

MINUTES COUNCIL

Wednesday 17 April 2024

Councillor Julie Najuk (Mayor)

Present:

Councillor Michael Adams	Councillor Alison Hunt
Councillor Sandra Barnes	Councillor Ron McCrossen
Councillor Stuart Bestwick	Councillor Viv McCrossen
Councillor David Brocklebank	Councillor Marje Paling
Councillor Lorraine Brown	Councillor Michael Payne
Councillor John Clarke	Councillor Sue Pickering
Councillor Jim Creamer	Councillor Catherine Pope
Councillor Andrew Dunkin	Councillor Grahame Pope
Councillor Boyd Elliott	Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne
Councillor David Ellis	Councillor Alex Scroggie
Councillor Rachael Ellis	Councillor Martin Smith
Councillor Roxanne Ellis	Councillor Sam Smith
Councillor Andrew Ellwood	Councillor Ruth Strong
Councillor Paul Feeney	Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton
Councillor Kathryn Fox	Councillor Jane Walker
Councillor Des Gibbons	Councillor Michelle Welsh
Councillor Helen Greensmith	Councillor Henry Wheeler
Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth	Councillor Russell Whiting
Councillor Paul Hughes	Councillor Paul Wilkinson

Absent: Councillor Roy Allan and Councillor Lynda Pearson

104 THOUGHT FOR THE DAY

The Mayor's Chaplain, Father Philipp Ziomek, addressed council and gave a reading.

105 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allan and Pearson.

106 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor confirmed she had undertaken many community events since the last meeting and noted how much she enjoyed the Netherfield senior citizens easter lunch and her introductory meeting with the new Lord Lieutenant, Professor Victoria Pickering.

107 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 24 JANUARY, 21 FEBRUARY AND 6 MARCH 2024

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the above meetings, having been circulated, be approved as correct records.

108 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None.

**109 TO DEAL WITH ANY PETITIONS RECEIVED UNDER
PROCEDURAL RULE 7.8**

None.

**110 TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE PUBLIC UNDER
PROCEDURAL RULE 7.7**

Two questions were received and both questioners were in attendance to ask their questions. The questions and answers are as follows:

Question 1 – Asked by Matthew Francis

On the 24 January, the Mayor was asked by Councillor Whiting why she had taken the decision to disallow motion one, regarding the conflict in Gaza. The Mayor stated one reason, in that she did not believe it complied with Paragraph 7.12 (e) of Section 4 of the Gedling Borough Council Constitution. It has since come to light, through an information request, that the Mayor also disallowed motion one, because she believed that it could cause untold damage to the reputation of the council amongst certain communities if voted on and reported in the press, and she also believed it held the possibility of threats to the personal security of members of the council or the public.

In the spirit of honesty and transparency, when asked by Councillor Whiting for the reasons behind the disallowing of motion one, why did you not make these other two reasons known to the council, and the public at large?

Answer 1 – given by the Mayor, Cllr Julie Najuk

When I was considering the motion from the independent members in relation to the conflict in Gaza, back in January, I did hold the view, as outlined in the question, that the motion could damage the Council's reputation and cause a security risk to members, in addition to the view that it did not accord with the constitution. I emailed my views to the Chief Executive explaining the motion was disallowed.

I have authority as Mayor, to determine the validity of motions under para 7.12 (e) of the constitution. In exercise of that specific power, the

constitutional grounds for refusal of the motion on which I relied, were that the motion did not, in my opinion, comply with para 7.12 (e) of section 4 of the Constitution, in that I did not consider it was relevant to a matter in relation to which the Council had powers and responsibilities or which affects the borough, as the motion related to national foreign policy.

Whilst I expressed wider reasons privately, I have exercised my mayoral authority, in line with paragraph 7.12 (e) of the constitution and that is the reason I gave, in line with that authority in a public meeting.

Question 2 – Asked by Auvil Graham

I emailed Michael Payne, copying in John Clarke, on 31 January and received a reply on 8 April. The reply does not answer my question.

