	Rees, C.
Haigh, L.	Rolstone, G.
Hughes, Z.	Snow, M.I.
Jobson, A	Williams, M.J.

SCRUTINY PROGRAMME BOARD (5)

Williams, M.J. (Chair)	Rees, C.
Mitchell, M.	Pole, L.
Parkhouse, J.C.M.	

AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (12)

Wardle, A.J. (Chair) *	Miller.M.
Jobson, A. (Deputy Chair)	Mitchell, M.
Atkinson, Y.	Moore, D. *
Begley, J.	Palmer, T.
Ketchin, A,	Patrick, S.
Knott, P.	Williams, M.

PLANNING COMMITTEE (14)

Knott, P. (Chair)	Hussain, J.
Patrick, S. (Deputy Chair)	Jobson, A.
Asvachin, M.	Ketchin, A.
Atkinson, Y.	Miller, M.
Banyard, J.	Mitchell, M.
Bennett, C.	Pole, L.
Hughes, Z.	Rolstone, G.

PLANNING MEMBER WORKING GROUP (8)

Patrick, S. (Chair)	Mitchell, M.
Atkinson, Y.	Pole, L.
Bennett, C.	Rolstone, G.
Jobson, A.	Knott, P. (Chair of Planning)

LICENSING COMMITTEE (14)

Snow, M.I. (Chair)	Holland, P.
Begley, J. (Deputy Chair)	Hussain, J.
Banyard, J.	Miller, M.
Bennett, C.	Parkhouse, J.C.M.
Fullam, A.	Sheridan, A.
Haigh, L.	Wood, D.
Harding, R.	Williams, M. J.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE (3)

Licensing Sub-Committee membership to be drawn from Licensing Committee Members above.

COMMUNITY GRANTS PANEL (6)

Vizard, M. (Chair)	Hughes, Z.
Darling, D.	Knott, P.
Holland, P.	Moore, D.

EXETER TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP (6)

Vizard, M. (Chair)	Wardle, A, J.
Holland, P.	Wetenhall, L.
Knott, P.	Wood, D.

EXETER HARBOUR BOARD (12)

(6 City Councillors)

Williams, R.T. (Chair)	Read, T.
Rolstone, G.	Snow, M.
Sheridan, A.	Williams, M.

(6 External Members)

ROYAL ALBERT MEMORIAL MUSEUM & ART GALLERY (RAMM) OVERSIGHT PANEL

(8)

(6 City Councillors)

Foale, R. (Chair)	Darling, D.
Atkinson, Y.	Jobson, A.
Banyard, J.	Snow, M.

(2 External Members)

COUNCILLOR DEVELOPMENT STEERING GROUP (6)

Wright, L. (Chair)	Palmer, T
Foale, R.	Vizard, M.
Jobson, A.	Williams, R.

COUNCIL HOUSING ADVISORY AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD (10)

(5 City Councillors)

Begley, J.	Fullam, A.
Asvachin, M.	Wardle.A.
Darling, D.	

(5 External Members)

INDEPENDENT PERSONS

Mr I Brooking and Professor B. Kirby appointed as Independent Persons to assist the Council in promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct amongst its Elected Members.

STRATA JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (3) – (1 FROM ECC)

Bialyk, P.M. (Leader)	

STRATA JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (9) – (3 FROM ECC)

Knott, P.	
Mitchell, M.	
Patrick, S.	

EXETER HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC ORDERS COMMITTEE (13)

(4 City Councillors)

Bialyk, P.M.	Wright, L
Wetenhall, L.	Wood, D.

(9 County Councillors)

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Tuesday 28 May 2024

Present:-

Councillors Asvachin, Atkinson, Banyard, Bennett, Bialyk, Darling, Ellis-Jones, Foale, Fullam, Haigh, Harding, Holland, Hussain, Jobson, Knott, Miller, Mitchell, M, Moore, D, Palmer, Parkhouse, Patrick, Pole, Rolstone, Sheridan, Snow, Vizard, Wardle, Wetenhall, Williams, M, Williams, R and Wright

Also Present:-

Chief Executive, Director Finance, Service Lead, Legal Services & Deputy Monitoring Officer, Democratic Services Manager and Democratic Services Officer (LS)

10

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Right Worshipful the Lord Mayor Councillor Kevin Mitchell, Councillors Allcock, Begley, Ketchin, Read, Rees and Wood.

11

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

It was noted that no public questions had been received.

12

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 8

It was noted that no questions had been received from Members.

13

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985 – EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED that, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of item 4a – Appendix 2, on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1, of Schedule 12A of the Act.

14

EXETER SCIENCE PARK LIMITED – CONVERSION OF DEBT TO EQUITY

The Leader presented the report which sought Members' approval for a range of proposals to enable Exeter Science Park Limited (ESPL) to deliver on its objective of providing high quality jobs to support the local region.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded an amendment to recommendation 3, to read as follows:-

“The appointment of Councillor Matt Vizard as shareholder representative with the Director Finance as an advisor.”

The Director Finance responded to questions from Members as follows:

- the loan was initially given and borrowed against the Council's loans and the conversion to equity, would equate to a debt repayment of £40,000 per year, with no interest issues;
- the Annual report and financial statement would be shared as soon as it is published;
- the Science Park would not become its own owner, however the percentage of shareholding would change;
- Councillor Vizard would act on behalf of Exeter City Council (ECC) and therefore look after the interests of ECC rather than the interests of the company;
- there was no conflict arising from the recommendations as they were acting in the interests of the Council; and
- the LEP had now ended and the money was being returned to the four stakeholders – Somerset Council, Devon County Council(DCC), Plymouth City Council and Torbay. These funds could only be used for the original purpose of what they were given.

Councillor Moore moved an amendment for the following additional recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor Palmer:-

- “1. That the shareholder representative report back to Council not later January 2025, on the progress on the matters in Recommendation 4 and the Company's ability to undertake the share buy-back;
2. As set out in minute 27 of the Audit and Governance Minutes of 30 November 2022 the next Audit and Governance Committee receive the report on the “review of the governance of external companies” and consider appropriate arrangements for the nomination for shareholder representatives to and the proper oversight of all Council connected companies and make recommendations to the Executive; and
3. To provide a report of all other unsecured loans and risk to the Council of those loans.”

During debate on the amendment, Members made the following further comments:-

- there was disappointment that the Executive had not acted on auditors' recommendations and progressed these matters;
- it appeared that the Council had not learnt from the Exeter City Living issue; and
- the additional recommendations would strengthen the Council's position, whilst reflecting on past situations and bringing accountability for using public money.

Councillor Palmer, in seconding the recommendation, commented that previous lack of governance and oversight could be amended to ensure residents were fully aware.

In concluding, Councillor Moore commented: -

- that she was glad people had contributed to the debate and that all Councillors wanted the same thing; and
- that the additional recommendations would help all Councillors understand the position.

The Leader, as the mover of the original motion, spoke on the additional recommendations and thanked Councillor Atkinson for providing context and in addressing the additional recommendations, made the following points:

- the Council would not wait until January 2025 to receive a report and Members would be advised as soon as any agreement was made.
- as there was already a minute at Audit and Governance, a discussion would be held with the Monitoring Officer; and
- there was only one unsecured loan, which was with Co-lab.

He also advised that it would be preferable to work on a trust basis rather than through a notice of motion and would request a Member Briefing to provide an update on the Science Park and ask Councillor Vizard to request an internal scrutiny process with the Science Park and engage Councillors in this.

The amendment was put to the vote and was not carried.

