

Minutes of the Council meeting held at Riverside, Canning Road, Lowestoft on **Wednesday, 14 November 2018** at **6.30 pm**.

3b

Members present:

F Mortimer (Chairman), S Ardley, P Ashdown, E Back, M Barnard, D Beavan, M Bee, N Brooks, P Byatt, A Cackett, G Catchpole, J Ceresa, M Cherry, Y Cherry, L Coulam, J Craig, J Ford, T Goldson, L Gooch, I Graham, K Grant, A Green, J Groom, M Ladd, P Light, T Mortimer, J Murray, K Patience, M Pitchers, B Provan, C Punt, D Ritchie, C Rivett, K Robinson, J Smith, L Smith, K Springall, C Topping, M Vigo di Gallidoro, N Webb, S Webb and S Woods.

Officers present:

S Baker (Chief Executive), C Bing (Legal & Licensing Services Manager), K Cook (Democratic Services & Cabinet Business Manager (SCDC)), A Jarvis (Strategic Director), N Khan (Strategic Director), S Martin (Head of Internal Audit Services), P Ridley (Head of Planning & Coastal Management), S Taylor (Interim Chief Finance Officer).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G Elliott, T Gandy, L Nicholls and M Rudd.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Service of Remembrance

The Chairman referred to the recent Service of Remembrance and gave thanks to Lowestoft Town Council, the Active Communities Team and all who had contributed to making the occasion such a success.

Carol Service

The Chairman referred to the Carol Service, scheduled to take place on 14 December 2018, and all Councillors were welcome to attend.

Democratic Services Manager

The Chairman advised Members that the Council's Democratic Services Manager was currently unwell; he, joined by all Members, wished her a speedy recovery.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE / LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Chief Executive

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive on this occasion.

Leader of the Council

The Leader reported that ward boundaries for the new East Suffolk Council had been published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. In response to local feedback during the public consultation, the Commission had changed some of the proposals it put forward in July 2018.

The Leader reported that a Polling Station Review was underway and, as such, he encouraged all Members to respond to the consultation process, which would end on 30 November 2018.

5. NOTICES OF MOTION

A Notice of Motion had been received from Councillor J Murray:

“This Council condemns the manner in which the sale of the old Lowestoft Hospital site was carried out.

Having been given the impression by the James Paget Hospital that the site would be sold in the coming months, it was very disappointing that the site was auctioned on 25 October, giving no time for the site to be considered within the current review of local NHS provision as a possible North Lowestoft Medical Hub.

Residents of Lowestoft over many years have supported the hospital financially, and part of the building was constructed through public subscription. Also the charity NSHEBA raised significant funds over many years for Hospital equipment. With that ‘local’ investment in mind, this Council calls on the James Paget Hospital to ring-fence their profits from the sale for the benefit of the health and well-being of Lowestoft residents.”

In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, it was proposed and seconded “That the Motion be discussed immediately”. On it being put to the Vote the Motion was **CARRIED** and the Motion was therefore duly discussed.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, following the consent of the Chairman of the Council, a paper was circulated for all Members present providing the history of Lowestoft Hospital. The paper had been prepared by Chris Brooks, a Local Historian.

Councillor Murray advised that in 2013 it was decided that Lowestoft Hospital would be closed; Lowestoft was however promised that a North Lowestoft Medical Hub similar to that of Kirkley Mill would be provided. Five years on and still no further progress had been made. In this time, three local GP services had closed and the future of a medical centre being built on Woods Meadow was reported to be in the balance.

Councillor Murray further reported that almost two years after finally closing Lowestoft Hospital, and following its sale to James Paget University Hospital for £1.00, and also after failing to be sold on as planned this iconic and valuable local amenity was recently sold at auction. In light of continued closure of local surgeries and a lack of Intermediate Care beds in Lowestoft she asked the Director of GP Services within the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group to look at the Lowestoft Hospital site again for

the much needed Health Centre. On 5 October 2018 the Clinical Commissioning Group replied advising that a feasibility study into the required hub site would include Lowestoft Hospital as an option. However, only 20 days after receiving this advice the hospital site was auctioned. Prior to the auction, Councillor Murray contacted Peter Aldous MP seeking his support in asking for an immediate suspension of the sale until all potential options had been explored. Peter Aldous MP did contact JPUH; however the decision was made to go to auction.

