

**COUNCIL MEETING held at 7.30 pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD  
SAFFRON WALDEN on 20 OCTOBER 2009**

Present:- Councillor A D Walters – Chairman  
Councillors K R Artus, S Barker, E L Bellingham-Smith, C A Cant,  
R H Chamberlain, R P Chambers, J F Cheetham, J E N Davey,  
A Dean, C M Dean, C D Down, K L Eden, M Foley, E Gower,  
E W Hicks, J E Hudson, D M Jones, A J Ketteridge, T P Knight,  
R M Lemon, J I Loughlin, H J Mason, J E Menell, M Miller,  
D J Morson, D G Perry, J A Redfern, H S Rolfe, D J Sadler,  
S V Schneider, G Sell, R D Sherer, A M Wattebot, L A Wells,  
P A Wilcock, and A C Yarwood.

Officers in attendance:- J Mitchell (Chief Executive), R Harborough (Acting Director of Development), S Joyce (Chief Finance Officer), S Martin (Head of Customer Support Services), M Perry (Assistant Chief Executive), C Rockall (Interim Change Manager), J Roos (Energy Efficiency Surveyor), P Snow (Committee and Electoral Services Manager), and A Webb (Director of Central Services).

C31

**REACCREDITATION OF BIRCHANGER PARISH COUNCIL**

The Chairman welcomed Councillor John Buchanan, Chairman of the Essex Association of Local Councils, to mark the presentation of a certificate to Birchanger Parish Council in recognition of their reaccreditation as a Quality Parish Council. He also welcomed Councillor Philip Hoy and Julia Peachey as representatives of the Parish Council to receive the award.

Councillor Buchanan said that it was a pleasure to visit Uttlesford to mark the achievement of Birchanger Parish Council in re-qualifying for Quality Status. There were presently 48 quality parishes in Essex, including four in Uttlesford, and 18 of these had reaccredited. He urged more parishes in Uttlesford to aspire to this standard.

Birchanger had undergone assessment by an independent panel over and above the original qualification standard. The panel had been especially impressed by the Parish's training intent plan and by their parish plan. In addition, they published a monthly newsletter and provided a welcome letter for all new residents.

The award was then made to Mr Hoy and Mrs Peachey. The Chairman added his warm congratulations on this achievement.

C32

**MEMBERS' QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

Councillor Lemon asked the Chairman of the Licensing Committee whether there was an enforcement officer in post able to deal with, and fully trained in, licensing enforcement? If so, what was the relevant qualification? He also asked whether

he considered it acceptable that it had taken in excess of a year to reach an agreement with the taxi trade about the cost of licensing.

Councillor Hicks replied that it was a decision of the Strategic Management Board to centralise enforcement into one generic team and this decision had been driven partly by the need for financial constraints. He said he was unable to answer the question as to whether individual members of the team were qualified in particular aspects of enforcement but that the experience and abilities of the candidates had been taken into account in making each appointment.

In relation to the second question, he said that a meeting had taken place recently between the Chief Executive and members of the taxi trade and he understood that the matter of fees had been agreed.

The Chief Executive commented that there was no longer any difficulty regarding fees and charges.

Councillor Hicks agreed with Councillor Lemon that the delay in reaching agreement was not acceptable and was regrettable, although there were mitigating factors such as the historic method used to calculate the fees.

Councillor Wilcock drew attention to the decline in performance figures for the development control function and asked what was being done to remedy the position?

Councillor Cheetham acknowledged there had been a dip in performance and said this was due to a number of factors such as long-term sickness in the department. Recruitment was now taking place and she hoped that this would help to address the recent problems.

Councillor Wilcock asked the Chairman of Scrutiny Committee when he intended to arrange for the scrutiny of crime and disorder reduction partnerships?

Councillor A Dean confirmed that there was a new duty on district councils to scrutinise CDRPs, as well as health. He had engaged in recent discussions with officers at Essex County Council about how these matters could be addressed. He recognised there was a lack of staff resource to support these new duties but hoped to be able to move the matter forward in the near future.

Councillor Chambers said that he welcomed the initiative on scrutiny of CDRPs and would be delighted to help wherever possible.

Councillor C Dean asked the Leader if he could specify the payment made for membership of the Rural Community Council of Essex and any other relevant dealings with that organisation.

The Leader said that he was unable to answer the question but would arrange to supply the figure to Councillor Dean.

C33

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Abrahams, Anjum, Clover, Godwin, Howell, and Smith.

*Councillor Chamberlain declared a prejudicial interest in item 9 as he had relatives employed by the Council. He would leave the room prior to the discussion of that item.*

*Councillor Lemon declared his interest as a member of the Museum Resource Centre Project Team.*

*Councillor Morson declared his interest as a member of the Museum Management Working Group and the Museum Resource Centre Project Team.*

*Councillor Eden declared his interest in item 13 as a director of the Museum Society and a member of the Museum Management Working Group and the Museum Resource Centre Project Team.*

*Councillor Schneider declared her interest as a member of the Museum Society and the Museum Management Working Group and the Museum Resource Centre Project Team.*

*Councillor Mason declared her interest as a member of Saffron Walden Town Council.*

*Council Wilcock declared a personal interest in item 13 as a beneficiary of Sainsbury's pension fund.*

*Councillor Chambers declared his interest as a member of the Museum Resource Centre Project Team, a member of the County Council and as Chairman of the Essex Police Authority.*

C34

## **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2009, having been received, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

C35

## **BUSINESS ARISING**

### **(i) Minute C18 – Members' Question and Answer session**

Councillor A Dean referred to the reference in this Minute to a question about discussions between the Monitoring Officer and senior officials of the Standards Board. He asked the Assistant Chief Executive to clarify the position.

Mr Perry replied that he had taken the context of the question as being a generic one. However, he had had discussions in the past with Belinda Shaw, an investigator at the Standards Board, about a case specific item. This had involved a case in which, at that time, the Standards Committee had no power to

act and could only refer the matter to the Standards Board. In the event, the Standards Committee had decided not to do so as the matter was of a trivial nature, and he had informed the complainant accordingly.

**(ii) Minute C22(i) – Business Arising – Members’ Question and Answer Session**

Councillor Wilcock again raised disabled parking provision at the Council Offices. He asked the Leader to comment on a suggestion that had arisen from discussion with representatives of the Access Group that it might be possible to achieve the objective he sought without a reduction in general parking provision. The Leader said that he was unable to comment as he had not seen the proposal.

**(iii) Minute C24 – Essex Waste Inter Authority Agreement**

Councillor A Dean asked whether the letter to Essex County Council mentioned in the resolution had been sent? Councillor Barker said that she was not aware of any such letter but that Councillor Tracy Chapman had arranged further meetings. She also expected that DEFRA would decide soon on the business case.

Councillor Dean asked that a check be made as to whether a letter had been written as agreed.

**(iv) Minute C29 – Sale of 46 High Street, Great Dunmow**

Councillor Artus asked about any follow up action taken to pursue the suggestion he had made to ensure adequate standards. The Assistant Chief Executive said that he was unable to provide a full answer in part 1 of the meeting and would supply information during part 2.

C36

**LEADER’S COMMUNICATIONS**

The Leader reported briefly on a number of recent developments. These included the signing off of the Council’s accounts as unqualified, and the uprating of the Council’s use of resources score to category 2 by the Audit Commission. This was encouraging but the Council must guard against complacency. The Medium Term Financial Strategy had already been amended to reflect the changes made and the challenges to be met.

A successful event had taken place at Chesterford Park recently to mark the Uttlesford Futures Annual Assembly.

C37

**MATTERS ARISING FROM COMMITTEES**

**(i) Standards Committee on 21 September 2009 – Minute S12 – Code of Probity in Planning**

Councillor Cheetham moved the recommendation from the Standards Committee recommending approval of the Code of Probity in Planning. This was largely a tidying up exercise and employed plain English to make clearer a councillor's responsibility.

RESOLVED to approve changes to the Code of Probity in Planning.

**(ii) Community and Housing Committee on 17 September 2009 – Minute CH27 – Council Housing Finance Consultation**

Councillor Chamberlain moved a recommendation from the Community and Housing Committee to approve the proposed response to the Government's consultation on housing finance. The Committee had been pleased to note the proposed abolition of the negative subsidy system but had expressed disappointment with the re-allocation of historic debt.

The housing stock in Uttlesford had been well run and managed for a number of years and he considered it unsatisfactory that the Council would have to subsidise significant debts run up by other councils.

Councillor A Dean drew attention to the proposed response to question 11 in relation to disabled facilities improvements. He referred to a resident in his ward who had waited for two years for a shower to be installed and asked for an indication of how this situation would improve.