Councillor Jobson, as Leader of the Conservative Group, made the following points:-

- the Council had a duty to recover these funds and could not be generous at the current time or rely on getting the money back;
- there was merit in negotiating partial repayments; and
- private sector support would be required and did she did not support the recommendations.

Councillor Moore, as co-Leader of the Progressive Group, made the following points:-

- she would be writing to the Monitoring Officer about actions being progressed;
- she could see the long-term investment, but enquired about how this could be changed in the next year; and
- she would support the recommendations provided that real action was made soon.

During the debate, the following points were made:-

- Councillor Vizard welcomed the Leader's suggestion of a Member briefing and scrutiny options;
- the Science Park had created 750 jobs; and
- a Member advised of her work in the wider industry and their understanding and expertise.

In concluding, the Leader advised that:-

- no alternative recommendations had been made;
- he understood Councillor Palmer's expertise on this matter;
- greater scrutiny was needed and this would be monitored; and
- Councillor Vizard would ensure he had the interests of the Council at heart and hoped that the recommendations would be supported.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations and following a vote, the recommendation was **CARRIED**.

RESOLVED that Council agree to:-

- 1) reaffirm its support to Exeter Science Park as a driver for delivering high quality jobs to the local economy;
- 2) authorise the Section 151 officer to agree a conversion of the Council's outstanding loan to equity, in conjunction and on condition that each of the other owners agree to do the same. The conversion would include an obligation placed on the Company to buy back the shares, as and when land sales provided sufficient funds to do so;
- 3) The appointment of a Councillor to either act as Shareholder Representative with the section 151 Officer as an advisor, or a Councillor to support the section 151 Officer in the role of Shareholder Representative;
- 3) the appointment of Councillor Vizard as shareholder representative with the Director Finance as an advisor.
- 4) authorise the Section 151 Officer to support the implementation of the recommendations set out in the recent review undertaken by Deloitte:
 - a) to develop a clear marketing and business development strategy;
 - b) to deliver a sustainable operating and funding model via cost reduction and a restructuring of the debt;
 - c) to improve the Governance by reviewing the Further Agreement and Reserved Matters; and
 - d) to secure an updated Local Development Order and start the process to bring in either a private sector investor or private sector developer to support delivery of the remainder of the science park.
- 5) delegate authority to the Shareholder Representative to vote on matters arising at Shareholder meetings where there are no financial implications for the Council. Matters reserved for Full Council will be:
 - a) decisions which have an impact on the financial position of the Council;
 - b) amendments to the Further Agreement and/or Reserved Matters;
 - c) approval of a Business Plan for the Science Park; and
 - d) a decision to change the strategic direction of the Science Park.

(The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.07 pm)

Chair

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Monday 10 June 2024

Present:-

Councillors Allcock, Asvachin, Atkinson, Banyard, Begley, Bialyk, Darling, Ellis-Jones, Foale, Fullam, Haigh, Harding, Holland, Hughes, Hussain, Ketchin, Knott, Miller, Mitchell, K, Mitchell, M, Moore, D, Parkhouse, Patrick, Read, Rees, Rolstone, Sheridan, Snow, Vizard, Wardle, Williams, M, Williams, R, Wood and Wright

Also Present:-

Chief Executive, Director Finance, Director of City Development, Service Lead, Legal Services & Interim Monitoring Officer, Democratic Services Manager and Democratic Services Officer (LS)

15

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bennett, Jobson and Wetenhall.

16

LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND (LAHF) ROUND 3 FUNDING

The Leader presented Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF) Round 3 Funding to consider the recommendations set out in the report and made the following points:

- the Executive considered the report last week; and
- Option 2 was the preferred choice, which would require a £297,000 contribution from Council.

Councillor Moore as co-Leader of the Progressive Group welcomed the report and asked that the Portfolio Holder provide an update in six months on the resettlement matching process.

The Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Knott spoke in support of the proposal making the following points:

- he had recently attended the Respect Festival and met some of those who have been supported in the previous housing schemes;
- this proposal and Option 2 also supported the reduction in local housing need; and
- he endorsed the report and sought Members to vote in support of the recommendations.

The Leader in summing up agreed to request that a Portfolio Holder report be presented to a future Scrutiny Committee to update Members on the resettlement process.

The Leader moved and Councillor Wright seconded the recommendations for Option 2 to be supported and following the vote was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that Council agree Option 2 as follows:

- 1) to accept the full allocation of £594,000 in DLUHC grant funding;
- 2) the purchase of (four) properties off the open market;
- 3) that the Council's Capital contribution be funded through £297,000 of S106 funds;
- 4) the identification and purchase of suitable properties to let;
- 5) that the rents be set at affordable rates in accordance with the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding between DLUHC and Exeter City Council and the DLUHC recommended rental funding model Rent Standard – April 2023;
- 6) that the MOU be signed and returned to DLUHC by the 12th of June 2024 confirming the Council's participation in the programme; and
- 7) that delegated authority be granted to the Director of City Development and Housing and the relevant Portfolio Holder to proceed with the acquisitions and to amend the number of properties purchased in line with the agreement above and including where additional government grant may become available (provided that no further capital contribution is required from Exeter City Council).

17

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions from members of the public.

18

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER
NO. 8**

There were no questions from Members.

(The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 6.14 pm)

Chair

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 29 May 2024

Present:-

Councillor Knott (Chair)

Councillors Patrick, Asvachin, Atkinson, Banyard, Bennett, Hughes, Hussain, Jobson, Miller, Mitchell, M, Pole and Rolstone

Apologies

Councillor Ketchin

Also Present

Director of City Development, Service Lead City Development and Democratic Services Officer (PMD)

17

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2014 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct.

18

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

19

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 24/0063/FUL - 70 ADMIRAL WAY, EXETER EX2 7GT

The Service Lead - City Development presented the application for solar panels on roof of dwelling and garage, advising that this was a relatively straightforward domestic alteration, which normally would not come to Committee but did so on this occasion because:-

- the property - along with its neighbours - had their permitted development rights removed through condition 15 of the original application; and
- the applicant was the spouse of an Exeter City Council member of staff, which requires going to committee for reasons of transparency.

He talked Members through his presentation, which included:-

- site location plan;
- aerial view;
- photographs of neighbouring properties;
- proposed site plan;
- proposed fixing layout;
- various other solar arrays in the area; and
- officer recommended conditions.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Councillor Mitchell asked what effect the approval of the proposal would have on the development rights of neighbouring properties. The Service Lead - City

Development clarified that any approval would only apply to the applicant's property and that neighbours would have to apply individually.

There were no other questions and Members opted to go straight to the vote. The Chair moved the recommendation for approval with conditions, which was seconded by Councillor Mitchell, voted upon and CARRIED.

RESOLVED that planning permission for solar panels on roof of dwelling and garage be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

20

LIST OF DECISIONS MADE AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The report of the City Development Manager was submitted. In regard of 24/0263/DIS (Land Off Spruce Close And Celia Crescent Spruce Close Exeter), Councillor enquired about the nature of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. The Service Lead - City Development offered to contact her in the following days with a detailed answer.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

21

APPEALS REPORT

The schedule of appeal decisions and appeals lodged was submitted. The Director - City Development drew Members' attention to application No. 21/1014/FUL (68-72 Howell Road, St James) and highlighted:-

- how the appeal was granted;
- how the Inspector had noted that policy H5(b) of the Local Plan had remarked a lack of clear definitions around over concentration, area of the city and imbalance in the community.

He also advised that he had asked the Planning Team to delve into the Inspector's decision.