It was apparent, Councillor Murray stated, that the auction was hurried through, she said that she knew of two potential local businessmen who were interested in buying the site. Both were prepared to include in their plans a healthcare provision and to work with the Local Community Health Trust. One of these indeed wrote to JPUH in February 2017 indicating his interest in purchasing the hospital and site and more recently offered almost double the reserve price for the site. Strangely this offer was rejected, with the Hospital going to auction under Residential Properties in London. The Hospital and site were sold at the reserve price of £475,000 to a mystery bidder. After speaking to Peter Aldous MP after the auction, Councillor Murray was pleased to say that he had promised to look further into this.

Councillor Murray stated that the history of Lowestoft Hospital, as circulated to Members, told a story of dedicated responsibility by residents of Lowestoft in its erection, funding and the subsequent development of services.

In conclusion, Councillor Murray stated that Lowestoft Hospital was chosen as the first to close in Waveney under the National Health Service five year forward plan. Incredibly, the new Health Secretary, Mr Hancock, had now promised to end the closure of community hospitals to ensure patients could be treated near their homes; this, unfortunately, was too late for Lowestoft.

The Leader of the Council thanked Councillor Murray for putting this Motion forward to Full Council; he also thanked Mr Brooks for providing the history of the Hospital. Councillor Bee referred to the joint working with Peter Aldous MP, and gave thanks for this.

Councillor Bee stated that this was a very emotive issue; this was an important building in Lowestoft, and a promise had been made, which had not been fulfilled. The James Paget Hospital should ring-fence its profits from the sale for the benefit of the health and well-being of Lowestoft residents. In conclusion, Councillor Bee stated that he, and his Group Members, supported the motion.

Councillor Goldson stated that he was horrified, and found the situation totally unacceptable.

Councillor Graham wished to point out that the building had been erected as a War Memorial; he, too, stated that he was horrified by the situation.

Councillor Ardley stated that he would support the ring-fencing of the profits; however it would depend on how the money was ring-fenced; it would not, he stated, build another medical facility. Councillor Ardley added that he was concerned that there was a corner stone there, together with a plaque, and he did not know if any provision had been made for keeping these. In conclusion, Councillor Ardley added that he supported the motion,

and suggested that a clause be added referencing the wish to keep the historical brickwork and plaques.

Councillor Rivett stated that he had been present at the auction, and it was a telephone bidder who had purchased the hospital. Councillor Rivett added that, in his view, it was a grotesque waste to sell the site without a planning permission in place.

Councillor Ladd referred Members to a similar situation that had taken place in Southwold; he suggested that perhaps an Inquiry should be held into the sub-standard price, and he further suggested that perhaps Peter Aldous MP could call for such an Inquiry.

Councillor Byatt stated that he had recently been at Kirkley Mill and he added that the “local touch” that was required was being lost; local services were being eaten away. There was not a minor injury unit in place. Councillor Byatt thanked all Members for their positive comments and suggested that, with regard to the ring-fencing, an amendment be made to the motion to refer to “with facilities provided within the town boundaries of Lowestoft”.

Councillor Cackett suggested that the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Joint Health Scrutiny Committee be asked to investigate the sale of the Hospital.

Councillor Goldson, referring to the ring-fencing of the profits, suggested that any amended motion should reference evidence being required of the money being spent in Lowestoft.

At this point it was proposed, seconded and unanimously

RESOLVED that the motion be amended as follows:

This Council condemns the manner in which the sale of the old Lowestoft Hospital site was carried out.

Having been given the impression by the James Paget Hospital that the site would be sold in the coming months, it was very disappointing that the site was auctioned on 25th October, giving no time for the site to be considered within the current review of local NHS provision as a possible North Lowestoft Medical Hub.

Residents of Lowestoft over many years have supported the Hospital financially, and part of the building was constructed through public subscription. Also the charity NSHEBA raised significant funds over many years for Hospital equipment. With that 'local' investment in mind, this Council calls on the James Paget Hospital to ring-fence their profits from the sale for the benefit of the health and well-being of Lowestoft residents.

The Council agrees to write to the James Paget Hospital Trust condemning in the strongest possible terms the sale of the Old Lowestoft Hospital and, working in conjunction with Lowestoft Town Council and Oulton Broad Parish Council, requesting all historical brickwork and plaques be protected.

