

PUBLIC Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 25 March 2015 at 7.00 pm

Present: Councillors Steve Liddiard (Mayor), Tim Aker, Chris Baker, Jan Baker, Terry Brookes, Mark Coxshall, Charles Curtis, Tony Fish, Oliver Gerrish, Robert Gledhill, Yash Gupta (MBE), Garry Hague, James Halden, Shane Hebb, Terence Hipse, Victoria Holloway, Barry Johnson, Roy Jones, Tom Kelly, John Kent, Cathy Kent, Charlie Key, Brian Little, Susan Little, Sue MacPherson, Ben Maney, Val Morris-Cook, Tunde Ojetola, Bukky Okunade, Barry Palmer, Maureen Pearce, John Purkiss, Joycelyn Redsell, Barbara Rice, Gerard Rice, Andrew Roast, Susan Shinnick, Philip Smith, Graham Snell, Richard Speight, Pauline Tolson, Simon Wootton and Lynn Worrall

Apologies: Councillors Sue Gray (Deputy Mayor), Clare Baldwin, Martin Kerin and Robert Ray

In attendance:
Graham Farrant, Chief Executive
Steve Cox, Assistant Chief Executive
Barbara Brownlee, Director of Housing - Thurrock Council
David Bull, Director of Planning and Transportation
Carmel Littleton, Director of Children's Services
Roger Harris, Director of Adults, Health and Commissioning
Sean Clark, Head of Corporate Finance
Mike Heath, Head of Environment
Jackie Hinchliffe, Head of HR, OD and Customer Strategy
Karen Wheeler, Head of Strategy
David Lawson, Deputy Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer
Matthew Boulter, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Jessica Feeney, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Stephanie Cox, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the meeting, the Mayor invited Reverend Barlow to lead those present in prayer.

The Mayor then informed all present that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

114. Minutes

Councillor S. Little observed that the details of her question to Councillor Gerrish, and the response which had been provided, was not included under item 109 'Questions from Members'. In response, the Chief Executive advised

that a full transcript of questions and answers could be found at Appendix 1 to the minutes.

In relation to the minutes of the 'Housing Base Estimates, Rents and Service Charges 2015/16' item, Councillor Gledhill remarked that the change to 5% reduction in central heating charges had been reflected in the resolutions, but that two further action points detailed in the body of the minutes had not been included as resolutions. He requested that this be amended so that the following were included in the decision at minute 106:

- 7. That the proposal regarding the dedicated Veteran's House be referred to the Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee to determine viability of the project and to scope out the necessary terms and conditions.**
- 8. That the assisted gardening scheme be reopened.**

Subject to the detailed amendments, the Minutes of the Council meeting, held on 25 February 2015, were approved as a correct record.

115. Items of Urgent Business

The Mayor informed the Council that he had agreed to the consideration of an urgent item of business, which related to the appointment of the Head of Paid Service.

The Mayor advised that the decision was referred to Council so as not to delay the recruitment process and that the report had been emailed to all Members and tabled at the meeting.

The Chamber were informed that item would be taken immediately before item 20 in the printed agenda.

116. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Shinnick declared a pecuniary interest in respect of Agenda Item 16, 'Serco Strategic Partnership – Update Report' as she was employed by Serco.

117. Announcements on behalf of the Mayor or the Leader of the Council

The Mayor informed the Chamber that he did not wish to make any announcements this month.

The Leader of the Council advised the Chamber that he had reflected on the question that had been submitted by Mr Perrin at the previous meeting regarding the commemoration of Thurrock service personnel who had lost their lives during World War One.

The Leader of the Council proposed that the names of Thurrock service personnel who lost their lives during the First World War be included on the agenda for every meeting of Council from the 2015/16 municipal year, starting from Annual Council in May 2015 until November 2018, so that every month Members could commemorate Thurrock service personnel who gave their lives in the service of their country for the corresponding month of World War One. The Leader thanked Mr Perrin for his suggestion and hoped that the proposal would be welcomed.

The Leader of the Council also informed Members of Network Rail's plans for the future of Grays level crossing, which they were considering closing due to safety concerns. The Leader of the Council observed that he had not seen any evidence of new signage at either the barrier or the edge of the platform, and there were no announcements on the train. He felt that further action should be taken by Network Rail to minimise health and safety concerns before any decision to close the level crossing was made and advised Members that the Director of Planning and Transportation was due to meet with Network Rail the following day to discuss these issues, and was keen to report back Members thoughts on this proposal in order to strengthen negotiations.

The Leader of the Council advised that he was against any closure of the level crossing and asked Members to signify whether they were in agreement. Members were unanimously in favour of no closure to the Grays level crossing, whereupon the Leader of the Council confirmed that this would be reported back to Network Rail.

118. Questions from Members of the Public

A copy of the transcript of questions and answers can be viewed online at <http://democracy.thurrock.gov.uk/thurrock>

119. Petitions from Members of the Public and Councillors

The Mayor informed Members that, in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, the requisite notice had been given by a member of the public and Councillor B. Rice who wished to present a petition at the meeting.

Mr Tarbard presented a petition on behalf of 680 Horndon-on-the-Hill residents regarding the proposal to cut the 374 bus route which was a key link for residents.

Councillor B. Rice presented a petition on behalf of 575 residents which called on the Council to improve the Cross Keys junction and traffic light system in Chadwell St Mary.

120. Petitions Update Report

Members received a report on the status of those petitions handed in at Council Meetings and Council Offices over the past six months.

121. Appointments to Committees and Outside Bodies, Statutory and Other Panels

The Mayor enquired whether Group Leaders wished for any changes to be made to the appointments previously made to Committees and outside bodies, statutory and other panels.

Each of the Group Leaders informed the Mayor that they did not wish to make any changes to the appointments previously made.

122. Exclusion of the Public and Press

The Mayor advised all those in attendance that the Gloriana Thurrock Ltd Proposed Development of St Chad's Site, Tilbury – Gateway 3 report was part exempt by reference to the descriptions in Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, due to information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The Mayor reminded Members that at the last meeting of Council in February 2015 it was agreed that any approval of expenditure, which included loan and equity advances, related to Gloriana developments should be referred to Council for a decision and not delegated to Cabinet. He advised that this had been embraced within the printed report, which detailed exempt financial information, and proposed that the Chamber move into exempt session as he was not confident Members would not be able to stray into discussing exempt financial information during the debate.

Councillor Gledhill declared that he was against moving into exempt session and argued that the public interest test should be applied. He made the following key points as to why the meeting should stay in public session, in reference with guidance from the Information Commissioner:

- That advice regarding exempt information could be ignored if it furthered the understanding of public participation during the debate.
- That it would promote accountability and transparency of public authorities and their decisions.
- That it would promote accountability and transparency in the spending of public money, which he felt was particularly important as Gloriana proposed to spend a large amount of public money.
- To allow individuals and public companies to understand decisions made by public authorities affecting their lives, and to assist individuals in challenging decisions.

Councillor Gledhill further remarked that the item could be in exempt session for the following reasons, but felt that they did not apply in this instance:

- If it would cause significant damage to the business reputation or confidence in the organisation.
- If it would have a significant detrimental impact on the commercial revenue or threaten the ability to obtain suppliers.
- If it would significantly weaken the position of the authority in the competitive environment and release commercially sensitive information to competitors.

Councillor Gledhill added that these factors weighed against moving into exempt session and called for the meeting to remain open to the public, which was seconded by Councillor Halden.

Councillor J. Kent remarked that he had chaired Cabinet meetings in Thurrock since June 2010 and that the meetings had never once moved into exempt session during that time. He felt that Members should do all they could to ensure that decision making was as open and transparent as possible, but that the test in this instance was the fact that the authority was looking to make a significant investment and the envelope figure was included within the report.

Councillor J. Kent observed that if the figure the Council was prepared to borrow became public, it could potentially disadvantage the authority by giving potential developers bidding for contracts a clear idea of how much the authority was prepared to borrow. He felt that this could cost the authority millions of pounds, and was not confident that this information would not be released during a debate by all Members present. As a result he reluctantly believed that the item should move into exempt session.

Councillor Ojetola asked whether if the vote to move into exempt session was successful, if the item could be moved back to last on the agenda so as not to disrupt the public and press from the Chamber.

The Mayor advised that as the item was an important issue, he did not wish to move it back in the order of the agenda and indicated his preference to discuss the report immediately.

The Mayor invited the Chamber to undertake a vote on the proposal to move into exempt session for the consideration of Item 10, 'Gloriana Thurrock Ltd ("Gloriana") – Proposed Development of St Chad's site Tilbury – Gateway 3 Report.'

Upon being put to the vote, 23 Members voted in favour, 19 against, with no abstentions, whereupon the Mayor declared that the proposal to move into exempt session be carried.

The Mayor asked the press and public to leave the Chamber during consideration of the next item, and advised that Democratic Services would inform them when they could re-enter.

Councillor Coxshall made an outburst with reference to the UKIP Group, during which Councillor Jones asked the Mayor to reproach Councillor Coxshall's inappropriate behaviour.

At 7.31pm the meeting moved into exempt session and the press and public left the Chamber.

At 7.32pm Councillor Hebb arrived at the meeting.

123. EXEMPT SESSION: Gloriana Thurrock Ltd ("Gloriana") - Proposed Development of St Chad's site, Tilbury - Gateway 3 Report

Councillor J. Kent, the Leader of the Council, introduced the report which provided an update on Gloriana's proposals to develop the St Chad's Road Site in Tilbury, in order that the Council could give final approval to enable both the freehold land to be transferred to Gloriana and the Council to borrow and advance funding for the scheme.

Members debated at length the financial information supplied within the report and the merits for excluding the public and press.

At 7.42pm Councillor Morris-Cook arrived at the meeting.

During the debate a number of Members confirmed that they were not against the Gloriana development, but were concerned with the presentation of the financial information and sought assurances on the future return of the investment.

A number of Members raised Points of Order throughout the debate, during which other Members promoted the innovative nature of the Gloriana development, which was expected to secure new affordable homes for the Borough and deliver value for investment to the authority.

Once the debate was exhausted the Mayor put the recommendations in the printed report to a vote, upon which 34 Members voted in favour, 6 against and 4 abstained, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That it be approved that Gloriana develop the St Chad's site in Tilbury in accordance with the consented planning application.**
- 2. That authority be delegated to the S151 Officer, in consultation with the Chief Executive and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Group Leaders, to agree the land transfer to Gloriana and the final funding, including a form of guarantee as required, when the construction tender is submitted in April, and to enter into legal agreements as required, but subject to the financial parameters as set out in the report.**

3. **That, with reference and subject to 1.2, it be approved that there be a variation to the Council's prudential borrowing limits and capital programme accordingly and that the Head of Corporate Finance be instructed to put in the necessary arrangements to secure the required funding.**

At 8.12pm the meeting went back into public session and the Mayor briefly paused to allow members of the public and press to enter the Chamber.

The Mayor thanked the public and press for their patience in leaving the meeting room during the consideration of the previous item.

124. Frost Estate Community Governance Review

The Mayor advised that the Monitoring Officer had received and accepted a proposed amendment to the recommendations in the report, which had been tabled at the meeting.

The Mayor advised the Chamber on the procedure for dealing with amendments and the order of debate. The Mayor asked Councillor J. Kent to move his proposed amendment.

Councillor J. Kent stated that his amendment was in essence a new recommendation to replace those in the printed report, and observed that the decision Council was being asked to take would affect every single resident of the Frost Estate, potentially for decades to come, so it was important that Members took their responsibilities seriously and carefully consider what they were being asked to do.

Councillor Ojetola asked for clarification as to who moved the original recommendations printed in the report before the amendment was debated, to which the Chief Executive clarified that the officer report was deemed to be moved and seconded by virtue that it was printed in the agenda.

This was further clarified by the Deputy Head of Legal Services who highlighted Council Procedure Rule 19.4, which stated that reports and recommendations from Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees and Officers shall be deemed to have been proposed and seconded.

Councillor J. Kent advised that this process had always been the case and reiterated that this was an important decision the Council was being requested to take. He highlighted that Ward Members were especially aware of issues, and informed the Chamber that Councillor Smith had taken him to see the condition of some of the roads on the Frost Estate first hand. He acknowledged that all Members would be aware that it was the state of the roads which was driving the desire for a Parish Council, and that he had been greatly swayed by both the questions submitted to the Council that stated they did not know enough about the proposal, in addition to the public responses to the consultation which had been detailed in the appendices.

Councillor J. Kent declared that Members had been extensively lobbied from both sides but with many residents emphasising that they did not know enough about the proposal he proposed the amendment, which read as follows:

“In light of the public questions submitted to this meeting and the responses to the second stage consultation, this matter should be deferred to allow for the Council to arrange a public meeting for residents and interested stakeholders to ask questions from a panel of experts made up of the highways, electoral, democratic, finance and legal department and thereafter this matter be brought back to Council for a decision”.

Councillor J. Kent further remarked that he would not have moved the amendment if its agreement increased the risk of delaying the implementation of a Parish Council, but that the advice which had been given was that elections could not be held until May 2016. Therefore Councillor J. Kent observed that he did not think anything could be lost in providing one more opportunity for public consultation and holding one public meeting in an attempt to provide some people with comfort and ease any concerns. He thought that this meeting could start a new debate with residents where perhaps there had not been one before and to see if the boundaries could be redrawn.

Councillor J. Kent advised that the decision, whether to create a Parish Council or not, should not be taken no later than September 2015 so that there was time to press ahead with the elections, if that was the view of the Council, for the following May 2016 and thereupon moved his amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Brookes.

Councillor Brookes indicated that he reserved his right to speak until later in the debate.

Councillor Coxshall remarked that the decision had been a long process which he had started in 2011, when the Frost Estate was a big issue in his ward, and a large number of residents of the Frost Estate had attended that public meeting. He observed that there had been a lot of public anger at the meeting and that there was now an opportunity for the issues to be resolved, not by the Council, but by Frost Estate Residents themselves. In responding to the proposed amendment Councillor Coxshall made the following key points:

- Frost Estate Residents had formed a Steering Group, to which everyone was welcome and every street was represented by one resident from every road, which had met once a month for nearly two years to decide its own consultations.
- That two consultations and two petitions (one for and one against) had been undertaken before the requisite number was reached for a Community Governance Review.

- That the Steering Group had met the Chief Executive and Legal Officers and had produced a process to initiate the formal Community Governance Review process.
- That the Stage 1 process had indicated that 84% of Frost Estate residents were in favour of the Parish Council.
- That a Stage 2 process had been introduced which had showed that 75% of the Frost Estate area had voted in favour of the Parish Council.

Councillor Halden remarked that he was loathe to vote against the Leader of the Council's recommendation, which could give rise to the perception that the groups were opposed, which he felt was not the case, and added that it was more important that Frost Estate residents supported it rather than Members.

Councillor Halden explained that at General Services Committee it had been agreed a local referendum would take place and that 75% of residents had voted in favour of the Parish Council during the referendum. He felt that this was a convincing majority as clearly over 50% of the population of the Frost Estate were in favour, and as a result argued that a Parish Council should be supported despite some scepticism and reservations of some residents which had been highlighted through the questions that had been submitted.

Councillor Halden further remarked that he thought an earlier election could be called in September 2015 and felt any delay would be in conflict with how the residents had voted. He recognised that the Frost Estate Parish Council could be a failure, but if this was the case residents could vote accordingly to remove Parish Councillor's or elect new Parish Councillor's with new responsibilities.

Councillor Jones observed that he had examined both the arguments for and against, and that it was evident the main motivation for establishing a Parish Council was due to the poor condition of the roads as some were in appalling condition. He stated that if Frost Estate residents felt that they could use the vehicle of a Parish Council to undertake road repairs and take on responsibility for the maintenance of the estate then he wished them luck, however he raised some concerns that the residents who voted against a Parish Council were likely to be those Frost Estate residents who had already paid considerable sums of money to have their roads repaired. He felt that rightly they would not want to have increased Council Tax in order to pay for the maintenance of other resident's roads.

Councillor Jones asked whether the Council could investigate other options to solve road maintenance problems or if the boundary lines could be redrawn to remove Lampits Hill Avenue, Chamberlain Avenue and the top part of Windsor Avenue.

In response the Deputy Head of Legal Services advised that consultations had taken place during Stage 1 and Stage 2 based upon the existing boundaries and that if the boundary lines were redrawn a further consultation would be required which could be addressed if the amendment passed.

The Deputy Head of Legal Services informed Members that the Council had taken legal advice regarding the dates of elections and that draft regulations were currently going through Parliament under a super-affirmative procedure that would change the date of when a Community Governance Review ran from. He further advised that whilst there was discretion to move the year or alter the initial term of office of a Parish Council, in order to match the cycle of local authority elections, the actual month of May being the normal day of election was binding and that the Parish Council election would need to be held in May.

Councillor Coxshall called a Point of Order and expressed concern with regard to the legal opinion provided. He felt that in his experience of working with the last failed Parish Council the legal advice provided was untrue.

The Deputy Head of Legal Services firstly explained that the proposed Community Governance Review Regulations 2015, which had begun as draft legislation in 2014 and was anticipated soon to be enacted in law, was expected to change the date from when the review started. He advised that in future, although law was not retrospective, the 12 month review would start from the date when a valid petition was received. He clarified to Members that the law as it currently stood was that the 12 month review period started when the review was commenced, which was in effect the date when the Terms of Reference were agreed. Members were advised that the 12 month period for the Frost Estate Community Governance Review was 10 September 2014 to 9 September 2015.

Councillor Roast congratulated residents of the Frost Estate who had taken the spirit of living on a private housing estate to heart and put their hands in their pockets when needed and had done a good job of paying for repairs to their roads. However he explained that some residents could not afford to pay for repairs when needed due to a variety of reasons and that there was a stalemate as the Council could not help because the roads were not adopted by the local authority.

Councillor Roast informed the Chamber that residents had been in the reported stalemate position for a number of years and that now some roads had become almost impassable to regular vehicles. He added that the poor condition of the roads did not only affect those residents of the estate but those who travelled through, visitors, emergency services and utility companies.

Councillor Roast observed that Elected Members had a responsibility to help find a solution to the problems and felt that a Parish Council was an innovative longer term solution for the Frost Estate which was acceptable to the majority. He felt that there was not a solution that would be satisfactory for everyone but hoped that if a Parish Council was agreed all residents could examine opportunities for other projects after the repair of roads and be involved in creating a longer term strategy plan.

Councillor Speight affirmed that he supported any initiative which increased local democracy and participation but highlighted a number of concerns as to whether the Parish Council was the most appropriate vehicle for delivering what residents wanted, which was to repair the roads, in light of the legal advice provided. He recognised that the motivation to repair the roads was the primary concern of the residents and that there was a good response to the consultation, but questioned whether a Parish Council could legally do what residents wanted it to do.

Councillor Speight further remarked that in light of the hostility and in a bid for community cohesion, he supported a further meeting where the issue of setting up a Parish Council could be debated and differences brought together.

Councillor B. Rice echoed the sentiments raised by Councillor Speight.

Councillor Gledhill asked for legal clarification as to when the earliest date for an election for a Parish Council could be held, and if this was May 2016 or September 2015 which was at the end of the governance review. In response the Deputy Head of Legal Services explained that the Council had approached Bevan Brittan, which was a leading public sector law firm, to confirm the legislation and they were clear in their advice that whilst there was flexibility as to year of the election and the length of the initial term of office to harmonise with the normal election cycle, the first election must be held on the normal day of election in May and there was no flexibility afforded to this.

Councillor Gledhill felt that the information regarding the Parish Council had been placed into the public domain for debate and consultation and supported resident's wishes to create a Parish Council as it had been voted by the majority. He observed that if legally the Parish Council could not use the precept to maintain the condition of the roads that negated some of the residents' concerns who had already paid for the cost of their roads.

The Mayor asked for legal clarification regarding Shadow Parish Councils, to which the Deputy Head of Legal Services stated that it would be of benefit and normal to form a Shadow Parish Council to operate in the interim period from the end of the Community Governance Review until the first available date of an election of the formal Parish Council in order for the detailed financial information required for the Governance Order to be agreed and consulted upon, as this was a legal requirement and to undertake other preparatory steps..

The Deputy Head of Legal Services advised Members that if the establishment of a Parish Council proceeded at pace without first determining the necessary financial information a situation could arise where a Parish Council was formed but they would have no money with which to operate or take any action.

The Chamber were advised that if a Shadow Parish Council was established in the form of a Committee, it would have access to Thurrock Council's legal

advice and other departments, such as Highways, and therefore afforded a level of support. He advised that this would allow the Committee time to undertake the necessary preparatory steps to agree their standing orders, to recruit a suitably qualified Parish Council clerk and make contact with the official receiver in order to examine the acquisition of the private roads.

The Deputy Head of Legal Services advised that the Parish Council could not begin to think about repairing the roads until it obtained the General Power of Competence, and in order to do this a qualified clerk was required to be appointed who had passed a particular training course.

The Deputy Head of Legal Services observed that Members would be familiar with the concept of Parish Councils, of which there were thousands across the Country, which were well established bodies traditionally dealing with cemeteries, village halls and such like and advised that a Shadow Parish Council would be of significant practical benefit in the interim period so that proper procedures could be established such as retaining a clerk, agreeing standing orders in order to help avoid any future challenges which could be very costly.

Councillor Coxshall expressed his confusion as he believed the substantial recommendations were to set up a Shadow Parish Council and felt that was what Members were voting for.

Councillor Coxshall further remarked that during the meeting he had researched Parish Councils on the internet and discovered that Wiltshire Council had held an election for a Parish Council in September, and observed that given the legal advice provided, that particular Council must have been wrong.

The Deputy Head of Legal Services clarified that the amendment was being discussed and that if a Parish Council was agreed that was when a Shadow Parish Council could be formed. He reiterated that specialist legal advice had been sought in order to check the Council's legal position as to whether there was any flexibility in moving the normal month of the of the election, and that Bevan Brittan – the leading public sector law firm – had been clear in their advice that the month could not be moved and it was required that the election would need to be held on a normal day of election in May.

The Chief Executive clarified that the recommendations detailed within the report asked Members to consider proceeding with the proposal to set up a Parish Council and the purpose of the amendment was to delay that decision for 3 months in order to allow a further consultation.

Councillor Aker observed that two consultations had already been undertaken and questioned why a third was required.

Councillor Smith remarked that a lot of questions had been raised throughout the report and that it was clear there was a real divide with those for and against. He expressed concern that some of the comments in favour of

setting up a Parish Council detailed in the consultation actually did not want what the Parish Council was going to be set up for.

Councillor Wootton observed that he fully supported the will of the residents to establish a Parish Council, which he felt was a good vehicle to influence decision making. He expressed his confusion that the debate had been driven by road maintenance and highlighted that there were many other positive benefits of a Parish Council.

Councillor Brookes confirmed that as the seconder of the amendment, his points had been covered during the debate by Councillor Speight.

Councillor J. Kent summed up the report and felt that there had been a good debate on the item. He recognised that the process had been long and congratulated the Frost Estate residents for their innovative work, and in doing so assured those present that the proposed amendment to defer was not intended to kill this work but to ensure that all residents were well informed in order to maximise the chances and increase the success of any future Parish Council.

Upon being put to the vote, 25 Members voted in favour of the new recommendation proposed by Councillor J. Kent, 19 Members voted against and none abstained, whereupon the Mayor declared the new recommendation to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That in light of the public questions submitted to this meeting and the responses to the second stage consultation, this matter should be deferred to allow for the Council to arrange a public meeting for residents and interested stakeholders to ask questions from a panel of experts made up of the highways, electoral, democratic, finance and legal department and thereafter this matter be brought back to Council for a decision.

125. Annual Equality Report

Councillor Speight, Cabinet Member for Communities and Regeneration, introduced the report which presented the annual equality report and demonstrated how equality considerations had been mainstreamed into the work of all directorates. In introducing the report, the following key points were highlighted:

- Positive engagement with the Community and Voluntary Sector in Thurrock had helped to reduce the impact of budget cuts on residents with protected characteristics.
- The Council had refreshed and re-launched Staff Forum's and staff were supported to progress issues around equality.
- That the five enabling strategic priorities had been refreshed.

- Stonewall had confirmed Thurrock Council's position as a Diversity Champion committed to reducing discrimination and creating a more inclusive workplace.
- The first meeting of the Thurrock Fairness Commission had been held, its principle of operation and outline work programme been agreed.

Councillor Ojetola welcomed the report which he felt included a good level of detail, but was concerned that despite the increase in Thurrock residents from BME (Black, Minority, Ethnic) groups the number of new starters from these groups had fallen from 10% to 7.6%, which was a 2.4% decrease. He also recognised that there had been a downward trend in the recruitment of new starters who declared a disability.

Councillor Worrall commended the openness of the Annual Equality Report as it was not a statutory duty and remarked that it was important to refer the information back to Council each year in order to publicly monitor progress. She further requested the Cabinet Member to do all he could to re-establish school trips to Auschwitz as she felt that was of benefit to children and young people in Thurrock to learn about such atrocities.

Councillor Okunade expressed her satisfaction with the achievements of Children's Services in meeting the equality duty and explained that positive outcomes were at the heart of all work.

Councillor Gledhill welcomed the report but felt more could be done, and requested that an additional recommendation be inserted to ensure that Council received an annual update in order to monitor and compare performance against the previous year.

Councillor Gledhill's proposal for a new recommendation was seconded by Councillor Ojetola.

Councillor Speight thanked Members for their comments and confirmed that he was happy to include the new amendment. He advised that he would do all he could to examine alternative sources of funding for school trips to Auschwitz.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, including the new insertion, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

- 1. Note the matters identified in the Annual Equality Report presented to Council.**
- 2. Agree that the report be published to meet the requirement of S.149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010.**

3. **That it be agreed an annual report be presented to Council in order to update Members and monitor and compare performance against indicators from the previous year.**

126. The 2014 Annual Public Health Report

Councillor B. Rice, Cabinet member for Adult Social Care and Health, introduced the Annual Public Health report which was a requirement of the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to report on the health of the people in the local authority each year.

In introducing the report the Councillor B. Rice explained that there had been a particular focus on the health and wellbeing of older people and highlighted the oven cleaning and safeguarding and fire protection projects. Members were advised that the proportion of people aged 65 and over in Thurrock was lower than average for England (13.6% compared to 17.3% respectively) but that this was set to rise sharply in the coming years.

Councillor B. Rice called upon Members to help promote schemes such as the oven cleaning project to increase the safety of older people in their homes, to embrace the Charter for Older People and work with Local Area Coordinators to improve the lives of residents.

Councillor Key welcomed the report as he thought that it would help the Borough prepare and anticipate issues before they arose. He expressed concern about the age profile of residents getting older and was worried only 69.2% of residents took up the flu vaccine, which he felt should be higher.

At 9.12pm, the Leader of the Council moved a motion to suspend Council Procedure Rule 11.1 to allow the meeting to continue beyond the 2 ½ hour time limit until 10.30pm. Members indicated their agreement to the proposal.

Councillor S. Little felt that there health and safety checks on electric blankets should be reintroduced and expressed concern at proposals to stop the Horndon-on-the-Hill bus service, which she remarked was a lifeline for residents and stopped older people becoming isolated and lonely.

Councillor Aker thanked Councillor B. Rice for the report but raised the following key points:

- That the planned closure of the Grays Walk-In Centre would have a detrimental impact on the health of older people, and that the change in opening hours was not a like-for-like switch.
- That the proposed changes to the Grays level crossing and the creation of an underpass would negatively impact on residents toward the river and that the underpass may be intimidating for older people.
- He asked the Cabinet Member to clarify how many children had been affected by black mould in the home.

Councillor Gupta commended the Annual Public Health report which highlighted the problems faced by older people in Thurrock. He was concerned that Thurrock had the tenth highest level of older people living in poverty in the East of England and questioned what could be done to assist older people to mitigate these effects on their health.

Councillor C. Kent left the meeting at 9.16pm.

Councillor Hebb observed that since April 2012 the health landscape had changed and that it was never too late to change lifestyle choices such as smoking. He further reported that he was proud that Thurrock was a dementia friendly Council and thanked the outgoing Director of Public Health, Dr Atherton for all her hard work.

Councillor Speight, in response to Councillor Aker's concern regarding the Grays underpass, assured Members that any proposal for an underpass would not be intimidating.

Councillor Gledhill was concerned about the effects of damp and mould and thought that the gap needed to be bridged for older people between staying warm and good ventilation in homes.

Councillor B. Rice in summing up the report made the following key points:

- That the Grays Walk-In Centre was the responsibility of the NHS and not a question for Public Health.
- That Thurrock Citizens Advice Bureau had an important role to play in Public Health, which was recognised in the £85,000 grant that had been provided.
- That in Thurrock 1 in 4 children also lived in poverty, and that it was not just a problem connected to older people.
- That people needed the right to support to overcome these issues, and that Local Area Coordinators were instrumental to helping residents access the appropriate benefits.
- That black mould was still an issue but that the problem was not as bad as it had been in 2011. The Cabinet Member explained that Black Mould was unacceptable but that the Council was investing £3 million into overcoming these issues in addition to the Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) scheme.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendation, whereupon the Mayor declared this to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That the contents and recommendations of the 2014 Annual Public Health Report be noted.

127. Charter for Older People

Councillor Barbara Rice, Cabinet member for Adult Social Care and Health, introduced the report, and in doing so thanked Councillor Halden, Councillor Ojetola and Councillor Redsell for their contributions.

Councillor Halden commended the Charter, which he felt was a good example of cross-party working and a policy to be proud of.

Councillor Gledhill welcomed the Charter for Older People, in addition to the Veterans Charter, and called for both pieces of work to be included in the 'other implications' sections of Committee and Council reports so that their progress and impact could be monitored. Members were in agreement to this proposal.

Councillor Worrall felt that all sections of the community should be encouraged to engage with Council activities so as to keep healthy and reduce strain on other services.

Councillor Worrall highlighted pledge 10 on the charter which was to build high quality housing with the right neighbourhood facilities for older people, which was being delivered with the HAPPI homes scheme to prevent social isolation.

Councillor Gupta welcomed the report and hoped that more good work was to come.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendation, whereupon the Mayor declared this to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That Council agrees and adopts the Charter for Older People.

128. Director of Public Health Appointment

The Mayor advised Members that the report of the Chief Executive requested confirmation to appoint Ian Wake to the post of Director of Public Health following interviews held on the 13th March 2015.

Councillor B. Little reported that he was part of the interview panel and commended the appointment.

Councillor B. Rice observed that there had been four excellent candidates for the role and thanked Dr Atherton for her brilliant job in leading the transfer of the Primary Care Trust (PCT) to the authority. She advised Members that due to the demands of the job a full-time post was required.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendation, whereupon the Mayor declared this to be carried.

RESOLVED:

That the appointment of Ian Wake to the post of Director of Public Health be agreed.

Councillor Shinnick left the meeting at 9.34pm during the consideration of the next item.

129. Serco Strategic Partnership - Update Report

Councillor J. Kent, the Leader of the Council, introduced the report which provided an update to the Council on the Serco Strategic Partnership in response to the resolution that had been agreed at the previous meeting.

In introducing the report Councillor J. Kent explained that he had hoped more concrete information would have been available but advised that negotiations were more positive than those which had taken place a few weeks ago. He assured Members that progress was being made and proposed the introduction of a new recommendation should a decision need to be made during the pre-election period, which read as follows:

“That in the event that an agreed way forward is identified which meets the council’s objectives, to delegate to the Chief Executive, acting in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Central Services and Transformation and the opposition Group Leaders, authority to enter into and implement the agreement, including making any appropriate changes to the revenue and capital budget frameworks.”

Councillor Gledhill thanked the Leader for the update and endorsed the new recommendation proposed. He remarked that this was an important issue and was happy with the level of detail provided, but that he did not wish to hinder or prejudice negotiations by discussing the item further.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the recommendations agreed at Cabinet on 11 March 2015 (detailed in Appendix 2) be endorsed.**
- 2. That any necessary changes to the revenue and capital budget framework to deliver the necessary outcome from negotiations be referred to full Council.**
- 3. That in the event that an agreed way forward is identified which meets the Council’s objectives, to delegate to the Chief Executive, acting in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Central Services and Transformation and the**

opposition Group Leaders, authority to enter into and implement the agreement, including making any appropriate changes to the revenue and capital budget frameworks.

Councillor Shinnick re-joined the meeting at 9.37pm following the resolution of the item.

130. Approval of the Schools Capital Budget

Councillor J. Kent, the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Education, introduced the report which sought approval for the Schools Capital Budget.

Members were advised that decisions regarding Capital Programme Schemes were not usually referred to full Council but would be included on the agenda going forward due to the resolution which was agreed at the February 2015 meeting of Council.

Councillor Halden advised Members that he fully supported the construction of new school buildings but expressed his dissatisfaction that the report proposed to delegate authority to a Director as an increasing number of reports sought to do this. As a result he requested that recommendation 1.2 be amended so that authority was delegated to the Director of Children's Services in consultation with relevant Group Leaders or General Services Committee.

Councillor Kent argued that the recommendation dealt with operational issues and as such should not involve Elected Members. He observed that a debate needed to take place outside of the Council meeting in order to agree how delegated decisions were dealt with going forward, but agreed in this particular instance that authority could be delegated in consultation with Group Leaders only.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, including the amendment at 1.2, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the School Capital Programme budget of £5.5 million funded as set out in this report be approved.**
- 2. That the invitation of tenders be approved in accordance with Council & EU procurement procedures for a one year agreement for providing Specialist Project Teams, for a JCT (Joint Contracts Tribunal) form of contract School Improvement Programme, and principal contractors to take forward the proposed schemes.**
- 3. That authority be delegated to the Director of Children's Services, in consultation with Group Leaders, to enter into a contract**

following the selection procedure results in compliance with procurement regulations.

131. 2015/16 Transportation Highways Capital Programme

Councillor Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation, introduced the report which set out the recommended programme of work that utilised the funding allocations available to the service within 2015/16.

The Cabinet Member advised that a revised Appendix 1 had been circulated and tabled at the meeting.

Councillor S. Little observed that the figures which had been circulated were incorrect and asked for assurances that the information detailed in the revised appendix were accurate. She further highlighted the most profitable bus route had been axed and questioned why information regarding the approved verge hardening initiative in Lenmore Avenue had not been included within the report.

Councillor Kelly remarked that he would have liked to have seen the verge hardening schemes in Little Thurrock and Stifford Clays progressed, he appreciated that capital funding had to be applied for but observed that six months had passed with no developments.

Councillor Ojetola was pleased to see the corrected figures but questioned what happened to the outstanding figures from previous years.

Councillor Gledhill remarked that he would have liked to have received the corrected appendix earlier and was concerned that the report proposed the delegation of authority to the Director of Planning and Transportation, in conjunction with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to agree any changes without referring the information to the relevant Committee first. He further highlighted the poor repair of the footpath in Lawns Crescent.

Councillor Gerrish summed up his report and in doing so highlighted the following key points:

- That the verge hardening initiative required funding to be able to progress further but that the service would continue to identify all opportunities and bid where appropriate.
- He explained that the proposal to delegate authority was in relation to decisions at an operational level and questioned whether it was appropriate to refer such detailed operational decisions to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Highways and Transportation Capital Programme related to the Department for Transport funding allocation for 2015/16 (as detailed in Appendix 1) be approved.**
- 2. That the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) measures, developer funded Section 106 schemes and Grays Town Centre Access Improvements, to be delivered in 2015/16, be approved.**
- 3. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning & Transportation, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to approve the sections which require additional data.**
- 4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning & Transportation, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to review and make local changes to these programmes during the course of the year taking into account local views and priorities.**

132. Annual Pay Policy Statement 2015/16

The Mayor advised that the report sought approval of the Council's annual Pay Policy Statement for 2015/16, and included the requirement under the Localism Act 2011 to publish its policy relating to the pay of Chief Officers.

Councillor Hebb thanked officers for the report and felt that the Council had a duty to provide quality roles for quality pay. He added more could be done to equalise public and private sector roles, and reflected that the motion he had presented the previous year which called on Senior Management to take a voluntary pay cut had been rejected.

Councillor Hebb felt that posts with a salary of over £100,000 should be referred to Council for approval and called for a new recommendation to be inserted so that all posts with a salary of over £68,502 would need to be brought to Council going forward, which was seconded by Councillor Gledhill.

The Chief Executive recommended that a post level, such as Head of Service and above, be agreed upon rather than a figure or pay band, in order to avoid future confusion when appointing to a post.

Councillor Halden commended the proposal to increase the apprentice pay rates from the national apprentice rate to the national minimum wage after six months satisfactory performance. He felt that this incentive was a positive step that would be a springboard into stable employment.

The Chief Executive clarified to the Chamber that the current practice was for Council to approve the recruitment of appointments over £100,000, not the approval of the appointment itself (the individual who would be successful in

securing the post). He asked for clarification whether Members wished to approve the recruitment of posts of Head of Service and above level instead of the £100,000 threshold but reiterated that this was approval to start the recruitment process, but not the appointment.

Councillor J. Kent understood from the debate that Members wanted to approve posts such as that of the Chief Executive, and observed that all Senior Management pay grades were published on the Council website for transparency. He felt that all posts at Head of Service level and above to be referred to Council was a sensible approach and confirmed that he was happy to accept the proposal, but asked for flexibility so that if it was wrong it could be discussed outside of the meeting and a further report be referred back in the new municipal year. Members indicated their agreement to this approach.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

- 1. To approve the NJC cost of living pay award for staff on single status pay scales.**
- 2. That senior officers should not receive a cost of living pay award in 2015/16.**
- 3. To publish mandated, additional data about senior officer pay in accordance with the Government's new Transparency Code.**
- 4. To continue paying the UK Living Wage to the Council's lowest paid employees.**
- 5. To authorise an increase in the UK Living Wage from £7.65 to £7.85 per hour with effect from 1st April 2015.**
- 6. That apprentice pay rates should, on an annual basis, increase from the national apprentice rate to the national minimum wage (according to age) after 6 months' satisfactory performance.**
- 7. To approve the Pay Policy Statement for 2015/16.**

133. Item of Urgent Business - Appointment of Head of Paid Service

The Mayor moved onto the consideration of the urgent item of business, which related to the appointment of the Head of Paid Service.

Councillor J. Kent introduced the report, which had been tabled at the meeting, and advised the Chamber that the post attracted a salary of over £100,000.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the recommendations, whereupon the Mayor declared these to be carried.

RESOLVED:

To note and approve in accordance with the Council's Constitution and the Pay Policy Statement:

- 1. General Services Committee consider and make arrangements for the replacement of the Head of Paid Service, including any interim arrangements.**
- 2. The recruitment of a post over £100,000.**

134. Report of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration

Councillor Speight firstly paid tribute to his predecessor Councillor Andy Smith, who had launched many of the initiatives that were coming to fruition and who was an advocate of regeneration for Thurrock.

Councillor Speight, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, introduced the report and, in doing so, highlighted some of the key achievements of the Portfolio, which included that:

- The Purfleet Regeneration Programme had proceeded at pace and a development partner had been appointed, Purfleet Centre Regeneration Limited (PCRL).
- The Council's development partner had selected its preferred financial partner, which was expected to invest £25 million to support the development of dynamic and sustainable communities.
- The Purfleet scheme would deliver 2,500 new homes, 600,000 sq ft of television and film studios, in a new complex set around community facilities, such as a new town centre.
- Lakeside had ambitious plans to improve the retail and leisure offer.
- The regeneration of Grays Town Centre had proceeded at pace, with the opening of South Essex College and the Magistrates Court.
- The Council were in discussions with Network Rail to deliver a boulevard underpass and station redevelopment.
- The work was underpinned by the Regeneration and Planning Teams which had brought £100 million of external investment into Thurrock through strong partnership working.
- The planning team was one of the strongest in the Country and had recently won a high profile award from the Royal Town Planning Institute.
- The refresh of the local plan was important and would be heavily dependent on external factors, but all Members were encouraged to contribute to its development.

Members questioned the Cabinet Member and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Ojetola echoed the comments about the work of Councillor Andy Smith and welcomed the refresh of the local plan. He highlighted that there had been many debates about greenbelt land and permitted developments and requested that this information be debated and clarified so that it could be included within the Local Plan. He also questioned what was being done to ensure that the housing target to build new homes was being met.

The Cabinet Member felt that a plan led approach was required to deliver housing in the Borough in order to enhance communities and reiterated that the local plan needed to have buy-in from all Elected Members and the community. In regards to house building targets, the Cabinet Member advised that a net increase was expected of 488 dwellings in 2014/15 and 987 in 2015/16 and the development industry's expectation for the next 5 years was an average of 844 new dwellings per annum, which was higher than recent times.

- Councillor B. Little thanked the Portfolio Holder for his report and acknowledged that Grays Town Centre did need real change. He felt that the development of Paramount Park could contribute to the regeneration of the waterfront in Grays and asked the Portfolio Holder to consider this in future plans.

The Cabinet Member advised that he was open to opportunities for partnership working but that it was still in early stages of development, however he was keen to strengthen the tourism offer in Thurrock to ensure that visitors did not simply pass through the Borough.

- Councillor Worrall asked the Portfolio Holder to bring back the Tilbury Programme Board in order to drive forward positive change for the community of Tilbury.

The Cabinet Member observed that there was a genuine desire to ensure that Tilbury was a growth hub and that through partnership working and community participation he hoped Tilbury could undergo a period of regeneration in both skills and physical assets.

135. Report of the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation

Councillor Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation, introduced the report and, in doing so, highlighted some of the key achievements of the Portfolio, which included:

- That the service had been made more efficient through the termination of the Europa Contract.
- A campaign had been fought against the new Lower River Thames Crossing.

- The service had campaigned for free flowing tolls on the Dartford Crossing.
- The development of plans to improve the one-way system in Grays.
- The agreement of ambitious plans to upgrade street lighting to an LED system in order to make efficiency savings.

The Cabinet Member presented an award to the Mayor which had been received by the service for the 'Beat the Street' initiative, which had been delivered jointly with the Health team, from the Smarter Travel Awards in 2015.

Members congratulated all those who helped in winning the award, following which the Mayor received the official certificate.

Members questioned the Cabinet Member and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Ojetola acknowledged the work that had been achieved in relation to pot holes but felt more could be done in order to control lorries parking in Thurrock. He further called on the Cabinet Member to clarify how the £5 million of funding was being spent in order to improve cycling routes.

The Cabinet Member advised that he agreed unauthorised lorry parking was a problem across the Borough and felt that more should be done regarding enforcement. He reported that he was happy to share documentation relating to cycling outcomes from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and agreed that Thurrock should be more ambitious about cycle routes to better link in with the waterfront and improve town centre cycling.

The Cabinet Member further reported that he did not expect to carry over any spend into the next financial year.

- Councillor Gledhill highlighted that cars and walls were regularly being damaged by heavy goods vehicles in Little Thurrock and asked for the Cabinet Member to work with the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration to examine these issues.

The Cabinet Member observed that he would explore the options available to mitigate the reported issues and make amendments to the Highways network.

- Councillor S. Little felt that road surfaces deteriorated due to high speed and suggested that if the roads were resurfaced and the speed limit reduced to 20mph the condition of roads would last much longer. She further proposed that bridleways could be merged with cycle tracks and pathways in rural areas and called upon the Cabinet Member to investigate problems with car cruisers and designate problem roads as a clearway.

The Cabinet Member stated that the suggestions were useful to identify smarter solutions and assured Members that Essex Police had the matter of car cruisers in hand at West Thurrock.

- Councillor Purkiss highlighted that the report did not mention the health and safety issues in East Tilbury and the consultation that was underway with Network Rail. He asked the Cabinet Member to consult with local Ward Members regarding any proposal to cut bus services in future, and called for black tarmac to be used on rumble strips rather than red tarmac.

The Cabinet Member provided assurances that he would consult with Ward Members at an earlier stage over any difficult decisions to come, as he would also be involved much earlier in identifying solutions. He confirmed that he would liaise with the Ward Member and Officers regarding the tarmac used on rumble strips.

The Chief Executive advised that as the cut off time for the meeting was approaching, as Council Procedure Rule 11.1 had been suspended beyond the 2 ½ hour time limit until 10.30pm, the following procedures would be followed:

- That as there would not be enough time to deal with Members questions that had been submitted, the Member to whom the question was addressed would provide a written answer as soon as practicable after the meeting.
- That the motions on the agenda not dealt with by the close of the meeting were deemed formally moved and seconded and would be put to the vote without debate.
- He further advised that the Member who submitted the motion would either have 3 minutes to speak before it was put to the debate, or have the opportunity to withdraw it.

136. Questions from Members

The Mayor informed the Chamber that three questions had been submitted to the Leader and a further nine questions to Cabinet Members, Committee Chairs and Member appointed to represent the Council on a Joint Committee.

Due to the time limitations of the meeting, the Mayor asked those Members who had submitted questions whether they would like to withdraw their question or receive a written response from the person to whom the question was addressed as soon as practicable after the meeting, to which the following responses were received:

- Councillor Aker and Councillor Jones confirmed that they wished to receive a written response to the questions which they had submitted to the Leader.

- Councillor Gledhill confirmed that he wished to withdraw his question to the Leader and resubmit for a later meeting if necessary.
- Councillors C. Baker, Hipsey, Aker, Johnson and S. Little confirmed that they wished to receive written responses to the questions which they had submitted to Cabinet Members.
- The Chief Executive advised that as Councillor C. Kent was absent she would receive a written response.
- Councillor Roast asked for his question to Councillor Gerrish to be withdrawn and advised that he would resubmit if necessary.
- Councillor Ojetola asked for his question to be withdrawn as Councillor Speight had already answered the question during his Cabinet Member report.

137. Reports from Members representing the Council on Outside Bodies

There were no reports from Members representing the Council on outside bodies.

138. Minutes of Committees

The Minutes of Committees, as set out in the Agenda, were received.

139. Update on motions resolved at Council during the previous year

Members received an information report updating them on progress in respect of Motions resolved at Council over the past year.

140. Motion submitted by Councillor Hebb

Due to the time limitations of the meeting the Motion, as printed in the Agenda, was withdrawn by Councillor Hebb, who indicated that he would submit the motion again for another meeting so that it could be debated more thoroughly.

141. Motion submitted by Councillor Gledhill

The Motion, as printed in the Agenda, was proposed by Councillor Gledhill and read as follows:

“We call on Thurrock Council to investigate taking similar action to Essex and Harlow Councils and apply for an injunction to help stop unauthorised traveller encampments in Thurrock”.

Councillor Gledhill presented the motion and in doing so made the following key points:

- That the motion was not aimed at persecuting any particular group, their lifestyle or cause divisions within the community but was

needed in order to protect green spaces and residents right of access in Thurrock.

- He felt that there were gaps in the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, which he believed put too many caveats on the Police which hindered their ability to do their job effectively.
- That the temporary injunction obtained by Harlow had prevented 35 unauthorised traveller encampments, which followed over 80 unlawful encampments in one year.
- That in Thurrock during the past 11 months over 57 illegal encampments had been reported, and a further 4 on private property, and that action was required.
- That illegal traveller encampments in car parks and the disposal of waste cost the authority both vital income and money.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the Motion, whereupon the Mayor declared the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

We call on Thurrock Council to investigate taking similar action to Essex and Harlow Councils and apply for an injunction to help stop unauthorised traveller encampments in Thurrock.

142. Motion submitted by Councillor Gledhill

The Motion, as printed in the Agenda, was proposed by Councillor Gledhill and read as follows:

“This Council thanks all retiring elected members for their service to Thurrock”.

Councillor Gledhill thanked Councillor Pearce for all her work in Aveley and paid tribute to Councillor Wootton for his active service to communities and observed that his wisdom and quiet approach would be a great loss to the Council.

Councillor Gledhill also expressed his appreciation to Councillor Morris-Cook, who he remarked had been a proactive member for over 10 years.

He further acknowledged that Councillor Kiely would be departing as Councillor.

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the Motion, whereupon the Mayor declared the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

This Council thanks all retiring elected members for their service to Thurrock.

The meeting finished at 10.36 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk**