

CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

held on 20 July 2022 at 7pm

PRESENT:

The Mayor (Councillor J Galley)
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor S Dobson)

Councillors R H Ambor, L Ashley, H Ayres, K Bentley, N B Chambers, D J R Clark, P H Clark, W A Daden, A E Davidson, C K Davidson, J A Deakin, J A Frasca, I D Fuller, R J Gisby, M C Goldman, S M Goldman, I S Grundy, R J J Hyland, A M John, D Jones, G B R Knight, J S Lardge, R J Lee, M J Mackrory, L A Mascot, R Massey, L A Millane, R J Moore, G H J Pooley, J A Potter, R J Poulter, S Rajesh, I C Roberts, S J Robinson, T E Roper, E J Sampson, S J Scott, C M Shaw, M Sismey, A B Sosin, J E Sosin, M Steel, N M Walsh, T N Willis and I Wright

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors H Ayres, M W Bracken, N A Dudley, N Gulliver, P V Hughes, J C S Lager, J M Raven, A Thorpe-Apps, C R Tron, R T Whitehead and S Young.

2. Mayor's Announcements

The Council observed a minute's silence to mark the 27th anniversary of the Srebrenica massacre.

The Mayor expressed appreciation for the recent work of Liberal Democrat members of the Council in helping to raise funds for the Mayor's Charities.

3. Declarations of Interest

Members were reminded to declare at the appropriate time any personal and prejudicial interests in the business on the meeting's agenda.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 22 March and 18 May 2022 were confirmed as correct records.

5. Public Question Time

Two members of the public asked questions about the proposed redevelopment of the Chislett Row play area, which they said:

- had been put forward without any consultation with local residents, many of whom felt that it would exacerbate problems with antisocial behaviour, vandalism and drug use;
- would be in the wrong location, would be of an inappropriate size and would result in the loss of the kickabout area.

The Cabinet Member for Greener and Fairer Chelmsford thanked the members of the public for their questions. She said that the proposal for the Chislett Row play area was being pursued as part of the Playground Development Plan which set the policy and standards for the provision of play equipment and a programme for the improvement of play areas. The Chislett Row play area served the Waterson Vale catchment area but its current equipment was below standard. The proposal would include a wider range of new equipment to inspire play in children up to the age of 12 years. The equipment would be in a slightly different location within the existing play area, which would have a new safety surface throughout. For safety reasons, the play area was unsuitable for kickabouts but there was room for ball games outside of the equipped play area.

All feedback from all forms of consultation would be taken into account in drawing up proposals for play areas. It was emphasised that in this case it was not a consultation on whether to provide a play area at this location but on what equipment should be provided. The City Council intended to proceed with the replacement of the equipment within the existing play area but in response to the comments received it would be making some adjustments to the proposals, including signage to indicate that the play area was for children up to 12 years of age and the provision of more natural colours for the play equipment. The play area would be located as far away as possible from Chislett Row and would be positioned so as not to impeded dog walking outside of the fenced-off area. The area of open space outside of the fenced area would continue to be available for recreation use, including kickabout activities, and there would be an opportunity to increase biodiversity.

There was no evidence that slightly repositioning the play area would lead to increases in vandalism and antisocial behaviour. However, this area was patrolled by the Community Policy Team and anyone witnessing antisocial behaviour or vandalism was urged to report it to that Team. The provision of a play area was rarely the cause of such behaviour.

6. Cabinet Question Time

There were no questions for members of the Cabinet.

7. Reports from the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford

7.1 Treasury Management Outturn 2021-22

The report to the meeting detailed the findings of the annual review of the Council's Treasury Management function and the rates of return on investments in 2021-22.

RESOLVED that the Treasury Management Outturn report for 2021-22 be noted.