Councillor Chamberlain said that the responses in the report related to the consultation. It was true that a number of tenants were waiting for work to be done even though a significant sum had been allocated for this work. Once matters were referred to Social Services assessments were carried out and work programmed accordingly. It was no longer possible to refer new cases in the remainder of this year but these could be referred for assessment in April 2010.

Councillor Sell commended the work undertaken in this field by Councillor Chamberlain and assured him there was cross party support for the general approach to housing policy. He recognised there were constraints in Government funding and hoped that any work committed would be carried out subject to budget.

Councillor A Dean then asked about the pooling of capital receipts covered by question 14. He wondered what had changed and whether Uttlesford would be better or worse off as a result?

Councillor Chamberlain confessed that he did not know the answer and hoped that as many capital receipts as possible would be retained. The Government had not been helpful in this area and it would be necessary to continue to maintain pressure to ensure the release of adequate resources for local use.

In relation to question 6 dealing with housing debt, Councillor Morson referred to the wording in the resolution to Minute CH27 of the Community and Housing Committee stating 'we are strongly opposed to the principle of having other

councils' debt allocated to us'. He asked that the actual wording be replicated in the response to the Government.

Councillor Chamberlain agreed that the correct wording should be used to reflect the appropriate level of concern felt by Members. The Chief Executive confirmed that Members' intention would be carried through.

RESOLVED that the responses to this consultation, as recommended by the Community and Housing Committee, be endorsed, subject to the use of the words 'strongly opposed' in relation to question 6.

C38

## **STRATEGIC SOLUTIONS**

*Councillor Chamberlain left the meeting before the commencement of the discussion of this item in accordance with his earlier declaration of interest.*

The Chief Executive welcomed Councillor Simon Edwards, Finance and Staffing portfolio holder, and Alex Colyer, Executive Director – Corporate Services at South Cambridgeshire District Council. He also thanked Colin Rockall, the Council's Interim Change Manager for his invaluable help and support.

He had been instructed to develop a business case for a council tax, business rates and benefits partnership and to report back to this meeting. Other workstreams would be needed to meet the Council's financial targets and these were set out in the report. A total of four workshops had been held to brief Members. Staff affected had been consulted at all stages of the process, as had Unison.

South Cambridgeshire District Council operated a cabinet system of governance. In other respects the two councils shared many of the same financial imperatives including the need to reduce costs. Revenues and benefits services in both authorities were very good but were seeking an improved performance. They were keen to pursue partnership working.

The two councils jointly commissioned a business case to cover the various options. This had been undertaken by the Anglia Revenues Partnership. The full business case had been circulated separately to Members and a summary of the case was appended to the report to this meeting.

It was envisaged that the 'back office' functions would be undertaken at Cambourne (South Cambridgeshire offices) but face to face facilities would be maintained at Saffron Walden and telephone contact numbers would remain the same. Some provision for home working would be made.

Savings of £591,000 were anticipated spread across both councils. The apportionment of this sum was yet to be decided. The projected level of savings would still leave a shortfall which would need to be addressed in other ways.

A proposal had been received from members of staff for an in house service to be provided. This set out two options for a hybrid service partnership approach, details of which were tabled at the meeting. This would need further examination

and the Chief Executive had amended the recommendations in the report to reflect the changed position.

He suggested that a Member Task Group be established to review the progress of partnership arrangements and to examine the proposals of members of staff. It was intended that a progress report would be submitted to each Council meeting.

Councillor Ketteridge proposed the recommendations in the report, as now amended, and Councillor Chambers seconded.

Councillor Sell agreed that partnership working was becoming increasingly common and that a powerful business case argument had been made. He urged that redeployment should be used wherever possible whilst recognising that this arrangement would not suit everyone. It was important not to spread resources too thinly. He asked about the use of accommodation at London Road.

The Chief Executive responded that redeployment policy would be used where appropriate but there was a wider issue to be addressed. As for accommodation the intention was to provide an enhanced service to the public. This might involve other services being integrated into the offices and there was a possibility this might involve the voluntary sector.

Councillor Loughlin referred to paragraph 25 and asked what would happen if a member of staff did not wish to move and refused to sign a revised contract of employment? Mr Mitchell said that the intention was that staff would be seconded from the host organisation and that redundancy would be the final option. It was intended to talk directly with each member of staff concerned.