In my original email I noted of nearly 50 councillors, officers, and members of the public in attendance at the full council meeting of January 2024, apart from myself there was only one other person from a visible ethnic minority.

Given the deputy leader's response to a constituent's question at that meeting in which he said the council takes its responsibility for equality and diversity seriously and that all protected characteristics are equally important, I question the validity of that statement.

According to the most recent equality monitoring data (2021) only 4.4% of the council's employees were from visible minorities against a population of about 10%. I don't have the current figures even though the delay in answering my question was apparently to ensure up-to-date information. I am not aware of any non-white councillors on GBC.

I had asked that given the councils stated commitment to equality I would be very grateful to know how GBC intends to make the council more representative ethnically of the public it serves and efforts to engage the council's minority ethnic population in all activities including local democracy. The reply from the leader and deputy leader does not, unfortunately, answer my question. Indeed, it does not specifically address under-representation of minority ethnic people at all. I would be grateful for a clear answer.

How does GBC intend to make the council more representative ethnically of the public it serves and engage the council's minority ethnic population in all activities, including local democracy?

Answer 2 – given by Councillor Michael Payne

Thank you, Mr Graham, for your question this evening and your earlier letter about the important issue you have raised. I share your concerns

about the need for greater progress on improving the representation of ethnic minorities within the Council's workforce and among its elected representatives.

In the interest of transparency, I will read your original letter and the response from the Leader of the Council and myself. I will then respond to your question this evening. Mr Graham's original letter to the Leader of the Council and I read:

Dear Michael

I listened with great interest to your eloquent response to a written question at last week's full council meeting regarding age discrimination. In it you stated that the council takes 'its responsibility for equality and diversity very seriously' going on to say that all protected characteristics are equally important.

You will be more aware than I that Gedling Borough Council currently has no visibly non-white councillors. To my knowledge it never has. This was of course evident to me at last week's meeting, but I also noted that of the nearly 50 councillors, officers, and members of the public in attendance, only 1 other apart from myself was from a visible ethnic minority. I don't know the status of the person, but I believe she is an officer. I find this disappointing and hope that this disparity is also of concern to the council.

Further, I note that according to the most recent equality monitoring data (2021) only 4.4% of the council's employees were from visible minorities against a population of about 10%.

Given your stated commitment to equality I would be very grateful to know how GBC intends to make the council more representative ethnicity of the public it serves and efforts to engage the council's minority ethnic population in all activities including local democracy. I note that you said a consultation on a new equality policy and action plan will commence shortly. Please can you advise however what is happening now and on the council's success in this regard. Kind regards, Auvil Graham.

The response from the Leader of the Council and myself was as follows:

Dear Auvil

Thank you for your email of 31 January 2024 in which you ask about the measures that the Council is taking to ensure that it is representative of the community that it serves. Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding - we were keen to share the most up to date and accurate information possible with you. We share your passion and commitment to the issues you have taken the time to raise with us.

Firstly, we would start by saying that although there have been elected Members of Gedling Borough Council from a visible ethnic minority in

the past, much more needs to be done to make progress on increasing representations from ethnic minorities on the Council. We would certainly welcome and support this and would be pleased to learn of potential candidates of an ethnic minority who wished to be considered for vacant ward positions as they arose. We have both worked hard to encourage, support and campaign for council candidates in our own political party who are from diverse backgrounds - including those from ethnic minorities. We were extremely disappointed none of them were elected in the recent May 2024 council elections, but we have continued to support them as individuals since the elections and will continue to do so.