(7.22pm to 7.24pm)

7.2 Capital Programme Update and Provisional Outturn 2021-22

The report to the meeting detailed capital expenditure incurred in 2021-22 and the resources used to finance it; set out variations to approved capital schemes and the Asset Replacement Programme; and presented a budget for asset replacements in 2022-23. At its meeting on 12 July 2022 the Cabinet had approved the proposed Asset Replacement Programme for 2022-23, the increase in scheme costs of £6,000, the rephasing of spend from 2021/22 of £271,000 and proposals for new items totalling £43,000 as shown in Appendix 3 and detailed in paragraph 4.2 of the report to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford said that the programme enabled the Council to continue to deliver all the services that residents depended on and reflected its ambitious plans:

- To modernise the theatres
- To develop various sites owned, both providing more much-needed affordable housing and creating new communities of which Chelmsford could be proud
- To invest in decent temporary homes, at lower cost, for families that have found themselves homeless
- To invest in Hylands House so that it could offer an even better experience to visitors
- To ensure the Council could deliver on its promise to plant 175,000 trees over 10 years
- To make progress towards the target of making the City Council net-zero carbon by 2030. The Cabinet Member was proud that the Council was set out on a path to convert its vehicle fleet to reduce and ultimately eliminate reliance on fossil fuels. All vehicles being purchased were now electric or other ultra-low-emission such as hydrogen, except where genuine operational constraints make these unsuitable or they were not available.

As well as updating the costs of the existing programme, there are two new schemes relating to the Army & Navy:

- The City Council had been asked to provide £4m towards the estimated £67m cost of the main scheme. The Government was expected to fund most of this cost.

- The junction improvements, enhancements to the Park & Rides and better options for cycling and walking would benefit residents and were long overdue. Essex County Council would work with the City Council to make more improvements for cycling and walking, and £1.5m of contributions from developers were allocated for this.

The two schemes were linked and the Council's contribution to the first was conditional on Essex County Council working with it on the second.

A question was asked about the cost of the Theatres Modernisation project and whether an assurance could be given that there be no further increases in its budget. The Cabinet Member said that at a time of inflationary increases affecting the building and supply sectors, no such assurance could be given but the Council was determined to deliver the project and was on track to do so.

Asked whether it was intended to provide a Changing Places facility for the Theatre, the Cabinet Member for Connected Chelmsford said that it was but that, unfortunately, the space and configuration constraints within the Theatre structure meant that it could not be located within the building. The Council was committed to improving, where possible, the accessibility to its facilities of those with disabilities and in the case of the Theatre redevelopment it was working with the Disability Access Group to enhance access where practicable.

RESOLVED that

1. the latest proposed budgets for Capital Schemes, an increase of £4.419m, shown in Appendix 1 and detailed in paragraph 3.1, be approved;
2. the budgets for two new schemes, detailed in paragraph 3.5, be approved:
 - Army and Navy Sustainable Transport package, capped at £4m;
 - East Chelmsford Cycling and Walking Connectivity, capped at £1.5m;
3. the outturn on the 2021/22 Asset Replacement Programme £3.849m, shown in Appendix 3 and detailed in paragraph 4.1, be noted;
4. the Asset Replacement Programme for 2022/23, £6.007m as shown in Appendix 3 and detailed in paragraph 4.2, be noted;
5. the proposed Asset Replacement programme deferred approved schemes from 2022/23 to 2023/24, £0.154m, shown in Appendix 3 and detailed in paragraph 4.2, be noted; and
6. the method of funding the capital expenditure incurred in 2021/22, as set out in the table in paragraph 5 be noted.

(7.24pm to 7.33pm)

7.3 Medium-Term Financial Strategy

The Council received an update on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the period 2022-23 to 2027-28, approved by the Council in July 2021. The MTFS provided a financial framework to support delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in "Our Chelmsford; Our Plan".

In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford said that it provided an update on the Council's projected finances over the next six years and the context for the next round of budget-setting.