Councillor Barker asked whether members of the task group would also be involved in joint governance management of the service or would be separated from those arrangements? The Chief Executive said he had not yet thought through to that level but saw the task group as a separate process intended to ensure that the partnership was workable.

Councillor Rolfe asked whom it was envisaged would undertake the key role of project management? Mr Mitchell replied that there would be a need to recruit a senior manager to oversee the transition arrangements and that Members would be involved at appropriate stages.

Councillor A Dean said he supported the proposals but there was a possible danger in a proliferation of partnerships. The Council must bear in mind the need to maintain a cohesive organisation.

Councillor Artus asked whether the procurement of services by joining ARP was still an option to be considered and whether any further work had been done in this area? The Chief Executive said that no further work had been done. The Anglia Revenues Partnership had a joining fee currently of £80,000 and there were a number of potential drawbacks associated with joining a partnership late. There was more certainty involved in starting a new hub as, for example, the future of authorities in Norfolk and Suffolk was unclear.

The Leader summed up the debate by calling for the Council to take firm and decisive action. Partnership working was now established in local government. It was vital for the Council not to be left behind. The principle of shared services was a key part of the vision in the Corporate Plan. He intended that Uttlesford should remain for as long as possible in this building. To achieve that it was necessary to change the way we worked.

Councillor Dean's point about a proliferation of partnerships was valid. It was important to strive to maintain the Council's independence and to continue to do what was best for Uttlesford. He gave an assurance that the task group, if approved, would take on board the business case and any in house bid received and give each proposal due diligence.

At this point a vote was taken and the recommendations in the report approved unanimously.

RESOLVED that:

1. Council confirms its support for pursuing a partnership with South Cambridgeshire District Council, in respect of the services listed in paragraph 15 of the report to this meeting, and on the lines indicated in Option 3b of the business case; and authorise the officers to:
  - a. enter into detailed discussions with South Cambridgeshire District Council to agree in principle the terms of the partnership agreement with a view to the partnership commencing in October 2010, or as soon after that date as practicable;
  - b. take the necessary steps to secure interim project management support for the project and to ensure that the relevant services are managed satisfactorily throughout the period of transformation;
  - c. seek financial support from Improvement East for (or towards) the cost of b. above— any financing required to be met by this Council to come from the Change Management Reserve;
  - d. undertake appropriate discussions with, and seek advice from, other agencies, such as the Audit Commission, to ensure the robustness of the proposed partnership agreement and the simplification of audit procedures;
2. As part of the processes referred to above, officers consult as appropriate with a Revenues and Benefits Member Task Group, to consist of 5 Members comprising 3 members of the Conservative Group and one member each from the Liberal Democrat and Independent Groups to be nominated by their Group Leaders;

and that the Task Group continues until 6 months after the commencement of the Partnership or within 18 months or until the



production of its final report, whichever is the sooner, and subject to the following terms of reference:

- to review the progress of partnership arrangements against agreed timescales and benchmarks
- to examine the proposals of members of staff
- to ensure adequate consultation is undertaken
- to recommend, in conjunction with South Cambridgeshire DC (and any other partners who may come forward) means of governance of the proposed partnership
- to report to each Council meeting on progress

3. Authority be given to officers to proceed with the subjects in the five workstreams and report to the relevant policy committees for decision.

After the vote on the recommendations had been taken, Councillor Ketteridge nominated the Leader, the Chairman of Finance and Administration Committee and Councillor Hicks as Conservative members of the Task Group. Councillor Wilcock nominated Councillor A Dean to represent the Liberal Democrat Group. On behalf of the leader of the Independent Group, Councillor Lemon nominated himself as that group's representative.

*At the conclusion of this item, Councillor Chamberlain rejoined the meeting.*

C39

## **MOTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY**

The following motion, proposed by Councillor A Dean and seconded by Councillors Wilcock and C Dean, was received:

'In support of global, UK and Uttlesford District Council's own Climate Change Strategy, Council commits to sign up to the national 10:10 project and through this to take action to cut its own carbon emissions by 10% during 2010.

To ensure it is well placed to meet this commitment, Council resolves to put in place resources to carry out enabling actions and to measure its progress towards the 2010 target.

Council further resolves to:

- set an example through its actions to its partners in the Uttlesford Futures Local Strategic Partnership
- promote the campaign to the residents and businesses in Uttlesford district

To satisfy concerns expressed by the Section 151 officer about unquantified resources, Councillor Dean proposed the following motion:

Paragraph 1 – as stated above.

Paragraph 2 – substitute the following words: ‘To ensure it is well placed to meet this commitment, Council resolves to request officers to assess the resources needed to carry out enabling actions and the benefits that will accrue and to measure its progress towards the 2010 target.’

Paragraph 3 and bullet points – as stated above.

Councillor Dean said the Council had made progress to reduce its carbon emissions but more needed to be done. A vote in support of the 10:10 project would give a kick start to the work done and enable the Council to move forward by a further 10%. The Audit Commission would be assessing the Council in terms of the Climate Change Act. He urged members to support the amended motion which was both deliverable and affordable.

In response, the Leader referred in detail to the Council’s Carbon Management Programme adopted in March 2008. He asked Members to consider whether there was a need for a further climate change strategy on top of the commitment already made? The policy adopted committed the Council to achieve 25% reduction in carbon emissions by 2011/12. The Leader quoted extensively from the document and stated that Uttlesford had achieved a reduction of 8.6% in the current year.

He said that the Energy Efficiency Surveyor, Mr Roos, would report tomorrow to the Strategic Management Board on progress towards meeting targets with a view to a report being submitted to the Environment Committee. There was therefore no point to the motion which was well meaning but was a distraction from the task in hand.

Councillor C Dean spoke in support of the motion. She referred to the meeting of world leaders in Copenhagen during December and said that it was imperative to agree carbon emission reductions to avoid catastrophic effects. The more councils that signed up to the 10:10 project would help to send a message to provide a mandate for tough decisions. The Council had made strides but there was more that could be done. One way to do this was to support a 10% reduction next year.

Councillor Wilcock acknowledged that the Council had done well but supporting the motion would send a message and help towards tough decisions at Copenhagen. There was already cross-party support for that approach.

Councillor Wattebot asked for clarification of the Council’s policy and the Leader confirmed that the aim was to achieve a reduction of 25% in carbon emissions between 2006/07 and 2011/12. She then stated that it was incorrect to say that the motion was asking for more than the commitment already made.

Councillor Jones said that the whole question of carbon reductions was complex. In his professional capacity he was required to make a reduction using a £4m budget. He had used input from Uttlesford as an exemplar of good practice. He had found that the big wins came early and it became increasingly difficult to achieve continuing reductions. The programme set for national reductions was ambitious as it called for 80% reductions by 2050 and 34% by 2020. However, the base year used for the calculation was 1990.

The Council was doing well. The 2010 target was something to aspire towards if no progress had already been made but the Council was now beyond that point.

At this point, the Chairman invited Mr Roos to clarify the present position. Mr Roos explained that the two policies of carbon management reduction and climate change strategy were both under review. It was correct to say that the quick gains came first and it was necessary to plan for the next phase. Further reductions of 10-15% were associated with the plan and, to achieve that level of reduction, it would be necessary to address the use of fleet diesel. Uttlesford had a good reputation and to maintain that the Council needed to keep moving forward.

Councillor Rolfe thought that it should be possible to find a compromise as Members were united on the principles involved. He proposed an amendment to reiterate support for the climate management plan and to ask officers to report back on finding a way to achieve the objectives set out.

The Assistant Chief Executive advised the meeting that, to be competent, an amendment must specify which words were to be deleted and/or added to the motion.

Councillor Rolfe then proposed the following wording:

'In support of global, UK and Uttlesford District Council's own Climate Change Strategy, Council commits to reiterate its commitment to the Carbon Management Plan and that officers review the yearly figures supporting the plan and report back to Full Council before the end of the year.'

Councillor A Dean indicated his willingness to accept the proposed wording and withdrew his motion in favour of the amendment. The Leader said again that the Environment Committee would be asked to consider the climate change strategy after consideration by the Management Board.

Councillor C Dean asked whether the resolution agreed by this meeting would be referred to the next meeting of the Environment Committee with a view to seeing what was achievable? The Chairman of the Environment Committee said that she was not prepared to take this matter at either of the scheduled or extraordinary meetings in November.

Councillor Rolfe clarified his amendment and confirmed that it allowed for further consideration at the Council meeting in December.

The motion as now agreed was put to the meeting and approved.

RESOLVED that the Council reiterate its commitment to the Carbon Management Plan and that a report be submitted to the next meeting on progress made towards the targets identified.