In terms of the Council more widely, it really is quite timely that you ask the question and we are really pleased and proud to be able to tell you of the good work that is currently in place as well as the imminent developments that you mention in your email although again, we would start by recognising your concerns that the proportion of employees is not yet representative of the visible ethnic minority population within the borough. Examples of the current measures that we have in place to try to help move us towards being more representative include:

- In addition to job advertisements appearing openly in the Council's jobs web page, all external job vacancies are also targeted directly to around 40 different individuals and community groups representing or working with potentially under-represented applicants: organisations such as PATRA for example.
- All managers who undertake recruitment are trained to ensure that they understand and apply fair process.
- Over the last year or so all office-based employees have undergone equality, diversity and inclusion training that also includes reference to unconscious bias. This is now being rolled out to the remainder of the workforce that does not have easy access to the e-learning training programme.
- The Council has now established an internal officer group called GIGS (the Gedling Inclusion Group Support) which comprises around ten employees from across the Council, all of whom have volunteered to take part in the group which aims to support the Council's work with a focus on all protected characteristics covered within the Equality Act 2010.

This is a new network group and I know that the members of the group are excited by the prospect of being genuinely able to contribute to the development of the Council's ambitions to improve equality, diversity and inclusion.

As you mentioned in your email, there are other work strands that are also currently being developed. The current framework that was in place for the three years leading up to 2023 contained around 70 equality-related actions almost all of which have now been completed. The revised and updated Council Equality Policy is now going through a period of consultation from which actions will be developed linking to the

Local Government Association's Equality Framework under which the Council hopes to move from its "developing" status to "achieving" status during the life of the Gedling Plan 2023-27. Service Plans are currently being developed for 2024-25 and each service area has been mandated to include at least one material equality-related action that will help support the Council to make positive improvement for its employees, residents and service users.

Once again, thank you for your interest. Hopefully this response gives a flavour of the measures of support that are currently in place as well as those that are being developed. We would of course be more than happy to meet with you to discuss these issues further and hear your feedback and suggestions.

Kind regards
Councillor John Clarke
Leader of Gedling Borough Council
Cllr Michael Payne
Deputy Leader of Gedling Borough Council

The simple truth is, too many individuals from black and ethnic minority groups still face discrimination and disadvantage in both getting into and progressing at work.

People of all ethnicities and backgrounds should have equality of access, treatment and outcomes, throughout the employee lifecycle. From getting a job, to accessing training and receiving a promotion, employees should feel empowered and be able to realise their full potential at work.

The Council has made progress in tackling some of these challenges but there is always more to do.

I have therefore asked the Council's Strategic Equalities and Diversity Group and senior management to commission an independent review of the Council's recruitment and retention procedures, policies and culture with a specific focus on the issue of the council's staff being representative of the community it services, including the representation of ethnic minorities within our workforce.

There are a wide range of important studies and reports into the issues facing black people and other ethnic minorities in the workplace, which the Council's senior management and Strategic Equalities and Diversity Group could examine - the 2017 McGregor-Smith Review into issues affecting black and minority ethnic (BME) groups in the workplace, the CIPD's race inclusion reports and the 2016 Parker Review into ethnicity of UK Boards, amongst others.

From a personal perspective, I will continue to do everything I can to support people from ethnic minorities who wish to stand for public office

too and to engage with our ethnic minority communities across Gedling Borough.

I am also keen to listen and hear Mr Graham's own suggestions about how further progress can be made on this important issue, I would therefore reiterate the invitation from the Leader of the Council and myself to meet with Mr Graham to listen to his concerns and suggestions regarding how further progress can be made.

Once again thank you to Mr Graham for taking the time to write and ask a question about this important issue.

111

TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.9

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change and Natural Habitat from Councillor Whiting as follows:

“Football at Colwick Rec is contributing to parking chaos in local roads every Saturday morning. With more pitches being used than advertised and insufficient facilities for players, what steps are being taken to reduce the number of pitches in use at Colwick and find suitable facilities elsewhere for the teams?”

Response from Councillor V McCrossen:

Thank you for your question and your keen interest around getting a resolution for Colick. As you are aware, I met with the parish council and with the football team – we were there on Saturday morning when the teams were playing, and we had discussions in regard to the situation.