It was usual at this stage in the budget-setting cycle to have a gap between the current forecast of spending over this period and the income expected to fund it. In July 2018, the gap for 2019-20 was expected to be £1.35m and in July 2021 the gap for 2022-23 had been forecast as £1.7m. In each case, by the time, six months later, that the budget proposals for the next year had been published, those gaps had been closed.

This year was no different. A somewhat larger gap was forecast – £4.2m for 2023-24 on the central case – but the Cabinet Member expected to present a balanced budget in January 2023. The challenges this year, however, were much greater.

As had been seen during the pandemic, the City Council's finances were very reliant on income that it generated itself. Only about a quarter of its spending came from Council Tax and almost £9 in every £10 of Council Tax collected was passed on to others, most of it to Essex County Council. Very little of the Council's spending was funded by Government grants: it kept a small proportion of the business rates it collected and sometimes received grants for specific activities. The Council therefore relied on the income it could generate through cautious investment of spare cash, rents on the property it owned and charges for some of its services.

The country had entered a cost-of-living crisis. Inflation was forecast to be in double figures later in the year. Residents were suffering with increases in the cap on domestic energy bills, diesel and petrol prices at the forecourts had hit new highs, and food prices were going up. Earnings, pensions and benefits were not keeping pace. People would spend less and that would affect the Council's income.

The City Council's spending was also caught by the same pressures. Energy costs had gone up by £900,000; fuel costs were up £300,000; the prices of building materials were pushing up the costs of the capital programme. All councils faced those pressures but Chelmsford had managed its finances carefully and was in a better position than many other councils.

The Government helped councils with very significant grants so they could survive the pandemic, when income fell and spending had to rise. Government help was now needed again, otherwise all councils would have to stop delivering vital services that residents depended on and some councils would become bankrupt. The Strategy aimed to plot a course through the current period of uncertainty.

Asked what the trend had been over recent years for the creation of unearmarked reserves, the Cabinet Member said that it was difficult to specify a trend as such. The pandemic had had a significant impact on the Council's income and expenditure, not all of which had been recovered through the government's assistance programme. The unearmarked reserves were intended to help the Council through periods of uncertainty and difficulty such as that currently being experienced. The aim was to create a reserve of £9 million and at present this was being achieved.

RESOLVED that the following be approved:

1. the updates to the capital strategy set out in Appendix 2;
2. the approach to reserves set out in the report and Appendix 5 of the report;
3. the Financial Strategy as set out in Appendix 4;
4. the budget guidelines for preparation of the 2023/24 budget set out in Appendix 6;
5. the carry forward of budgets of £247,000 from 2021/22 for initiatives which were delayed, as detailed in Appendix 6; and
6. additional Revenue Budget of £80,000 for 2022/23 (equivalent to £135,000 in a full year) for the switch to a low-carbon fuel for the Council's larger vehicles, as detailed in Appendix 6.

(7.33pm to 7.42pm)

8. Reports from the Leader of the Council

8.1 UK Shared Prosperity Fund

The Council received a report on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF), which had been launched in April 2022 and aligned with the Government's levelling up agenda.

Chelmsford had been allocated £1,173,283 to deliver the aims of the UKSPF which would run from April 2022 until March 2025. In order to obtain the funding an Investment Plan for City needed to be developed and then approved by the government. Local authorities were also expected to form formal partnerships to oversee the development of their area's Investment Plan or to use current groups for this purpose. The Cabinet on 12 July 2022 had agreed that the One Chelmsford Board was the most appropriate body for Chelmsford's Investment Plan to be officially endorsed by the required partners, stakeholders and relevant MPs.

Supporting the skills of young people, developing local business and working with the voluntary sector and health service to address health inequalities had been identified by the Council and its partners as particular priorities for the funding.

RESOLVED that

1. the publication of the prospectus for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund be noted;
2. the developing Investment Plan be endorsed, the support of the One Chelmsford Board to it be noted and the allocation of the funding from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund in accordance with the Investment Plan be approved; and
3. the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Council's Section 151 Officer, to take the necessary actions and decisions required to finalise Chelmsford's Investment Plan and approve it for submission to the Government for approval within the stated timeframes.