C40

## **URGENT ITEMS**

### **(i) Social Housing Grant – Holloway Crescent, Leaden Roding**

Members received a report on action taken to pursue a Social Housing Grant to build five bungalows at Holloway Crescent, Leaden Roding. This had involved a bid for funding to the Homes and Communities Agency. The final bid had to be submitted by 30 October hence the need for this matter to be considered as an urgent item.

RESOLVED that approval be granted retrospectively for the submission of a form to the Homes and Communities Agency and that John Mitchell, Roger Harborough and Suzanna Wood be granted authority to apply for Social Housing Grant.

### **(ii) West Essex Trust Board**

The Chairman agreed to this item being considered as urgent on the grounds that a nomination to this body was needed as a successor body to the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership.

RESOLVED that Councillor J E Menell be appointed as the Council's representative to serve on the West Essex Trust Board.

C41

## **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED that, under Section 100(I) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of Exempt Information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

C42

## **MUSEUM HERITAGE QUEST CENTRE**

The Chief Executive reported on discussions held with Sainsbury's regarding the possibility of a land exchange to enable a planning application for a retail store to proceed on land at Thaxted Road, Saffron Walden. If agreed, such an arrangement would change the location of the Heritage Quest Centre (HQC).

The report offered three possible options for the HQC project to proceed and the Chief Executive explained the background to the approach made by Sainsbury's. Reporting of the proposal had appeared in the local press although the details of the negotiations remained confidential.

Councillor Morson proposed adoption of option one in the report to reject the Sainsbury's approach and to continue to build the HQC on the existing site. He said it was important to ensure that all committed grants, including from the Heritage Lottery Fund, were secured and that nothing was done to pre-empt the planning process. He was concerned that the project might be lost altogether if the land swap was agreed.

The motion was seconded by Councillor A Dean.

Members debated various aspects of the options available, with a particular concentration on the merits of the two possible building sites, the access arrangements, and the position of members of the Development Control Committee in relation to any future planning application.

Councillor Cheetham stated clearly that Development Control Committee members should not be fettered by any agreement with Sainsbury's. In response to a specific question, the Assistant Chief Executive stated that Development Control members did not, in his opinion, have a prejudicial interest in this matter as no application had yet been submitted and no Member would have knowledge of the content of any such application. When an application was submitted and considered, it would be dealt with on its merits. If any Members wished to abstain they could but there was no necessity for them to do so.

Councillor Eden answered a number of questions about the position of the Museum Society and about the specification for the HQC project. The Museum Society had agreed that a land exchange was appropriate.

The Chief Executive and Director of Central Services answered Members' questions about the ownership and planning potential of the land concerned, and about the access arrangements to the two sites. They also reported in as much detail as was possible regarding the nature of the negotiations conducted with Sainsbury's.

It was noted that the Council had given an undertaking to gift the land for the construction of the HQC and that any consideration would be ring fenced to the project.

After further discussion, the motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

Councillor Ketteridge then proposed acceptance of the officers' recommendation. Councillor A Dean requested that a recorded vote be taken.

The outcome of the recorded vote was as follows:

For the motion:

Councillors Barker, Chamberlain, Chambers, Cheetham, Down, Eden, Hicks, Ketteridge, Lemon, Mason, Menell, Perry, Rolfe, Sadler, Schneider, Sherer, Walters and Wells.

Against the motion:

Councillors A Dean, C Dean, Foley, Jones, Morson, Sell, Wattebot and Wilcock.

Abstained:

Councillors Artus, Cant, Davey, Hudson, Knight, Loughlin, Miller and Redfern.

The motion was declared carried.

RESOLVED that:

1. Subject to planning decisions, a land exchange be entered into with Sainsbury's;
2. the consideration be ring fenced to the HQC build costs; and
3. the company chosen to build the HQC be selected by a process of competitive tender.

In connection with the sale of 46 High Street, Great Dunmow mentioned earlier in the meeting by Councillor Artus, the Assistant Chief Executive gave a brief update of developments following the suggestion made at the previous meeting.

C43

#### **DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT**

Mr Harborough left the room before the discussion of this item.

The recommendation of the Appointments Committee meeting held on 15 October 2009 was received.

RESOLVED that Mr Roger Harborough (currently employed as Acting Director of Development) be appointed to the position of Director of Development.

Mr Harborough was invited to return to the meeting, advised of his appointment and congratulated by the Chairman.

The meeting ended at 10.10pm.