Councillor Mitchell thanked the officers involved for their work and made the following comments:-

- the community in St James was bewildered by the appeal decision;
- the concept of balance in the plan referred to buildings; and
- community balance was not the same as mixed communities.

Councillor Hughes relayed similar concerns from Pennsylvania residents and noted that the wording of the appeal decision seemed to suggest that it agreed with the original refusal whilst upholding the appeal.

Members made the following further comments:-

- purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) applications were always problematic;
- the new Local Plan provided an opportunity to agree on a precise definition of "balance";
- it was unclear whether limits set for student accommodation would apply to the entire city or to specific wards or even smaller areas;
- it was important not to create a divisive "us and them" rhetoric in any debate on student accommodation;
- it was worth investigating any best practice from similar cities;

- it would be helpful if future iterations of the supporting text were more thorough;
- imbalance could come from having an area where there was already an over concentration of students; and
- high concentration of student accommodation was sometimes perceived rather than factual.

Addressing the above comments, The Director - City Development :-

- provided clarity on the issue of costs and how the recent approval for PBSA at Beaufort House, to which reference had been made, had not been considered similar enough;
- agreed with a Member that the judgement could be viewed as setting a precedent and could make it more likely that other challenges would succeed;
- confirmed that it was unlikely that lawyers were involved in the appeal, seeing as a written representation had been submitted;
- called for a 'root and branch' approach to addressing over concentration;
- felt it was essential to consider the objectives of the city as a whole;
- stressed the need for a strong evidence based to justify any course of action;
- explained that the supporting text were not examined to the same extent as policies and also did not carry the same weight; and
- highlighted the need to weigh up the benefits of having students in Exeter.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.18 pm)

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

STRATEGIC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

6 June 2024

Present:

Councillor Councillor Liz Pole (Chair)
Councillors Mitchell, M, Atkinson, Ellis-Jones, Haigh, Hughes, Jobson, Moore, D, Rees,
Rolstone and Snow

Apologies:

Councillors Knott, Palmer and Williams, M

Also present:

Service Lead - Active & Healthy People, Director Finance, City Surveyor, Service Lead -
Communications, Tourism & Culture, Service Lead Legal Services, Democratic Services
Manager and Democratic Services Officer

In attendance:

Councillor Philip Bialyk	- Council Leader
Councillor Naima Allcock	- Portfolio Holder for City Development
Councillor Matthew Vizard	- Portfolio Holder for Climate, Ecological Change and Communities
Councillor Duncan Wood	- Portfolio Holder for Leisure Services and Healthy Living

20 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2024 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct, subject to the addition of a vote of thanks given to Sharon Sissons.

21 **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

22 **Questions from Members of the Public Under Standing Order No.19**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

23 **Questions from members of the Council Under Standing Order No.20**

There were no questions from members.

24 **Commercial Property Review**

Chair proposed that Commercial Property Review be heard.

The Director Finance introduced the report stating that there were around 600 leases and licenses, many historic owned since wartime and all were within the city.

The City Surveyor presented the report making the following points:

- There was a substantial asset value of £98.5million with an annual rental income of £8.38 million;
- In addition, land ownership strengthened strategic control of land use and regeneration
- A review of disposals would be coming to Executive as a more proactive approach was needed;
- There were recruitment issues within the team and innovative approaches were being explored to address this; and
- the funds for the Guildhall were ring-fenced.

The Director Finance and the City Surveyor answered questions from Members as follows:

- any sales funds not used for debt repayment would need to be invested and may break-even but longer-term interest rates may fall and impact on investment;
- rents were reviewed with new leases and rent review events. There were opportunities for restructuring of leases in locations such as the High Street and Marsh Barton;
- there was a budget of £1.7million to address Environmental Performance Certificates when properties were returned;
- it was requested that the Scout Hut make contact with the team with a proposition and the lease length could then be discussed;
- the wider corporate aims to reduce carbon impact to objectives would be added;
- Capital receipts go into the General Fund and were treated as any other funding;
- interest and capital were paid, as fixed rate loans and all would have a zero balance at the end;
- there were a number of capital requirements which would need to be prioritised;
- the government were not encouraging the acquisition of commercial property, hence the Guildhall funds were ring-fenced for use on regeneration activities;
- Office occupancy was down but Senate Court was amongst the most modern offices in the city which people are willing to pay for, but re-investment was needed to continue this;
- an asset strategy review was required but should take place after the corporate restructure;
- some historic assets were used as operational spaces and the Council worked with the historic organisations;
- there were not many applications under community asset transfer;
- the city wall was not strictly commercial but a member of the team was working on a repair project;
- a report would be coming on Belle Isle. Mary Arches was on the market and CityPoint and Clifton Hill will follow;
- there were government rules around paying back and re-financing of the Guildhall, with a management agent in place dealing with billing, tenants and maintenance, which was also monitored by a Council accountant;
- there were not really any post-covid trends around voids. The long-term void in the Guildhall was paying rent in full and not sub-letting; and
- recruitment issues within the team were problematic.

Councillor Mitchell proposed and Councillor Moore seconded the following recommendation which following the vote was carried.

RECOMMENDED that the Executive Committee consider a review of the current Asset Management Policy in relation to commercial property.

RESOLVED that the report was noted.

25 **Leisure Service Update**

The Service Lead - Communications, Tourism & Culture presented the report making the following points:

- leisure was taken back in-house in 2020;
- the team had bucked the national trend and were trying to improve daytime footfall;
- there was a lot of competition, but the rise in budget gyms was now falling;
- work was being undertaken on linking with other teams to meet corporate priorities;
- there had been successes in joint working with GP Referral Schemes being nationally recognised, which saw over 200 people per week, with a waiting list of 80 and making a profit. There were strong links with NHS teams and the voluntary sector;
- the staffing model had changed following received advice and research undertaken about what people want and need;
- diversification work was ongoing for the digital offer;
- there was a need to be cost-neutral, which was a challenge with aging stock. Northbrook would come to Council, St Sidwell's Point required updating, Wonford had proposals on the table and Riverside had ongoing challenges;
- the team was still recovering from staffing changes;
- there were just under 12,000 members with 47,000 pay as you go members. Attrition had also peaked with university students leaving;
- work was being undertaken on creating social cohesion using the available space, such as the Northcott Theatre using space for junior sessions;
- Active Devon were a critical partner for benchmarking; and
- the net cost of the service for 2024-35 was £2.8million

The Service Lead - Communications, Tourism & Culture answered questions from Members as follows:

- data had been collected from projects such as Pelican and each one was reviewed to enhance and improve accessibility;
- data was also shared between teams, with Active and Healthy People looking at areas of deprivation and reach out to where there was no leisure facility;
- there is potential to increase income as St Sidwell's and Riverside had reached capacity;
- the pricing structure would be reviewed for implementation next year, and would consider peak/off-peak;
- the revenue cut had been difficult but would not compromise Health and Safety; There was no date for becoming cost-neutral due to the aging buildings;
- most swimming pools generally loss money but St Sidwell's Point bucked this trend;
- junior and family options would be considered when addressing prices, as current 12 for 10 didn't apply;
- there were no outcomes from the travel plan which had been worked on with the bus station. The report would have gone to Devon County Council but there were no final results currently;

- the Council continued to encourage sustainable travel through green tourism and had arrangements with Stagecoach and GWR;
- car parking pricing was being looked at to see if there was anything which could be done for members;
- Northbrook was in an area of deprivation and was a fantastic facility, however it required a Member decision in future;
- Riverside didn't always look clean despite using appropriate cleaning chemicals. Issues raised at the meeting would be picked up with operational team; and
- a breakdown of memberships would go to the Executive, but the highest was adult gym memberships, followed by adult swimming and then junior and swimming lessons.

RESOLVED that the report was noted.

26 **Live and Move Strategy**

The Service Lead – Active and Healthy People presented their report and made the following points:

- a further application for funding had been made to Sport England, the outcome of which would be determined in a couple of weeks;
- there had been a focus on lower super-output areas;
- the Active Lives survey provided rich information to inform where resources were pointed;
- there was a focus on those doing no activity, and the survey demonstrated a year-on-year reduction of those doing zero activity;
- there was a £4.50 return on every £1 invested, which could be greater for those increasing from zero activity;
- work was being undertaken with Inclusive Exeter to improve activity in diverse communities;
- the Live and Move programme was nationally recognised as being innovative; and
- there had been an increase in the proportion of families who were active.

The Service Lead – Active and Healthy People answered questions from Members as follows:

- through partnership with Devon County Council and the LCWIP, support had been provided for a number of schemes however, Sport England work had supported Newtown area;
- Alphington Green Circle diversion would have a consultation later this year and may potentially require partner finance;
- the Ebrington Road area was contained within the St Thomas priority area
- governance belonged with the Council as the host organisation and was contracted until the end March 2025 subject to the further ask of funding for 2025-2028
- Sport England would meet on 25 June 2024;
- data was based on the annual local lives survey and had a dashboard and focus on the 20 lower super-output areas;
- information could be provided on protected characteristics in future;
- there had been a focus on culture, long-term health conditions and low income;
- the Wonford Hub governance would be decided post-planning;
- the Alphington crossing idea had been appraised by Devon County Council and deemed not feasible;

- King George V playing field was a multi-use area for football, walkers and those enjoying the biodiversity. There was a shortfall of three ATP pitches and work with the Community Trust would be taking place;
- community builders were the eyes and ears on the ground, connecting directly with their communities;
- there was learning to be had from the programmes which have been in place such as those for girls and women;
- teenage girls showed the largest drop-off in activity;
- it was a great time for girls' rugby with two city teams and another about to begin ahead of the Womens Rugby World Cup in 2025; and
- there was a focus on the city working with Cranbrook as a satellite town to identify barriers such as single car occupancy, which for Cranbrook, was the highest in the country.

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure Services and Healthy Living was invited to the table and answered questions as follows:

- he acted on HATOC as an independent Member, rather than as a Portfolio Holder;
- he supported Devon County Council with elements which learned from and work with local communities;
- work was being looked at for improvement to transport options and seeking more active travel;
- HATOC were undertaking an equalities impact assessment and seeking legal advice and there will be learning from the analysis; and
- the Live and Move Strategy would support Devon County Council to learn and it was important to note Exeter City Council only monitored emissions.

RESOLVED that the report was noted.

27 **Forward Plan of Business and Scrutiny Work Plan**

The Chair shared that the Scrutiny Programme Board had been re-scheduled and would be meet on 17 June 2024.

The Service Lead Legal Services, in responding to a question from a Member, agreed to look at the Scrutiny forms and processes for submission, with the Scrutiny Programme Board.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 8.34 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

EXETER HARBOUR BOARD

Thursday 13 June 2024

Present:-

Councillor Williams, R (Chair)
Councillors Read, Rolstone, Sheridan, Snow and Williams, M
R Eggleton, A Garratt, J Green, D Marino, J Prescott and C Seddon

Also Present

Harbour Master Exeter Port Authority, Waterways Team Manager and Democratic Services Officer (PMD)

79

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2024 were taken as read and signed by the Chair as correct, with one minor amendment to Minute No. 74.

80

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of pecuniary interest were made.

81

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chair advised that a number of questions had been submitted but that the author of the questions was unable to attend the meeting.

82

CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

New Members

The Chair welcomed the two new elected Exeter Harbour Board members (Councillors Gemma Rolstone and Alison Sheridan) as well as the two new independent members (Lt Col David Marino and James Prescott). Members and Officers then introduced themselves.

Thumbnail Portraits of Members

The Chair informed the Board that she had received a request from a member of the public for thumbnail portraits and short biographies of Harbour Board members to feature on the website. She advised that this would be discussed at the informal session which followed the present meeting.

Heritage Harbour Festival

The Chair thanked the Waterways team for their efforts towards making the Heritage Harbour Board a roaring success.

Water Lane SPD

The Chair reminded Members that the Harbour Master was a non-statutory consultee on waterways planning matters. She advised that she had attended a meeting of the Planning Member Working Group on the subject, and read out an email from the case officer for the Water Lane planning application, detailing next steps and deadlines, including:-

- deadline for comments – 23 June; and
- consideration by the Executive on 9 July.

The Harbour Master welcomed that the importance of Gabriel's Wharf as a craning point was now recognised and highlighted the need to have a space for large vehicles (e.g. cranes) to turn. Jane Green remarked that the drawing had been amended and felt that this might constitute an area of disagreement.

Terms of Reference

The Chair advised that the Terms of Reference of the Exeter Harbour Board needed to be amended to reflect the change of Duty Holder and that she would circulate a draft revision for comments.

Stakeholder Engagement

Referring to Minute No. 75 from the previous meeting, the Chair reminded Members of the existence of the Exe Estuary Management Partnership and read out its full membership, advising that partner updates were provided at every meeting.

83

EXETER PORT USER GROUP UPDATE

The Chair of the Exeter Port Users Group (EPUG) was unable to attend the meeting and, as a result, copies of the EPUG Annual General Meeting held on 26 March 2024 and the Chair's Report, also dated 26 March 2024, were circulated to Harbour Board Members.

Responding to queries from Members on silt buildup in the estuary and the state of Dawlish Warren, the Harbour Master explained that:-

- recent surveys showed that the channel between buoys 1 and 12 were pretty good but that between buoys 21 and 25 showed a dramatic change and the area from buoy 21 looking north was silted up;
- a survey for the area between buoys 13 and 17 would take place later this week;
- there were no plans to bring forward addressing the state Dawlish Warren as a future project;
- Dawlish Warren had a limited lifespan, supposed to be 50 years; and
- although it was difficult to predict what would happen if the Warren disappeared, it should be noted that the coastal area off Lytham St Annes was now marshland.

Members also made the following comments on the state of Dawlish Warren:-

- repairs of that nature tended to last 20 years on average;
- if the Warren were to disappear, flood risks would increase at Starcross and Powderham; and
- the Environment Agency had to decide whether they could afford not to spend another £80m, although they would have considered and studied all possible scenarios.

The Chair also noted a couple of inaccuracies in the EPUG documents tabled, namely:-

- the ECC Executive now comprised eight members, not nine; and
- independent Members to the Harbour Board were appointed for three years, not two.

The Chair also proposed that the number of terms that a Member can serve on the Board be discussed at a future meeting. A Member also sought clarity on what the EPUG Chair referred to in his report when he wrote "similar problems or points of

discussion which were discussed the year or two years previously”.

Members noted the two documents.

84

APPOINTMENT OF THE DUTY HOLDER

The Chair talked the Board through the current situation and explained that:-

- the eight members of the Executive of Exeter City Council were now the Duty Holder;
- the Director Net Zero Exeter and City Management and the Chair herself had started Duty Holder training; and
- training for Members of the Executive would be arranged soon.

85

HARBOUR REVISION ORDER UPDATE

The Harbour Master advised that:-

- the pre-consultation period (three sessions in total) was over;
- the next step would be a 42-day formal consultation period;
- no start date had been set for the formal consultation yet, and this currently sat with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO).