(7.42pm to 7.46pm)

8.2 Membership of Committees

RESOLVED that the replacement of Councillor J Galley by Councillor A Thorpe-Apps as a member of the Chelmsford Policy Board be approved.

(7.46pm to 7.47pm)

9. Annual Report of the Audit and Risk Committee

The Council considered the Annual Report of the Audit Committee for 2021-22, submitted in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) recommended practice.

The report included among other things a review of the Committee's terms of reference; its work on the audit charter and internal audit strategy; the publication of information about the audit function; the Committee's work programme for 2021-22 and its planned work for 2022-23.

RESOLVED that the Annual Report of the Audit and Risk Committee for 2021-22 be approved for publication.

(7.47pm to 7.48pm)

10. Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the activity of the scrutiny function of the Council for 2021/22 was submitted for information.

The report outlined the Committee's main areas of work over the past year, which had included examining the final report of the Riverside Project Task and Finish Group, the annual report of the Chelmsford Policy Board, and a review of the Our Chelmsford Our Plan corporate plan. The Committee had also monitored the performance of key services and activities and had received the annual presentation on the work of Essex Police and the Safer Chelmsford Partnership.

RESOLVED that the Annual Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2021-22 be approved for publication.

(7.48pm to 7.50pm)

11. Amendments to the Constitution

The Council had been recommended by the Governance Committee, Mayoral Working Party and Cabinet to approve proposed changes to the Constitution in respect of general amendments to the Constitution (Appendix 1), revised Financial Rules (Appendix 2) and amendments to the Mayoral Party Rules and Protocol (Appendices 3a and 3b).

A member of one of the smaller minority groups expressed the view that the change proposed to the Executive Rules to remove the ability of such groups to appoint spokespersons on Cabinet functions would remove their ability to contribute to debate at its meetings and, accordingly, was unfair and undemocratic. The Leader of the Council did not agree with that view, saying that all members would continue to have the right to attend and speak at Cabinet meetings. Any amendment to the arrangements for appointing spokespersons as a result of changes in the size of minority groups at an election could be addressed fairly quickly after the election.

RESOLVED that the amendments to the Constitution detailed in the appendices to the report to the meeting be approved.

(7.50pm to 7.58pm)

12. Model Code of Conduct for Members

The Council was informed that the Governance Committee on 15 June 2022 had recommended that it adopt the latest version of the Local Government Association's Model Code of Conduct for councillors.

Members were told that forthcoming training by the Monitoring Officer on the new Code would help answer many of the questions members might have on the declaration of interests and offers of gifts and hospitality. It was also recognised that parish clerks would need to help make members of their councils aware of the Code and its requirements.

RESOLVED that the Model Code of Conduct for Members submitted to the meeting be approved and adopted as Part 5.1 of the Constitution.

(7.58pm to 8.02pm)

13. Notice of Motion – Councils for Fair Tax Declaration

In accordance with notice duly given, it was moved by Councillor R Hyland, seconded by Councillor W Daden, that:

“This Council notes

1. The pressure on organisations to pay their fair share of tax has never been stronger.
2. Polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that “corporate tax avoidance” has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct.
3. Two thirds of people (66%) believe the Government and local councils should at least consider a company’s ethics and how they pay their tax, as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when awarding contracts to companies.
4. Around 17.5% of public contracts in the UK have been won by companies with links to tax havens.
5. It has been conservatively estimated that losses from multinational profit-shifting (just one form of tax avoidance) could be costing the UK some £17bn per annum in lost corporation tax revenues.
6. The Fair Tax Mark offers a means for business to demonstrate good tax conduct, and has been secured by a wide range of businesses across the UK, including FTSE-listed PLCs, co-operatives, social enterprises and large private businesses.