Colwick recreation ground has three football pitches and a changing pavilion which has been used for over 30 years for the purpose of training and matches and the current incumbent team, Mapperley Allstars, are indeed a very popular team. During the season, 2 of the 3 pitches are used on a Saturday with each pitch hosting 2 junior clubs – 1 for 5 a side and 1 for 9 a side games – and there is an occasional Sunday game too.

Such activities are part of our Gedling plan of health and wellbeing and our objectives in terms of improving health and wellbeing for young people and we would want to continue to encourage our young people in borough to keep healthy and active and improve their mental health. In one sense it is really positive that so many young people are playing football and that Mapperley Allstars have such a large group of children. The parking situation on a Saturday morning when there is heightened use of that facility isn't good – we do know that since covid and the pandemic the percentage of use decreased so it is good that people are using open spaces and getting out and again is a good thing, but we know that it has increased some of the use of Colwick which is a very

popular spot in our borough. We also know that the city introduced car parking charges into Colwick park which is adjacent to the Colwick recreational grounds and of course we as the borough don't charge for our car parking so it makes our car park looks very attractive and we know that's a decision that the city council have taken, and we know that our officers have has discussion with the city council and that will remain. We also know that park runs, which also fit in with our health and wellbeing strategy, are very well attended and these unfortunately clash with the children's football teams.

Our officers have had discussions with them about this to see whether it is possible to put the park run on a different day, but we have been unable to negotiate that. All of these things attract people, so it is a bit of a hotspot and I know this has caused particular concern to residents around parking and antisocial behaviour. It is something that we and the parish council have looked at to see if we can get a resolution. I know that some county councillors have been down to look at the site to look at how they could implement some yellow lines and restrictions to try to help the antisocial parking situation. My understanding is that nothing has happened since then.

What we've been doing in terms of pitches and facilities, we continue to try and improve the facilities for our players and teams. The number of games is being limited to four games on a Saturday with one spilling over to Sunday. We know that car parking is an issue and understand that you have sought some additional car parking for the home club and encourage the use of this facility to reduce the number of vehicles parked on the roadside.

In terms of suitable facilities elsewhere, it is good to know that as a borough we have many football teams. The Mapperley Allstars were temporarily relocated to the Colwick recreational site while we were doing work on Gedling county park and the Lambley lane site to improve facilities. They have recently returned to the Lambley lane site so the over 11 teams are now playing there, which is good.

We also face these parking issues in other open spaces in the borough – clearly tolerance and trying to work together is the answer to this problem. We don't want to ban football in our open spaces and want to keep young people active, so it is about educating the adults and parents around how we can ensure they park in a respectful way.

Looking at a way forward, I would suggest that the borough and parish councils along with the local residents work together to put a proposal together for the county council to see what they can do to improve restrictions in the area. I, as portfolio holder, will continue to work with officers to look for a solution here. I am also working with leadership to see how we can improve the car park in the future. We are not a washed with finances and are trying to do the best we can with what we have. I

hear what you are all saying about how difficult it is and we will work together to get this sorted.

Councillor Whiting asked a supplementary question to see if it was known when or if some of the junior teams would be returning to Lambley lane to reduce the number of parking issues at Colwick recreational ground.

Councillor McCrossen confirmed she would check with officers to see if there was any possibility of moving some of the junior teams back to Lambley Lane.

112 TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS CONCERNING ANY MATTER DEALT WITH BY THE EXECUTIVE OR A COMMITTEE (PROCEDURAL RULE 7.10)

No comments were made.

113 REVIEW OF COUNCIL PROCEDURAL RULES

Consideration was given to a report of the Interim Corporate Director and Monitoring Officer which sought approval of the amended councils' procedural rules.

A revised set of recommendations than those printed in the agenda pack were proposed by Councillor John Clarke and seconded by Councillor Payne, in the following terms:

That Council:

1. Agrees the amended procedure rules at Appendix 1 to this report, with the additional amendment of amending the words 'three Members' to 'five Members' in clause 7.12 paras f and g.
2. Authorises the Monitoring Office to update the Constitution and any minor amendment to formatting or typographical errors.