The Chair read out a summary of the responses received during the pre-consultation period. She advised that she had received legal advice that these could go on the website despite the pre-election Period of Heightened Sensitivity. A Member asked how much notice period would be given before the start of the formal consultation period. The Harbour Master replied that some warning would be given and that the process would have to be advertised in a local newspaper. He would endeavour to enquire about the exact notice period and report to the Member.

86

HARBOUR MASTER'S REPORT

The Harbour Master talked the Board through his report, highlighting:-

- the success of the Heritage Weekend;
- the positive dialogue with the RNLI following a serious incident involving known offenders, although he stressed the need to collate information better;
- incidents of youngsters attempting to swim from Exmouth to Dawlish Warren and found clinging to buoy 10, as a result of not understanding the speed of moving water;
- boats breaking free of their moorings because these had not been maintained;
- how lifeboats only went out if life was at risk, which resulted on port authorities being leant on more;
- how a couple of boats had sunk and how retrieving them came at a cost; and
- the three new buoys in the river, as well as a “Danger: Weir Ahead” sign.

Risk Assessment

The Harbour Master remarked that the Exeter City Council risk assessment did not lend itself to a maritime environment and stressed the need to consider a separate one for all water-based activities (such as the MARNIS system) and to encourage all users to come and speak to the Harbour Board.

The Harbour Master the responded to queries from Members as follows:-

- “Local Notices to Mariners” covered specific events;
- there was no framework for understanding risk;
- the Harbour Office currently held pollution gear at four locations and were able to respond quickly to minor pollution incidents;
- it was not possible to identify boats not registered with the Lower Exe Mooring Authority (LEMA) because, at the moment, the Port Authority did not have the power of special direction;
- there had been two incidents of cars being discarded into the estuary but no evidence of spillage;
- there was no formal link-up with the RNLI at Exmouth but both parties were speaking on a regular basis;
- the Port Passage Plan, which explains how to get into the Exe, was required by law; and
- while there was no current initiative to educate people, new Board members would soon be invited to the water.

Appointment of Designated Person

The Chair proposed that the Harbour Master draft a specification, which would be circulated to Members for comments.

87

PORT MARINE SAFETY CODE AND SAFETY IN DOCKS

The Harbour Master remarked that the report did not fundamentally say anything that the Board did not already know and highlighted the following:-

- the appointment of a Duty Holder was a genuine step change;
- the legislation referred to “existing powers”, when in fact the Harbour Board did not have any;
- any Marine Safety Management System could be woven into the text; and
- the Board could finally produce a Safety Plan now that a Duty Holder was in place.

Addressing the key points of the report, he acknowledged that the Exeter Harbour Board was lacking in some areas (especially with regard to the Gap analysis) but was in a much better position than five years ago. The Chair noted that considerable progress was being made towards compliance and stressed the importance of the Board’s independent members.

During further discussion, Members received clarification on:-

- pilotage
- stakeholder engagement and Code compliance.

Mr Eggleton advised that a new Port Marine Safety Code was imminent. The Chair looked forward to the implementation of an action plan.

88

STATUTORY HARBOUR AUTHORITY STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT AND 2024-25 FEES & CHARGES

A Member sought clarity about the significant drop in income figures between 2021-22 and 2022-23. The Harbour Master offered to look into this and respond to the Member.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.55 pm)

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

COMBINED STRATEGIC SCRUTINY AND CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

18 June 2024

Present:

Councillors Atkinson, Begley, Darling, Fullam, Haigh, Harding, Holland, Hughes, Hussain, Knott, Miller, Mitchell, M, Moore, Palmer, Parkhouse, Patrick, Pole, Read, Rees, Rolstone, Snow, Wardle and Williams, M

Apologies:

Councillors Ellis-Jones and Jobson

Also present:

Director Finance, Service Lead, Legal Services & Interim Monitoring Officer, Democratic Services Officers (PMD and LS)

In attendance:

Councillors Bialyk and Williams, R

8 Appointment of Chair for the Meeting

Councillor Pole was appointed Chair of the meeting.

9 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Combined Strategic Scrutiny and Customer Focus Scrutiny Committees held on 7 February 2024 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct.

10 Declaration of Interests

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest were made.

11 The Medium Term Financial Plan: How It Works and Review of the Current Plan

The Director Finance & s151 Officer introduced the presentation, which included:-

- Nature of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP);
- Starting Point;
- Funding;
 - Grants, Business Rates and New Homes Bonus
 - Council Tax Calculation
- Expenditure;
 - Spending Pressures, Assumptions and Proposed Reductions;
 - Inflation and Net Interest Position;
- Budget Gap;
- Risks;
- High Level Timetable;
- Role of Scrutiny.

During the presentation, he explained that:-

- the MTFP covered a period of four years;
- LG Futures provided data which helped predict future business rates;
- inflation for Leisure services and car parks was not included previously;
- Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funded Liveable Exeter;
- District Councils had the option of charging 2.99% or an additional £5 in Council tax;
- There had been a Collection Fund surplus for a number of years;
- the pension deficit had dropped from £90m to £16m;

- debt repayment information was not provided in the presentation as it covered a period of 60 years,
- a total of £3.5m was required to balance budget next February; and
- in total, £5.4m worth of reductions was required across the MTFP.

Further reference was made to:-

- the gap between funding and resources;
- the Science Park and CoLab loans;
- the Public Works Loans Board; and
- the Leisure Complex loans;
- the New Burdens Funding.

The Director Finance answered questions from Members as follows:-

- the bus station lease did not cover the loan,
- surplus from the Guildhall could not be used in the General Fund (due to timing);
- loans were not a service cost in line with accounting standards (CIPFA code);
- public consultation was intended for this year;
- one-off scrutiny may not be right;
- LG Futures only provided updates when a major fiscal event occurred;
- capital expenditure increases were built into the programme;
- fleet lease projections were for the entire fleet and not individual vehicles;
- no details had been given yet about an all-electric fleet;
- apprenticeships should be encouraged;
- delivery on the Capital Programme would be reviewed;
- Microsoft 365 costs were built in for this year;
- people of working age were by far the largest cohort among housing benefit recipients;
- resources were expected to flatline for the next couple of years;
- the rise in debt was due to a mixture of new debt on an annuity basis;
- debt repayment would increase but interest would drop; and
- Council had resolved to pay real living wage.

The Director Finance reminded Members that he was always happy to answer questions or give further detail, whether in person or via email.

A discussion on the next steps ensued, during which Members:-

- felt that they should be given the opportunity to look at the process after options had been considered;
- voiced concerns that there would not be sufficient time to carry out a line by line analysis of the proposed budget;
- expressed various preferences (e.g. smaller groups, spotlight reviews) about the best way to conduct budget scrutiny.

The Interim Monitoring Officer advised that the Combined Strategic Scrutiny and Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee was not a constituted meeting and, therefore, had no decision making powers.

Members noted the presentation.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7:19 pm

Chair

CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

27 June 2024

Present:

Councillor Josie Parkhouse (Chair)

Councillors Rees, Fullam, Holland, Hussain, Miller, Moore, D, Pole, Read and Wardle

Apologies:

Councillors Darling, Harding and Patrick

Also present:

Chief Executive, Director Net Zero Exeter & City Management, Service Lead - Environmental Health & Community Safety, Service Lead, Legal Services & Interim Monitoring Officer, Service Lead Housing Needs & Homelessness and Democratic Services Officer (PMD)

External presenters:

Supt. Antony Hart, Mat Jarratt, Insp. Nathan Johnson, Jeanie Lynch and Peter Scargill

In attendance:

Councillor Atkinson

In attendance as Portfolio Holders:

Councillors Asvachin, Bialyk, Vizard and Wright

18 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee held on 28 March 2024 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record.

19 **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

20 **Questions from the Public under Standing Order No. 19**

The Chair reported the receipt of two questions from members of the public under Standing Order No. 19:-

Question from Ms Marilyn Spurr

“Given that Exeter City Council has declared a climate emergency I would expect that this would be to the forefront of any policy. What consideration has been given in the Treasury Management Strategy to the impacts of climate change, specifically in relation to the Carbon Footprint (environmental) implications?”

The Chair asked Councillor Vizard, Portfolio Holder for Climate, Ecological Change and Communities, to answer Ms Spurr’s question. Cllr Vizard gave the following response:

“Exeter City Council’s Treasury Management Strategy is compliant with Secretary of State Investment Guidance which emphasises the security and liquidity of any investment, followed by yield. There is currently no requirement to produce a policy that addresses climate emergency, Environmental, Social & Governance (ESG), or ethical investment issues. Authorities can implement such a policy but are not permitted to prioritise these considerations above security, liquidity or yield. Whilst the Council does not specifically refer to ESG considerations in its Treasury Management Strategy, managing the ESG risk is part of current treasury management practices, as the Council uses mainstream rating agencies to assess counterparty creditworthiness – they now more formally incorporate ESG risk alongside more traditional financial risk metrics when assessing counterparty ratings. The Council has previously used the Standard Chartered Sustainable Deposit where the rate is the same as the standard fixed term deposit so there has been no impact on security, liquidity or yield. Our Treasury Management advisers state that “The deposit guarantees that investment is referenced against sustainable assets, both existing and future. The investments are referenced against the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals; thus funds are put to work addressing some of the world’s biggest long-term threats including, but not limited to, climate change, health, financial inclusion and education.”

In a supplementary question, Ms Spurr asked the Portfolio Holder why an emergency could not be prioritised. Cllr Vizard offered to reply to Ms Spurr in writing.

Question from Mr Chris Hill

“The Council's corporate plan says that it aims to reach Net Zero by 2030 as part of its Climate Emergency strategy. What assessments have you made of the banks used by the council and those banks' investments and how they align with the goal of Net Zero?”

The Chair asked Councillor Vizard, Portfolio Holder for Climate, Ecological Change and Communities, to answer Mr Hill’s question. Cllr Vizard gave the following response:

“The Council seeks external treasury management advice from the Link Group. Link provide regular counterparty lists and suggested investment durations and notify us of any creditworthiness changes. These counterparty lists are based on credit ratings from the three rating agencies (Fitch, Moodys and Standard & Poors), and the rating agencies take Environmental, Social & Governance (ESG) risk into account when they make their assessments.”

In a supplementary question, Mr Hill asked the Portfolio Holder if he agreed that the carbon footprint caused by investing in the exploitation of fossil fuel needed to be taken into consideration when choosing a bank. Cllr Vizard offered to write to Mr Hill in writing.

21 **Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order No. 20**

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Read in relation to the Portfolio of Councillor Asvachin, who attended the meeting:-

“At the previous meeting, we heard that the Great Western Hotel was at maximum occupancy and providing some breakfasts. Communal kitchens were also discussed. What is the current state of play at Great Western Hotel

regarding occupancy and progress to communal kitchens? Is this a priority to pursue and, if so, when can we expect it to happen? And can the Portfolio Holder let us know the exact number of children in the Great Western Hotel?"

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, Homelessness Prevention and Customer Services gave the following answer:-

"Exeter City Council has 30 'block-booked' rooms at the Great Western Hotel as of today: 18 occupied, four prebooked, two in void (repairs) and six ready to let. Typical average occupation is between 25 and 29; however, there is an unusually high number of vacancies at this specific time.

A small kitchen is available with microwaves at this time. Work on a shared kitchen has begun, with plumbing and other services to be installed along with partition walls. Completion is estimated to take approximately 6 weeks.

Exeter City Council does not place children at the Great Western Hotel. However, the owner does use a few rooms for this purpose for private clients. There are 2 families at Great Western Hotel, accommodated in a different part of the hotel. Family 1 consists of Mum, Dad and 1 child. Family 2 also consists of Mum, Dad and 1 child."

In a supplementary question, Councillor Read asked:-

- what would be provided in terms of kitchen facilities; and
- how long the families in question were expected to stay at the Great Western Hotel.

Councillor Asvachin informed Councillor Read that she would reply to her in writing.

22 **Work of the Community Safety Partnership to Tackle Violence Against Women and Girls at Night**

The Chair explained that, as the originator of the proforma requesting a Scrutiny item on "Local Measures to Tackle Violence Against Women and Girls", Councillor Atkinson had been invited to sit with the Committee for this item and would be allowed to ask the first question after the presentation.

The external guests (Peter Scargill, Jeanie Lynch, Mat Jarratt, Supt. Antony Hart and Insp. Nathan Johnson) introduced themselves to the Committee, then talked Members through the presentation, which included:-

- Purpose of the Exeter Community Safety Partnership
- Partners
- Areas of Focus 2020-2025
- Funding
- Improving Safety for Women in Exeter
- CoLab Women
- Women's Centre for Exeter
- Best Bar None
- Safe Space
- Police Overview
- Evening and night time economy (ENTE) Locations and Patterns
- Bystander Intervention Programme
- Network of High-Definition Cameras

Community Safety Partnership

Peter Scargill (the only non-statutory Chair of a CSP in Devon) noted the uniqueness of the set-up. Jeanie Lynch praised the breadth of the partnership as well as the breadth of commitment across the city.

CoLab Women and Women's Centre

Jeanie Lynch stressed how important the Safer Streets Funding had been. She also highlighted the need for a women's hub in Exeter.

Best Bar None and Safe Space

Mat Jarratt remarked that these two projects did not exist in isolation, adding that:-

- it was crucial not to consider best-case scenarios but real-life experience; and
- the statistics for the Safe Space were inspiring.

Police Overview

Supt. Hart made reference to:-

- the improved intelligence at Devon & Cornwall Police's disposal;
- the importance of internal as well as external culture; and
- hotspot policing in Exeter.

Insp. Johnson, remarking that the night time economy had changed, talked Members through the four "Tier 1" hotspots and stressed the importance of foot patrols.

Portfolio Overview

Councillor Wright remarked that members of the LBGTQ+ community were also vulnerable within the NTE context. She also praised:-

- Tony Cox for being responsible for many ideas aimed at improving the safety of women in Exeter;
- street pastors; and
- the work of everyone involved in the implementing the CCTV network, reminding Members that this was not a statutory duty.

Finally, she introduced the "Need Help" sign with the aid of which women who feel at risk can direct police operatives to the nearest camera.

The Director Net Zero Exeter & City Management praised the wide variety of representatives in the room and noted that the spirit of cooperation demonstrated in Exeter was the envy of all CSPs, adding that the Exeter model was recognised as best practice by the College of Policing.

Councillor Atkinson thanked all participants for their contributions but felt more detail could have been provided about:-

- Serious Violence Duty;
- Cause of Violence
- Partnership Working across Devon; and
- the deployment of staff to alert to VAWG.

The Service Lead - Environmental Health and Community Safety assured Councillor Atkinson that Exeter was fully involved in work taking place across the South West Peninsula. He acknowledged that more detail and/or topics could have been covered but explained that a conscious decision had been made to keep proceedings to one hour. On the issue of Serious Violence Duty, he referred to the link with neighbouring CSPs. Peter Scargill advised that the Safer Devon Plan was reviewed by the Safer Devon Partnership and that everyone was sighted on the Plan. Mat Jarratt highlighted that bar culture applied to both patrons and staff; he offered to meet up with Councillor Atkinson.

During discussion, Members made reference to:-

- the daytime economy (especially around South St and Cathedral Green);
- the need for a clear action plan with tangible outcomes;
- the importance of communication around good work being done, and the role Councillors could play in this respect;
- the need for conversations to take place in the men's realm and for recognising that VAWG meant specifically Men's Violence against Women and Girls; and
- the feeling of insecurity felt by passengers at taxi ranks.

The external guests provided the following responses to questions from Members:-

- the CSP had a sub-group set up specifically to deal with anti-social behaviour (ASB);
- it was essential to marginalise the behaviours of perpetrators rather people themselves;
- ASB constituted the bulk of complaints made to police in Exeter;
- there was a detailed action plan;
- there was no budget for communication and a lot had been achieved through sheer goodwill;
- it was important not to mislead people into thinking that Exeter was unsafe;
- staffing costs were the largest obstacle to the opening of a Women's Centre in Exeter, and securing premises would be a significant first step;
- for every pound spent on a Women's centre, £5 would be saved to the public purse;
- a total of 53 venues had signed up to the voluntary Best Bar None scheme, including bars on the university campus;
- Devon & Cornwall Police were acutely aware that VAWG was under-reported;
- it was crucial to engage with young men to make them realise the damage caused by VAWG and pornography;
- the Safe Place had been financed through one-off funding (Safer Streets 4) and a business case was needed for its continuation;
- the two-hour slot between 10pm and midnight - before the opening of the Safe Place - was largely covered by street pastors (who started work at 10.30pm);
- taxi rank marshals had made a significant difference to problems at taxi ranks, which were paid for by the trade itself;
- problems in Sidwell Street and Fore Street were well and truly on the radar of Exeter police; and
- under-reporting was always a hindrance.

The Chair thanked all participants and Members noted the presentation.

23 **Scrutiny Work Plan and Proposals Received**

Members discussed the Work Plan and Scrutiny Proposals submitted.

Performance and service provided to customers and stakeholders of Stagecoach South West in Exeter

The Chair advised that she had met the Managing Director of Stagecoach, adding that, although she was one of the proposers, her personal preference would be for this item to go the Transport Working Group first. Councillor Moore welcomed the proposal to invite Stagecoach to the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee and made reference to:-

- the Bus Impact Plan; and
- the fact that the new Combined County Authority would have Transport in its remit.

Councillor Holland remarked that Transport was still currently a County matter and wondered if someone from HATOC should be invited. Councillor Wardle clarified that, while Stagecoach representatives could be invited, they did not have to accept the invitation.

It was moved by Councillor Parkhouse and seconded by Councillor Rees that the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee agree in principle to add this Scrutiny proposal to the Work Plan, with timescale and scoping to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Committee. Following a vote, the recommendation was CARRIED unanimously.

Update on Exeter Community Lottery first year of operation, amount raised for good causes

Members noted that Exeter Community Lottery was on the agenda of the September meeting of the Executive and felt that the November meeting of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee (instead of October) would allow for more precise scoping for this piece of work.

It was moved by Councillor Parkhouse and seconded by Councillor Rees that this item be put on the Work Plan for 27 November 2024, with timescale and scoping to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Committee (3 October). Following a vote, the recommendation was CARRIED.

Anti-Social Behaviour in the City Centre – its causes and possible solutions

While Councillors Read and Moore supported the proposal, with Councillor Moore singling out street attachment as an issue of importance, Councillor Wardle felt that the proposal would add little to what had been presented earlier in the meeting. Councillor Holland agreed with him and reminded Committee members of the importance of the Police Neighbourhood Meetings. Councillor Miller felt that there could be capacity for the item on the Work Plan but not until March 2025.

Councillor Wardle proposed, and Councillor Pole seconded, an amended to defer any discussion on the subject until the January 2025 meeting of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee. Following a vote, the amendment was CARRIED.

Budget Scrutiny proposal

Councillor Moore referred to the recent meeting of the Combined Customer Focus and Strategy Committee and sought clarity on how to progress the scrutiny of the

budget process. She proposed that the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee should receive a report from relevant Portfolio Holders on options for approaches to achieve a balanced budget, followed by three spotlight reviews (i.e. one meeting) to consider each of the following:

1. HR: staff pay, skills gaps, use of contractors and use of apprenticeship levy
2. Progress of income generation strategy/income generations
3. Impact of options on environment, inequality and protected characteristics

The Chair made the point that, while she agreed that Scrutiny should exercise finance monitoring, the remit of this committee was to scrutinise process; she also reminded Members to be mindful of the capacity of the Democratic Services team.

The Interim Monitoring Officer remarked on the complexity and the operational nature of the areas of scrutiny proposed by Councillor Moore. He further felt that the timescales were not realistic and called on Committee members to look at Scrutiny in the longer term.

Councillor Rees called on members of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee to share their ideas and suggestions with the Chair, stressing the need to have a robust plan in place after the October meeting.

It was moved by Councillor Parkhouse and seconded by Councillor Wardle that this item be put on the agenda for the 3 October 2024 meeting for further scoping and to allow for more clarity. Following a vote, the recommendation was CARRIED.

External witnesses

Councillor Rees called on members of the Committee to email the Chair and Deputy Chair if they wished to propose external witnesses and, in instances of witnesses who could be perceived as either partial or non-neutral (e.g. from pressure groups), provide a short biography of the person(s). Councillor Moore expressed unease at this last point, making the point the definition of what constitutes a pressure group may change from one person to the next.

It was moved by Councillor Parkhouse and seconded by Councillor Rees that the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee approve the Work Plan as submitted, with the Six-monthly update on Homelessness Strategy to be added to the 27 November 2024 agenda. Following a vote, the recommendation was CARRIED unanimously.

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 8.39 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE

Tuesday 4 June 2024

Present:

Councillor Bialyk (Chair)

Councillors Wright, Allcock, Asvachin, Foale, Vizard, Williams, R and Wood

Also present:

Councillor Jobson (as an opposition group Leader);

Councillor Moore (as an opposition group Leader); and

Councillor M. Mitchell (as an opposition group Leader).

Also present:

Director Net Zero Exeter & City Management, Director of City Development, Director Finance, Service Lead Legal Services and Democratic Services Manager

57

AGENDA UPDATE

The Leader advised that items 7, 10, 11 and 12 (Minute No's 62, 65, 66 and 67) were deferred to the next Executive Committee meeting scheduled for the 9 July 2024.

58

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 April 2024, were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

59

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

60

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 19

No questions from members of the public were received.

61

LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND (LAHF) ROUND 3 FUNDING

The Executive received the report on the Local Authority Housing Fund (LAHF) round 3, in which the Council had been invited to bid for a national £450 million of funding to deliver high-quality temporary accommodation for homeless families and to provide housing to those on the Afghan Citizens Resettlement Scheme (ACRS).

Particular reference was made to:-

- the housing of seven families under rounds one and two, with a further number of families waiting to move;
- the Council had been allocated nearly £600,000 to purchase four more homes and was using a matching process for the third round of funding;
- the Council would need to contribute a further £297,000, as part of the grant fund agreement and it was recommended that uncommitted Section 106 funding be used for this purpose;
- the recommendations would also support the Council in meeting its temporary accommodation needs without having to incur borrowing; and

- delegated authority was being sought to sign the Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) to access the grant funding before the deadline to enable the Council to undertake the purchases.

Opposition group leaders spoke on the item and made the following points:-

Cllr Moore – thanked the officers for the work undertaken and enquired:-

- what was the reason for the delay in undertaking the matching process for the homes purchased under previous funding rounds; and
- why was the rent of the two bed properties proposed to be a higher than the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) level, given that housing and universal credit rent was based on the LHA level?

Cllr Mitchell – enquired on whether assurance could be given on whether the money was guaranteed, given the forthcoming General Election?

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- regardless of the election, the Council needed to proceed with accessing the grant funding;
- clarification was sought on the Council loans programme and options for Section 106 money to ensure there was enough to make the programme happen;
- was the council getting value for money?
- the outlay costs for maintenance and repairs appeared to be the same for both options, how were the figures made and did they reflect the costs of buying former council homes?
- the report highlighted Exeter being a welcoming city and beneficial to the Council's medium- and long-term housing provisions and the recommendations were supported in principle ;
- the positive impact within the equality impact assessment was welcomed; and
- the report and work undertaken in the report was welcomed.

In response to questions and points raised, the Director City Development advised that:-

- a written response to Councillor Moore's questions would be provided outside of the meeting;
- the money had already been agreed and the signing of the MOU would release the funding for use;
- the report provided full transparency on the land property and potential use of S106 funding and borrowing options;
- the Government calculated the amount of money awarded to a local authority through a median house price calculation, which for Exeter was £300,000;
- if the Council were looking to purchase new build homes on the open market it would increase the figure requiring more money to be added to the grants; and
- new build houses did not always meet the Council's requirements for electrical and gas appliances and required Council teams to enter the properties to fix the issues, which was an expensive endeavour.

The Leader moved, and Councillor Wright seconded, the recommendations which were voted upon and CARRIED unanimously.

RECOMMENDED that Council agree option 2 at the Extraordinary meeting on 10 June as follows:-

- (1) to accept the full allocation of £594,000 in Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) grant funding;
- (2) the purchase of four properties off the open market;
- (3) that the Council's Capital contribution is funded through £297,000 of S106 funds;
- (4) the identification and purchase of suitable properties to let;
- (5) that the rents be set at affordable rates in accordance with the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding between DLUHC and Exeter City Council and the DLUHC recommended rental funding model Rent Standard – April 2023;
- (6) that the MOU (Appendix 1) be signed and returned to DLUHC by the 12th of June 2024 confirming the Council's participation in the programme; and
- (7) that delegated authority be granted to the Director of City Development and Housing and the relevant Portfolio Holder to proceed with the acquisitions and to amend the number of properties purchased in line with the above agreement. This is to include where additional government grants may become available (provided that no further capital contribution is required from Exeter City Council).

62

REVIEW OF THE CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

63

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES PAID 2023/24

The Executive received the annual statutory report outlining the allowances and expenses paid to Members in 2023/24.

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- there had been a productivity increase of 12.5% following the reduction in the number of Executive Committee Members; and
- Members commented on some of the expenses incurred during the year and noted that the Council was obliged to publish the allowances each year.

The Leader moved, and Councillor Wright seconded, the recommendations which were voted upon and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED that the allowances paid and the expenses claimed by Members in 2023/24 be noted.

64

EXETER PORT AUTHORITY: THE ROLE OF THE DUTY HOLDER

The Executive received the report which sought to establish the role of the Duty Holder for the Port of Exeter. The Council as the statutory Harbour Authority was responsible for ensuring that the organisation complies Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC) and demonstrating best practice in harbour management.

Particular reference was made to:-

- the PMSC introduced two main roles - the Duty Holder and the Designated Person;
- the main responsibility of the Duty Holder was ensuring compliance with the PMSC and to act on recommendations made by the Designated Person; and

- in municipal ports it was common practice for the Duty Holder post being held by a committee of elected Members, rather than an individual.

The Leader clarified that the Executive were being recommended to become the Councils' Duty Holder and that Members would need to update their registerable interests accordingly.

Opposition group leaders spoke on the item and made the following points:-

- Cllr Moore – noted the onerous responsibility of the role and enquired on how Members would be advised on enabling compliance, and what would the extent of the indemnity provided would be for this role?
- Cllr Mitchell – sought further clarification on the Duty Holder's responsibility to ensure the Executive were compliant and if there was any legal responsibility to provide regular reports on the work undertaken?

During the discussion, the following points were made:

- the Executive would receive reports from the Designated Person in their role as the Duty Holder; and
- would the Duty Holder training be single or ongoing training?

The Portfolio Holder for City Management in commending the report, advised that establishing a Duty Holder was the next step in obtaining a Harbour Revision order.

The Leader advised on the points raised, that the Executive would be taking the role seriously and would undertake all required training to provide the strategic responsibilities entailed in the role. He also advised that the Executive would report back on work undertaken to a relevant committee to ensure full transparency.

The Service Lead Legal Services advised that that the Duty Holder would have a Designated Person providing advice and guidance to Members to ensure they complied with their obligations as the Duty Holder.

The Leader moved, and Councillor Wright seconded, the recommendations which were voted upon and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED that the Executive undertake the role of the Duty Holder for the Port of Exeter in accordance with the Port Marine Safety Code and undertake the required training to fulfil the role.

65

PARKING TARIFFS 2024

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

66

KING GEORGE V PLAYING FIELDS

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

67

LAND AT PENDRAGON ROAD

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.02 pm)

The decisions indicated will normally come into force 5 working days after publication of the Statement of Decisions unless called in by a Scrutiny Committee. Where the matter in question is urgent, the decision will come into force immediately. Decisions regarding the policy framework or corporate objectives or otherwise outside the remit of the Executive will be considered by Council on 16 July 2024.

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

SEATING IN THE GUILDHALL

		Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Knott (L)	Chief Executive	Lord Mayor Councillor K.J. Mitchell (LD)	Democratic Services Manager	Service Lead Legal Services	Democrati c Services Officer
--	--	---	--------------------	---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

				Director	Director	
--	--	--	--	----------	----------	--

<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Councillors</u>	TABLE	<u>Councillors</u>	<u>Councillors</u>
Darling (L)	Miller (L)	Bialyk (L)		Moore, (G)*	Jobson (C)
Atkinson (L)	Snow (L)	Wright (L)		Mitchell, M.N. (LD)*	Holland (C)
Patrick (L)	Begley (L)	Wood (L)		Fullam (LD)*	Sheridan (C)
Ellis-Jones (L)	Hussain (L)	Williams, R.T. (L)		Read (G)	Palmer (LD)
Hughes(L)	Parkhouse (L)	Allcock(L)		Ketchin (G)*	Banyard (G)
Rolstone (L)	Pole (L)	Foale (L)		Rees (G)*	Haigh (I)

Cllr Harding (L)	Cllr Williams M.J. (L)	Cllr Wardle (L)	Cllr Asvachin (L)	Cllr Vizard (L)			Cllr Bennett (G)	Cllr Wetenhall (G)
---------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	--------------------	--	--	------------------------	--------------------------

Portfolio Holders

L:	Labour:	24
G:	Green:	7*
LD:	Liberal Democrat	4*
C:	Conservative:	3
I:	Independent	1

Bialyk:	Leader
Wright	Deputy Leader and Corporate Services & City Centre
Vizard	Climate and Ecological Crisis and Communities
Williams, R.T.:	City Management
Asvachin	Housing, Homelessness Prevention & Customer Services
Wood:	Leisure Services and Healthy Living
Foale:	Arts, Culture & Tourism
Allcock	City Development

* Known as the
Progressive Group