This Council believes that:

1. Paying tax is often presented as a burden, but it shouldn’t be.
2. Tax enables us to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defence, roads, policing and defence. It also helps to counter financial inequalities and rebalance distorted economies.
3. As recipients of significant public funding, local authorities should take the lead in the promotion of exemplary tax conduct; be that by ensuring contractors are paying their proper share of tax, or by refusing to go along with offshore tax dodging when buying land and property.

4. Where councils hold substantive stakes in private enterprises, influence should be wielded to ensure that such businesses are exemplars of tax transparency and tax avoidance is shunned.

5. More action is needed, however, as current and proposed new UK procurement law significantly restricts councils' ability to either penalise poor tax conduct (as exclusion grounds are rarely triggered) or reward good tax conduct, when buying goods or services.

6. UK cities, counties and towns can and should stand up for responsible tax conduct - doing what they can within existing frameworks and pledging to do more given the opportunity, as active supporters of international tax justice.

That councils have an important role to play in ensuring their contracts and supplies arrangements are set up to support Fair Tax ethics.

This Council resolves to sign and approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration

1. Approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration.

2. Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities.

3. Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly, and contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes.

4. Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.

5. Undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately by suppliers as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates.

6. Demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers UK and overseas and their consolidated profit & loss position, given lack of clarity could be strong indicators of poor financial probity and weak financial standing.

7. Promote Fair Tax Mark certification especially for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due.

8. Support Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrate the tax contribution made by responsible businesses are proud to promote responsible tax conduct and pay their fair share of corporation tax.

9. Support calls for urgent reform of UK procurement law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies."

It was moved as an amendment by Councillor C Davidson, seconded by Councillor M Goldman, that:

"The following wording be deleted from the motion:

- ‘- doing what they can within existing frameworks and pledging to do more given the opportunity, as active supporters of international tax justice’;
- ‘sign and approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration’ to the end of the Motion.

The following wording be inserted after point 6 of the section This Council believes:

‘7. It is HM Revenue & Customs’ responsibility to ensure that companies pay a fair amount of corporation tax on the profits they make, and for the Government to ensure they have the legislation and resources they need.

8. Tackling multinational profit-shifting involves negotiations with international trading partners and entering into multilateral agreements.

9. Local authorities cannot second-guess national and international tax law or HMRC’s and the courts’ application of it.’

The following be inserted in the section This council resolves to:

‘1. Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities.

2. Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly, and contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes.

3. Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.

4. Promote Fair Tax Mark certification especially for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due.

5. Encourage contractors and suppliers to have good tax practices.

6. Instruct the Cabinet Member for a Fairer Chelmsford to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to express our concern at the level of corporate tax avoidance the Government is still tolerating.

7. Sign and approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration only to the extent set out above.’ “

The amendment was accepted by Councillor Hyland and became the substantive motion, which was then debated.

In moving the original motion, Councillor Hyland emphasised the need for the Council to lead by example and follow an ethical approach to the procurement of goods and services. Councillor C Davidson agreed that the motion was about fairness and that it would be in the best interests of public services and local businesses if the principles set out in it were followed. He believed, however, that in some respects the motion asked the Council to commit to things it could not realistically achieve and which more appropriately fell within the remit of Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs or the government. His amendment was therefore limited to addressing that point whilst accepting the principles of the original motion and adding an action that he would write to the government expressing the Council’s and

residents' concern about the avoidance of tax by some companies. He understood that the Council would still be accredited by the Fair Tax campaign if the motion as amended was adopted.

The ensuing debate revealed that whilst most members were sympathetic to the principles of the motion and its amendment, not all felt able to support either as they placed obligations on the Council and officers that they would not be in a position to meet and assumed that the Council would be able to monitor the compliance or otherwise of companies.