The Council requests that Mr Peter Aldous MP seeks an inquiry into the sale of the hospital, that the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Joint Health Scrutiny

Committee scrutinises the sale of the hospital and that the proceeds of sale of the hospital be ring fenced for the people of Lowestoft and Oulton Broad and only be spent on facilities within Lowestoft and Oulton Broad.

6. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The following questions had been submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11:

(a) Question from Councillor I Graham to the Cabinet Member for Community Health and Safety

What are your views on the recent surge in violent street crime in Lowestoft and what action will you be taking to address this issue?

Response from Councillor M Bee

At the last Police performance meeting a small increase in reported crime was considered. It is important to note that this is an increase in what is reported and recorded, not necessarily in crime itself, and is far from a surge in crime.

There is still a proportion of historic sex crime being reported that inflates figures. Domestic violence crime is stable at about a third of all reported violent crimes and the good news is that there is now more confidence in reporting these crimes.

Late night street violence is quite low and the Night Time Economy is much better than it was five years ago. The two recent stabbings on the same night in Lowestoft have raised fear levels within the town but both perpetrators were known to the Police and the Lowestoft Rising Interventions meeting partners, and both were drink/drug related incidents and not random public attacks.

So whilst reported and recorded crime is up, this does not mean the streets of Lowestoft are any more violent.

Supplementary Question from Councillor I Graham

Councillor Graham referred to the perception that there were no Police on the streets; he asked if the Council could contact the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk and ask him to re-consider his decision in respect of Police Community Support Officers on the beat, to make the public feel safe.

Response from Councillor M Bee

Councillor Bee responded stating that he felt this was a valuable point; he too was concerned. Councillor Bee added that Peter Aldous MP would raise this at Home Office Questions. Referring to the allocation of resources, Councillor Bee stated that Suffolk received less than Norfolk, and this needed to be addressed. All Suffolk MPs were concerned regarding the situation. Councillor Bee stated that the Council would work with the Police and Crime Commissioner for Suffolk on this, and he added that he was happy to write a letter, for the Council, stating that.

Councillor Bee stated that the people of Suffolk lived in one of the safest parts of the country, but when they heard of incidents around the country, of course, they were fearful. Much of the crime now, Councillor Bee acknowledged, was cyber crime, and the Police were sat in front of computers dealing with that.

Councillor Bee concluded that he was in receipt of an email in respect of crime statistics, and he would arrange for this to be circulated to Members.

(b) Question from Councillor A Green to the Cabinet Member for Resources

What are the current figures for domestic rates arrears and domestic rental arrears across the District?

Response from Councillor B Provan

The current level of domestic rates arrears, also known as council tax arrears, is £4.8 million. The majority of arrears span financial years 2013/14 to 2017/18, with a small amount pre 2013. The split of arrears over those financial years is £203k for pre 2013; £519k for 2013/14; £647k for 2014/15; £797k for 2015/16; £1.057m for 2016/17; and £1.581m for 2017/18.

Recovery actions continue beyond the year for which the debt is due and may need more than one method to be used to recover the debt. The Council's share of the £4.8m is approximately 10% and equates to £480k.

Regarding domestic rentals arrears, the Council only holds information in relation to the council dwellings it owns. The current arrears level is £863k, which is the accumulative balance of all arrears including previous years. The arrears level last year was £921k.

Supplementary Question from Councillor A Green

Councillor Green asked if arrears were sometimes written off and, if so, who took that decision.

Response from Councillor B Provan

Councillor Provan responded, stating that arrears were sometimes written off; however, 100% provision was in place to cover this.

(c) Question from Councillor A Green to the Cabinet Member for Resources

How many properties are there in the District where Council Tax is not being paid and how much has this cost the Council?

It is not possible to give you an exact figure in relation to how many properties are not paying council tax, as this changes on a daily basis and will depend on how far through the recovery process a property is, as individuals who refuse to pay on the day, may change their mind when they receive further recovery letters stating legal action will be taken to secure a charging order on their property or a committal

order (which can result in the Court writing the debt off based on an individual's financial position).

What I can tell you though is that Council Tax collection is a continuous process and continues beyond the end of the year to which the debt relates. In year collection for Waveney DC is 96.45% but ultimately reaches 99% with on-going recovery through methods such as attachment of earnings, enforcement agents & charging orders. As mentioned earlier, whilst an account may not currently be in payment, either because a bill has only recently been issued and the first instalment isn't due or it is going through the statutory recovery process, this does not mean that it will not be paid. Approximately 10% of any uncollected monies is the District Council's share.

There have been 65,825 Council tax bills raised for 2018/19 of which 57,262 have a balance to pay before their council tax bill is settled. This includes direct debit payers and individuals who always pay by other methods on a monthly basis. Of those with something to pay, 53,790 have made at least one payment and 730 have had their bill less than 1 month. Those accounts where payments have not been made will be going through the statutory recovery process.

Supplementary Question from Councillor A Green

Councillor Green asked if the Council gave advice to anybody that was struggling to pay, before taking them to Court.

Response from Councillor B Provan

Councillor Provan responded, stating that the Council tried to assist those that could not pay.

(d) Question from Councillor K Patience for the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Does WDC or any of their contractors make use of the powerful weed killer Glyphosate?

Yes, our partners Waveney Norse use Glyphosate.

All pesticides used by the Council, including Glyphosate, must comply with the DEFRA/HSE code for safe use. This ensures that only those pesticides that are approved, regulated and fully authorised are permitted for use by the Council.

Glyphosate has only recently undergone a thorough review in Europe and has been re-approved for use in amenity situations. The Council will follow any guidance provided by DEFRA/HSE and will comply with such guidance.

More generally, the Council continually seeks to work with stakeholders across the amenity sector in promoting best practice in all aspects of weed management, chemical and non-chemical. We support an integrated approach making best use of all tools available to ensure a safe and healthy environment fit for purpose whether it be street verges, parks, sports grounds or other amenity spaces.

Norse have explored using other forms of weed control, but continue to use glyphosate because it is the only means of effective weed control in specific circumstances/certain weeds.

Supplementary Question from Councillor K Patience

Councillor Patience asked for an assurance that, while spraying was underway, warning signs were placed in the vicinity.

Response by Councillor G Catchpole

Councillor Catchpole responded, stating that, as he stood before Members, he could not give that assurance. He added that the chemical was used in a very diluted state. Together with that, all operatives were trained in its use; there were, Councillor Catchpole stated, no direct health issues to the public.

(e) Question from Councillor M Pitchers for the Cabinet Member for Resources

What is the figure for non-domestic rates arrears across the District?

Response from Councillor B Provan

The current level of non domestic rates arrears for the Council is £1.72m and is made up of arrears dating back to 2010/11 as follows:

<u>2010/11</u>	<u>£32,221.16</u>
<u>2011/12</u>	<u>£50,390.87</u>
<u>2012/13</u>	<u>£75,658.59</u>
<u>2013/14</u>	<u>£158,374.23</u>
<u>2014/15</u>	<u>£171,471.97</u>
<u>2015/16</u>	<u>£223,763.71</u>
<u>2016/17</u>	<u>£331,942.87</u>
<u>2017/18</u>	<u>£675,083.55</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>£1,718,906.95</u>

As mentioned earlier regarding the question on council tax arrears, recovery actions continue beyond the year for which the debt is due.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Pitchers

Councillor Pitchers referred to the Forward Plan, for Waveney, and a report scheduled to come forward in respect of writing off arrears; he asked if this was the best route to take.

Response by Councillor B Provan

Councillor Provan responded stating only after going through the recovery process did the Council take the decision to write off debts; in some circumstances it had no choice in the matter.

(f) Question from Councillor P Byatt for the Cabinet Member for Community Health & Safety

Who is ensuring that monitoring of the Kirkley Stream is taking place on a regular basis, to ensure that residents and their properties in the Aldwycy Way area are protected from the threat of flooding, such as the devastating occurrence in 2015?

Response from Councillor M Bee

Anglian Water undertake regular inspections of their assets on Kirkley Stream and Suffolk County Council are responsible for a joint funded maintenance programme with Anglian Water for the clearance of vegetation and de-silting, which is undertaken by the Internal Drainage Board – Water Management Alliance, that is designed to reduce the risk of flooding. A project to construct a permanent flood wall and pumped storage to further reduce the risk for homes in Velda Close and Aldwyk Way is due to commence construction in 2019 as part of the Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project.

If Members have any specific concerns about Kirkley Stream they can contact Phil Gore, Head of Service (phil.gore@eastsoffolk.gov.uk) or Peter Langford, East Suffolk District Emergency Planning Officer (peter.langford@eastsoffolk.gov.uk) in the first instance and they will liaise with the relevant agencies.

Supplementary Question by Councillor P Byatt

Councillor Byatt referred to not only the importance of members of the public being protected, but also the threat to their properties. He referred back to 2015 and the fact that residents had only been compensated through their water rates payments being returned. Councillor Byatt asked if the Council could engage with Anglian Water regarding further compensation.

Response from Councillor M Bee

Councillor Bee responded, stating that he was happy to ask that question.

7. PETITIONS

No petitions have been received.

8. QUESTIONS FROM THE ELECTORATE

No questions have been submitted by the electorate as provided by Council Procedure Rule 10.

9. 100% BUSINESS RATE RETENTION PILOT – PLACE BASED FUNDING (REP1935)

The Leader of the Council presented the report which advised Members that in September 2017 DCLG issued an invitation to local authorities in England to pilot 100% Business Rates Retention in 2018/19, to which Suffolk responded, led by the East Suffolk councils. Over 180 councils forming 23 pools submitted bids, 10 were successful, including the Suffolk

bid. This resulted in over £30m of retained business rate income for Suffolk, £10.5m more than the previous 50% pooling system.

One of the unique features of the Suffolk pilot was its focus on “Inclusive Growth” which proposed a placed based approach to allocation of additional business rate income. This approach introduced a more collaborative working arrangement between the County Council and the District and Borough Councils. Recognising that local councils could offer greater solutions to local issues, Suffolk County Council (SCC) agreed for its share of the additional retained value ie 20% to be included in the allocation on a placed based basis among East, West, Central and Ipswich councils and invested in initiatives in agreement with the County.

In an unlikely event of Suffolk County Council and the councils not reaching an agreement, the District and Borough Councils were still able to invest their share ie 80% and return SCC’s 20% share back to the County.

Councillor Provan thanked officers who had prepared the bid.

Councillor Graham referred to page 8 of the report, “W09 – South Beach – Demolition of existing chalets, re-development of new overnight chalets and café including works to sea wall”. Councillor Graham suggested that this had been trialled in other areas and had been a disaster. Councillor Provan stated that the project would come forward to Cabinet for consideration.

Councillor Pitchers referred to page 8 of the report, “W01 – Cleveland Road supported housing – contribution to construction costs”, and requested an update. The Strategic Director stated that progress was being made with this, working closely with Suffolk County Council, to ensure that the client’s needs were met.

Councillor Byatt referred back to W09, and asked if the report would be considered prior to the creation of the new Council. He was assured that the demolition work had already been approved and the re-development work was scheduled to be considered by Cabinet early in 2019, before the creation of the new Council. Councillor Ritchie added that, in Holland, overnight beach huts were well established, and very successful.

Councillor Ladd stated that he was not against any of the proposed projects; however he noticed that the Suffolk Coastal projects were well spread across the whole District. Councillor Ladd commented that it would have been nice to have seen a similar spread across the Waveney district.

RESOLVED

1. That the potential income of £3.6m of additional funding for projects through the 100% Business Rate Retention pilot (£1.1m for Waveney and £2.5m for Suffolk Coastal) be noted.
2. That the list of district projects that have been put into the programme (Section 2.1) which have met the scheme’s objectives; on the proviso that each project will be brought forward with a robust business case to the relevant committee (if not already subject to an approved business plan) be noted and approved.

3. That in an unlikely event of Suffolk County Council and this Council not reaching an agreement, which would result in a 20% reduction in the anticipated place based allocation; the Council agrees that the projects be carried out using the Council's own funding, where possible, subject to that project's approved business plan.
4. That should it be deemed necessary due to a change in circumstance to a particular project, delegated authority be given to the Strategic Director and Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources to reallocate the funding levels to other projects on the list.

10. LICENSING ACT 2003 : STATEMENT OF POLICY – REVISION (REP1889A)

Councillor Brooks presented the report which advised Members that in 2005 when the Licensing Act 2003 commenced, a Licensing Authority was obliged to adopt a Statement of Licensing Policy and renew it every third year; legislation now allowed for a five year period. On 6 June 2018 the Licensing Committee approved a draft revision of the Statement of Policy for consultation. On 3 October 2018 Licensing Committee considered the response received during the consultation, agreed the final wording of the Policy and resolved to recommend to Council that it adopts and publishes its new Licensing Act 2003 Statement of Policy.

Councillor Brooks advised Members that, following advice from the Legal and Licensing Services Manager, the recommendation within the report needed to be amended. He, at this point, proposed the amended recommendation, which was duly seconded and unanimously

RESOLVED

That the revised Licensing Act 2003 Statement of Licensing Policy be adopted for publication and implementation on 31 January 2019.

11. GAMBLING ACT 2005 : STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES – REVISION (REP1890A)

Councillor Brooks presented the report which advised Members that the Gambling Act 2005 came into force on 1 September 2007. The Act required the Council to adopt a Statement of Principles and to update this Statement, following a consultation procedure, by January 2010 and three yearly thereafter. The report presented to the Licensing Committee on 6 June 2018 proposed a draft statement on which to base a consultation. On 3 October 2018 the Licensing Committee resolved to recommend to Council that it adopts its revised Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles.

Councillor Brooks drew Members' attention to an error within the report, on page 93, he advised that Beccles did have a betting shop.

Councillor Brooks advised Members that, following advice from the Legal and Licensing Services Manager, the recommendation within the report needed to be amended. He, at this point, proposed the amended recommendation, which was duly seconded.

Councillor Graham referred to page 50 of the report and the reference to "XX December 2018". He asked if this was an error. It was confirmed that it was an error and the

report should have said “XX November 2018”. The Legal and Licensing Services Manager advised that this would be amended.

Councillor Topping referred to the consultation exercise that had been undertaken, commenting that one organisation had responded. Councillor Topping stated that the Council should not be complacent, and added that a gambling problem did exist in the area, and people were taking their own lives and being made homeless. Councillor Topping stated that she would abstain from the vote.

The Legal and Licensing Services Manager responded, stating that the Council did take this issue very seriously; it did signpost to appropriate organisations.

The Leader of the Council stated that gambling was a national problem and it must be tackled; he agreed, stating that the Council should not be complacent, and suggested that the Council should review the advice it gave, to ensure that it was adequate. There may be, Councillor Bee stated, more that the Council could do in respect of signposting.

Councillor Byatt stated that he echoed Councillor Topping’s observations and he added that it was important that they were addressed.

Councillor Graham referred to on-line gambling, acknowledging that there was little control over this.

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the revised Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles be adopted for publication and implementation on 31 January 2019.

12. SEX ESTABLISHMENT LICENSING POLICY (REP1891A)

Councillor Brooks presented the report which advised Members that in 2005 when the Licensing Act 2003 commenced, a Licensing Authority was obliged to adopt a Statement of Licensing Policy and review it every third year; legislation now allowed for a five year period. On 6 June 2018 the Licensing Committee approved a draft Sex Establishment Licensing Policy for consultation. No responses were received during the consultation exercise. On 3 October 2018 the Licensing Committee resolved to recommend to Council that it adopts its revised Sex Establishment Licensing Policy for publication on 31 January 2019.

Councillor Brooks advised Members that, following advice from the Legal and Licensing Services Manager, the recommendation within the report needed to be amended. He, at this point, proposed the amended recommendation, which was duly seconded.

Following a question from Councillor Graham, it was confirmed that the Marina Theatre in Lowestoft was not classed as a sex establishment.

Councillor Gooch echoed earlier comments and concerns raised by Councillor Topping, and referred to publicity in respect of slavery and people trafficking. Councillor Gooch referred to the need to protect employees and said that this was extremely important. Councillor

Gooch requested that the policy be amended, at page 135, in respect of “Performers”, number 10, to read “Performers shall be aged not less than 18 and not there under coercion.”

The Leader stated that that there were already policies in place in respect of anti-slavery; he felt, however, that there was no harm in reinforcing this view and he stated that he was happy to support the amendment.

Following a question by Members regarding whether or not, if the policy was amended, it would need to be referred back to the Licensing Committee for further consideration, the Legal and Licensing Services Manager confirmed that this was not the case.

At this point the amendment was proposed, seconded and it was

RESOLVED

That the Sex Establishment Licensing Policy be adopted for publication and implementation with immediate effect, subject to page 135, in respect of “Performers”, number 10, being amended to read “Performers shall be aged not less than 18 and not there under coercion”.

13. EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

RESOLVED

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

14. ADDITIONAL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS IN THE PLANNING AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

The Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management presented the report regarding the additional staffing requirements in the Planning and Coastal Management Service.

RESOLVED

That the proposed staff changes in the Planning Service, as set out in section 2 of the report, be approved, in order to deliver the identified needs of the service.

The meeting concluded at 8.20pm.

Chairman