

**Exeter City Council, Scrutiny Committee (Resources) Committee, 24 March 2010**

**Question from Member of the Public (HB Wilkins 12 Well Oak Park, Exeter, EX2 5BB)**

**Accuracy of Minutes of Meeting of 27 January 2010**

The draft minutes do not record a number of comments made by members. In particular the following contributions have not been recorded:

re Revenue Budget Proposals 2010/11

- A Member (DM) stated that he always feels uncomfortable when asked to consider a proposal if there are no options presented for consideration. With reference to the capital programme he emphasized the need for ensuring value for money (VFM).
- With reference to the then proposals to close public conveniences, a member (JS) commented that it is deeply regrettable that alternatives to closing the public conveniences had not been identified.
- The Chair (JC) noted that the Council needs to make cuts in public expenditure and the need to face up to financial austerity. He said that the Council will have to find savings.

re General Fund Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2012/13

- A Member (PP), referring to the proposal to allocate £80,000 for the controversial plan for a footpath through Well Oak Park, said that although he had been to Planning Committee meetings at which the footpath had been discussed he had no recollection of this sum having been mentioned previously. He asked whether this figure was an exact figure or an estimate. He said there had been changes of route for the proposed footpath, that the police are not going to fund CCTV and that he did not know how much the section 106 agreement would be contributing. He said that £80,000 is an awful lot of money and that if members of the planning committee had known this it might have had a bearing on the planning decisions. He asked for clarification, further details and justification for the capital expenditure for both this proposal and the proposal to refurbish the King William Street car park.
- There was a move to accept the capital programme proposals but a Member (DM) intervened to say that Cllr Prowse had raised questions about the budget and queried whether the scrutiny committee could approve the budget whilst these questions remained unanswered. It was agreed that the Committee note the Capital Programme proposal but with a caveat that questions had been raised without being responded to. An officer said that he would circulate the requested information.

I feel these are noteworthy comments which have a more general application to governance and policy and should be recorded if the minutes are to be an accurate record of what was said.

**Question:**

**Can the minutes be amended to include the above contributions from DM, JS, JC and PP?**

Footnote

The Revenue budget proposals are shown as Item 5 in the draft minutes and Item 8 in Agenda papers prepared prior to the 27.1.10 meeting. The Capital Programme proposals are shown as item 6 in the draft minutes and item 9 in Agenda papers prepared prior to 27.1.10 meeting.