On being put to the vote, with no votes against but a number of abstentions, it was

RESOLVED that:

“This Council notes

1. The pressure on organisations to pay their fair share of tax has never been stronger.
2. Polling from the Institute for Business Ethics finds that “corporate tax avoidance” has, since 2013, been the clear number one concern of the British public when it comes to business conduct.
3. Two thirds of people (66%) believe the Government and local councils should at least consider a company’s ethics and how they pay their tax, as well as value for money and quality of service provided, when awarding contracts to companies.
4. Around 17.5% of public contracts in the UK have been won by companies with links to tax havens.
5. It has been conservatively estimated that losses from multinational profit-shifting (just one form of tax avoidance) could be costing the UK some £17bn per annum in lost corporation tax revenues.
6. The Fair Tax Mark offers a means for business to demonstrate good tax conduct, and has been secured by a wide range of businesses across the UK, including FTSE-listed PLCs, co-operatives, social enterprises and large private businesses.

This Council believes that:

1. Paying tax is often presented as a burden, but it shouldn’t be.
2. Tax enables us to provide services from education, health and social care, to flood defence, roads, policing and defence. It also helps to counter financial inequalities and rebalance distorted economies.
3. As recipients of significant public funding, local authorities should take the lead in the promotion of exemplary tax conduct; be that by ensuring contractors are paying their proper share of tax, or by refusing to go along with offshore tax dodging when buying land and property.
4. Where councils hold substantive stakes in private enterprises, influence should be wielded to ensure that such businesses are exemplars of tax transparency and tax avoidance is shunned.

5. More action is needed, however, as current and proposed new UK procurement law significantly restricts councils' ability to either penalise poor tax conduct (as exclusion grounds are rarely triggered) or reward good tax conduct, when buying goods or services.
6. UK cities, counties and towns can and should stand up for responsible tax conduct.
7. It is HM Revenue & Customs' responsibility to ensure that companies pay a fair amount of corporation tax on the profits they make, and for the Government to ensure they have the legislation and resources they need.
8. Tackling multinational profit-shifting involves negotiations with international trading partners and entering into multilateral agreements.
9. Local authorities cannot second-guess national and international tax law or HMRC's and the courts' application of it.

That councils have an important role to play in ensuring their contracts and supplies arrangements are set up to support Fair Tax ethics.

This Council resolves to

1. Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities.
2. Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly, and contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes.
3. Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.
4. Promote Fair Tax Mark certification especially for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due.
5. Encourage contractors and suppliers to have good tax practices.
6. Instruct the Cabinet Member for a Fairer Chelmsford to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to express our concern at the level of corporate tax avoidance the Government is still tolerating.
7. Sign and approve the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration only to the extent set out above."

(8.02pm to 8.23pm)

Urgent Business

The Mayor informed the Council that he had agreed to accept as an additional item of urgent business a report on a prospective property purchase, on the grounds that not considering the proposal at this meeting was likely to result in the Council missing the opportunity to purchase the property in question. As the report contained exempt information, the Council needed to decide whether to exclude the public during its consideration.

Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED that the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of Item 14 as it contains exempt information within Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

14. Proposed Property Purchase

Public interest statement: It is not in the public interest to release details of this report at present, on the grounds that it contains information that is commercially sensitive and to place the information in the public realm will be detrimental to the negotiations to be undertaken by the Council.

The Council was requested to authorise the purchase of a property in Chelmsford and approve the allocation of a budget for that purpose.

Several members indicated that they could not support the proposal on the grounds that the Council's financial position was such that it should not be embarking on speculative purchases at this time, that less costly land was available, and that no business case had been made for the purchase and the intended use of the land and property. Others, however, believed that the purchase would be good value for money and would help replenish the Council's diminished land bank.

RESOLVED that:

1. the Director of Public Places, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford pursuant to paragraph 3.4.5.46 of the Constitution, be authorised to agree terms for the purchase of the property referred to in the report to the meeting; and
2. pursuant to paragraph 3.2.2.11 of the Constitution the allocation of a budget to support the purchase of this property interest in the sum referred to in the report be approved.
- 3.

The meeting closed at 8.42pm

Mayor