RESOLVED that Council:

1. Agrees the amended procedure rules at Appendix 1 to this report, with the additional amendment of amending the words 'three Members' to 'five Members' in clause 7.12 paras f and g.
2. Authorises the Monitoring Office to update the Constitution and any minor amendment to formatting or typographical errors.

114 DISCRETIONARY LOCAL SCHEME - WAR PENSIONS

Consideration was given to a report of the Housing and Welfare Manager which sought approval to reconfirm the 100% discretionary disregard applied without revision in the calculation of Housing Benefit for all War Widows (Widowers)/War Disablement Scheme and the Armed Forces Compensation Scheme income received.

A revised set of recommendations than those printed in the agenda pack were proposed by Councillor John Clarke and seconded by Councillor Payne, in the following terms:

That:

- All income from War Widows (Widowers)/War Disablement Scheme and the Armed Forces Compensation Schemes be fully disregard when assessing entitlement to Housing Benefit, and by extension Discretionary Housing Payments.

RESOLVED that:

- All income from War Widows (Widowers)/War Disablement Scheme and the Armed Forces Compensation Schemes be fully disregard when assessing entitlement to Housing Benefit, and by extension Discretionary Housing Payments.

115 TO CONSIDER COMMENTS, OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN, UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.11

None.

116 TO CONSIDER MOTIONS UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.12

Motion 1

Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Elliot, proposed a motion in the following terms:

The council notes the obligations it owes to the Armed Forces community within Gedling Borough as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most. Gedling Borough Council along with all other local authorities in Great Britain, has proudly signed the Armed Forces Covenant.

That in the course of their service in His Majesty's Armed Forces, some members of the Armed Forces Community, by virtue of the often dangerous and risky nature of their work, or environments in which they are required to operate, become wounded, injured, or sick in such a way that affects their life in a permanent or significant way.

That a number of military compensation schemes exist to recognise and compensate Service Personnel and sometimes their families, for the hardship, inconvenience or ongoing impact conditions such as PTSD, limb loss, hearing loss etc. Military compensation can be awarded through the War Pension Scheme (WPS), Armed Forces Compensation Scheme (AFCS) or through a veteran's occupational Armed Forces

Pension Scheme (AFPS), known as Service Invaliding Pensions (SIPs) or Service Attributable Pensions (SAPs). Compensation awards under these schemes may also include supplementary payments. This compensation often interacts with benefits issued through Local Authorities and may impact a veteran's entitlement to such benefits.

That whilst some benefits such as Universal Credit rightly disregard military compensation as income, others administered by or subject to the discretion of Local Authorities, do not always do so, meaning that some veterans must give up their compensation in order to access essential financial support.

A 2022 Freedom of Information request by the Royal British Legion showed that only one in five (19%) of Local Authorities in Great Britain rightly disregarded all military compensation when assessing local benefits claims for Housing Benefit, Council Tax Support, Discretionary Housing Payments and Disabled Facilities Grants.

In light of the above, this council resolves:

1. That no member of the Armed Forces Community should be forced to give up their military compensation to access the same welfare support as their civilian counterparts.
2. To support the Royal British Legion's call for all forms of military compensation to be disregarded as income in the assessment and administration of locally administered benefits over which this council exercises discretion; Council Tax Reductions, Housing benefit, discretionary housing payments and Disabled Facilities grants.
3. To ask the executive to review relevant local policies, to reflect such a position and report back to an appropriate meeting of this Council.

Proposer: Councillor Mike Adams

Secunder: Councillor Boyd Elliott

An amended motion was proposed and seconded by Councillor Payne and Clarke, in the following terms:

The council notes the obligations it owes to the Armed Forces community within Gedling Borough as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most. Gedling Borough Council along with all other local authorities in Great Britain, has proudly signed the Armed Forces Covenant.

That in the course of their service in His Majesty's Armed Forces, some members of the Armed Forces Community, by virtue of the often dangerous and risky nature of their work, or environments in which they are required to operate, become wounded, injured, or sick in such a way that affects their life in a permanent or significant way.

That a number of military compensation schemes exist to recognise and compensate Service Personnel and sometimes their families, for the hardship, inconvenience or ongoing impact conditions such as PTSD, limb loss, hearing loss etc. Military compensation can be awarded through the War Pension Scheme (WPS), Armed Forces Compensation Scheme (AFCS) or through a veteran's occupational Armed Forces Pension Scheme (AFPS), known as Service Invaliding Pensions (SIPs) or Service Attributable Pensions (SAPs). Compensation awards under these schemes may also include supplementary payments. This compensation often interacts with benefits issued through Local Authorities and may impact a veteran's entitlement to such benefits.

That whilst some benefits such as Universal Credit rightly disregard military compensation as income, others administered by or subject to the discretion of Local Authorities, do not always do so, meaning that some veterans must give up their compensation in order to access essential financial support.

A 2022 Freedom of Information request by the Royal British Legion showed that only one in five (19%) of Local Authorities in Great Britain rightly disregarded all military compensation when assessing local benefits claims for Housing Benefit, Council Tax Support, Discretionary Housing Payments and Disabled Facilities Grants.

In light of the above, this council has at its meeting on 17 April 2024, resolved;

1. That no member of the Armed Forces Community should be forced to give up their military compensation to access the same welfare support (Housing Benefit and Discretionary Housing Payments) as their civilian counterparts;
2. To support the Royal British Legion's call for all forms of military compensation to be disregarded as income in the assessment and administration of locally administered benefits over which this council exercises discretion; (Council Tax Reductions), Housing Benefit, and by extension Discretionary Housing Payments

And this council resolves:

3. To write to the Secretary of State for Defence and shadow secretary requesting that it be made a national statutory

requirement that all forms of military compensation are disregarded as income in the assessment and administration of locally administered benefits over which a council exercises discretion, namely Council Tax Reductions, Housing Benefit, Discretionary Housing Payments and Disabled Facilities Grants; and that this new statutory requirement on local government be fully funded by central government.

4. To ask the executive to consider:
implementation of a 'Discretionary armed forces personnel, veterans and immediate family grant', with benefits which would include:
- To be fast tracked to deal with as a priority
 - To disregard the Armed Forces pension in the means test
 - To disregard Armed Forces Compensation Scheme – Guaranteed Income Payment in means test
 - To disregard War Widow pension in means test;
- and consider an update to relevant local policies, to reflect such a position and report back to an appropriate meeting of this Council on the effectiveness of the schemes.

Proposer: Councillor Michael Payne
Seconder: Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth

An adjournment was proposed, seconded, and agreed to allow members time to review the amendment. Upon return, the proposer and seconder of the original motion indicated their support and acceptance of the amendment. As such, it was deemed to be the substantive motion.

Upon being put to a vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that:

The council notes the obligations it owes to the Armed Forces community within Gedling Borough as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most. Gedling Borough Council along with all other local authorities in Great Britain, has proudly signed the Armed Forces Covenant.

That in the course of their service in His Majesty's Armed Forces, some members of the Armed Forces Community, by virtue of the often dangerous and risky nature of their work, or environments in which they are required to operate, become wounded, injured, or sick in such a way that affects their life in a permanent or significant way.

That a number of military compensation schemes exist to recognise and compensate Service Personnel and sometimes their families, for the hardship, inconvenience or ongoing impact conditions such as PTSD,

limb loss, hearing loss etc. Military compensation can be awarded through the War Pension Scheme (WPS), Armed Forces Compensation Scheme (AFCS) or through a veteran's occupational Armed Forces Pension Scheme (AFPS), known as Service Invaliding Pensions (SIPs) or Service Attributable Pensions (SAPs). Compensation awards under these schemes may also include supplementary payments. This compensation often interacts with benefits issued through Local Authorities and may impact a veteran's entitlement to such benefits.

That whilst some benefits such as Universal Credit rightly disregard military compensation as income, others administered by or subject to the discretion of Local Authorities, do not always do so, meaning that some veterans must give up their compensation in order to access essential financial support.

A 2022 Freedom of Information request by the Royal British Legion showed that only one in five (19%) of Local Authorities in Great Britain rightly disregarded all military compensation when assessing local benefits claims for Housing Benefit, Council Tax Support, Discretionary Housing Payments and Disabled Facilities Grants.

In light of the above, this council has at its meeting on 17 April 2024, resolved;

1. That no member of the Armed Forces Community should be forced to give up their military compensation to access the same welfare support (Housing Benefit and Discretionary Housing Payments) as their civilian counterparts; and
2. To support the Royal British Legion's call for all forms of military compensation to be disregarded as income in the assessment and administration of locally administered benefits over which this council exercises discretion; (Council Tax Reductions), Housing Benefit, and by extension Discretionary Housing Payments;

And this council resolves:

3. To write to the Secretary of State for Defence and shadow secretary requesting that it be made a national statutory requirement that all forms of military compensation are disregarded as income in the assessment and administration of locally administered benefits over which a council exercises discretion, namely Council Tax Reductions, Housing Benefit, Discretionary Housing Payments and Disabled Facilities Grants; and that this new statutory requirement on local government be fully funded by central government.
4. To ask the executive to consider:

implementation of a 'Discretionary armed forces personnel, veterans and immediate family grant', with benefits which would include:

- To be fast tracked to deal with as a priority
 - To disregard the Armed Forces pension in the means test
 - To disregard Armed Forces Compensation Scheme – Guaranteed Income Payment in means test
 - To disregard War Widow pension in means test;
- and consider an update to relevant local policies, to reflect such a position and report back to an appropriate meeting of this Council on the effectiveness of the schemes

Proposer: Councillor Mike Adams

Seconder: Councillor Boyd Elliott

Motion 2

Councillor Sam Smith, seconded by Councillor Adams, proposed a motion in the following terms:

This Council resolves to review the approach to Strategic and Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy allocation, to ensure it is expended effectively in local communities where development has or will take place and in consultation with those local communities and ward members.

Proposer: Councillor Sam Smith

Seconder: Councillor Mike Adams

An amended motion was proposed and seconded by Councillors Hollingsworth and Payne, in the following terms:

This Council notes that national Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations, determined by central government dictate that where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place in a parished area, the Parish Council receives 25% of the total CIL receipt collected in the parish and where there is no Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council receives 15%.

This Council notes that central government's updated Infrastructure Levy regulations, which have recently been consulted on, may change the overall approach to Community Infrastructure Levy.

This Council resolves to undertake a full review of the approach to Strategic and Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy allocation following introduction of the updated regulations, to ensure it is expended effectively in local communities where development has or will take place and in consultation with those local communities and ward members and within the next year will commence a review of the current 123 infrastructure funding list and consult with communities and Councillors on appropriate infrastructure projects.

Proposer: Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth
Seconded: Councillor Michael Payne

The proposer and seconder of the original motion indicated their support and acceptance of the amendment. As such, it was deemed to be the substantive motion.

Upon being put to a vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that:

This Council notes that national Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations, determined by central government dictate that where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place in a parished area, the Parish Council receives 25% of the total CIL receipt collected in the parish and where there is no Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council receives 15%.

This Council notes that central government's updated Infrastructure Levy regulations, which have recently been consulted on, may change the overall approach to Community Infrastructure Levy.

This Council resolves to undertake a full review of the approach to Strategic and Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy allocation following introduction of the updated regulations, to ensure it is expended effectively in local communities where development has or will take place and in consultation with those local communities and ward members and within the next year will commence a review of the current 123 infrastructure funding list and consult with communities and Councillors on appropriate infrastructure projects.

Proposer: Councillor Sam Smith
Seconded: Councillor Mike Adams

The meeting finished at 8.12 pm

Signed by Chair:

Date: