



Democratic Support Service  
PO Box 136  
County Hall  
Northampton  
NN1 1AT

MINUTES of the Budget Meeting of the NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL held at County Hall, Northampton on 17 March at 10.30am

**PRESENT:**

Councillor Phil Larratt (Chairman)

Councillor Malcolm Waters (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor “	Wendy Brackenbury	Councillor	Joan Kirkbride
“	Julie Brookfield	“	Graham Lawman
“	Michael Brown	“	Derek Lawson MBE
“	Robin Brown	“	Stephen Legg
“	Mary Butcher	“	Chris Lofts
“	Michael Clarke	“	Arthur McCutcheon
“	Adam Collyer	“	Allan Matthews
“	Elizabeth Coombe	“	Andy Mercer
“	Brendan Glynane	“	Dennis Meredith
“	Matt Golby	“	Ian Morris
“	André Gonzalez De Savage	“	Steve Osborne
“	Christopher Groome	“	Bill Parker
“	James Hakewill	“	Bhupendra Patel
“	Eileen Hales MBE	“	Suresh Patel
“	Mike Hallam	“	Russell Roberts
“	Jim Harker OBE	“	Ron Sawbridge MBE
“	Stan Heggs	“	Bob Scott
“	Alan Hills	“	Mick Scrimshaw
“	Sue Homer	“	Judy Shephard
“	Jill Hope	“	Danielle Stone
“	Dudley Hughes	“	Winston Strachan
“	Sylvia Hughes	“	Sarah Uldall
“	Cecile Irving-Swift	“	Allen Walker

Also in attendance (for all or part of the meeting):

Dr Paul Blantern, Chief Executive

Matt Bowmer, Director for Finance

Tony Ciaburro, Director for the Environment, Development & Transport

Laurie Gould, Monitoring Officer

Paul Hanson, Manager, Democratic Services

Michael Quinn, Liberal Democrat Group Political Assistant

Jenny Rendall, Democracy Officer (Minutes)

Ben Wesson, Labour Group Political Assistant

And 3 members of the public.

#### 09/16 Apologies for non-attendance:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Bell, Sally Beardsworth, Jim Broomfield, Gareth Eales, Malcolm Longley, John McGhee, Heather Smith & Michael Tye, as well as Honorary Aldermen John Bailey, Derek Batten & Priscilla Padley and the Director of Children, Families & Education.

Condolences were also offered to Councillor Michael Tye on the sad loss of his wife. The Chairman confirmed he had written to Councillor Tye on behalf of the Council.

Councillor Heather Smith was also sent best wishes for a speedy recovery from a recent accident she had experienced when leaving Council the previous week.

#### 10/16 To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 29 February 2016:

**RESOLVED that: Council approved the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 17 March as a true and accurate record of the meeting subject to the following amendments:**

- **Page 14 of the document pack, final set of bullet points, bullet point number 7 should state that a future Labour Government would regulate children's services.**
- **Page 16 of the document pack, first bullet point, final sentence should state '*They had in his opinion..... because of a need to write blank cheques .... children's services.*'**
- **Page 17 of the document pack, bullet point 2, second sentence should state that '*Corby Borough and East Northants District Councils had no confidence*'**
- **Page 17 of the document pack, bullet point 10, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence should state that 'it was '*modelled on OCS which did provide a good value service*'.**
- **Page 17 of the document pack, bullet point 13, to state that the county '*could be broken up*'.**

#### 11/16 Notification of requests by members of the public to address the meeting

##### **Agenda Item No: 7 - Opposition Priority Business**

- Mr Colin Bricher

##### **Agenda Item No: 12b – Motions submitted by Councillors under rule 13.1**

- Ms Rose Gibbins

#### 12/16 Declarations of Interest by Councillors:

Councillor Mike Hallam declared an interest in agenda item number 8c as the lead for LGSS at Northampton Borough Council.

#### 13/16 Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting including those watching via a live webcast.

He also thanked all those who attended his recent civic dinner which successfully raised some money towards the Caring and Sharing Trust who also arranged a performance for the event. A prize was overlooked at the event being a ticket for 2 adults and 2 children to attend a 20/20 cricket match on Sunday 26 June 2016. He asked councillors to give him their bid for these tickets by the end of the meeting that day.

Very pleased to attend with the Mayor of Northampton the Shine a Light on Tibet which raised the profile of the plight of the Tibetan people? Mayor of Northampton shine a light on Tibet raising the profile of the plight of Tibetan people. He felt their plight to be too often overlooked so was very pleased to take part in the ceremony.

Congratulations were offered to the Northampton School for Boys (NSB) who's under 18 rugby team won the national plate at Twickenham the previous afternoon. At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Matt Golby stated this was a fantastic achievement throwing light on the pedigree of and how important schools were in schools.

#### 14/16 Petitions:

There were none.

#### 15/16 Opposition Priority Business:

At the Chairman's invitation, Mr Colin Bricher addressed Council stating he was delighted to see the motion on the agenda and how it was worded in a way that suggested no particular solution as he felt it was right and proper for all options to be given careful consideration. He felt it was vital not to rush this through and he expected the report to produce a number of national ideas that could be actioned before too long. He felt the Council had inherited decades of mis-management and Government cutbacks. He noted over 70% of his council tax was given to the County Council indicating the financial difficulties the Council faced. He felt it disappointing that from Brussels down through Westminster and local councils, decisions were based on what the politicians wanted. He felt it was time to look at a bigger picture. The width of the County was 70 miles and this required careful consideration as Brackley and Oundle were very different towns.

The Chairman then invited Councillor Adam Collyer to propose the following motion:

*"Councils in Northamptonshire are under unprecedented and increasing financial pressures.*

*There is also confusion amongst the public as to which Council is responsible for which service, and this damages democratic accountability for service delivery.*

*Integration of local government services across Northamptonshire could release at least £50 million a year for local services, eliminate the confusion about service responsibilities and provide further opportunities for collaboration with health and other public services.*

*This Council therefore agrees to commission an independent study into the scope, benefits and costs of the various options for introducing unitary local government in Northamptonshire.*

*Council further agrees to report the outcome of the study to the public and ensure that their opinions are fully taken into account."*

In moving the motion, Councillor Collyer highlighted the following:

- Many members of the public did not know the difference between county and district councils and when councillors try to explain, they get confused. The County Council was responsible for maintaining road side verges but the district council for clearing litter. The County Council was responsible for social services but the district and

borough councils for housing. The County Council set a precept but district and borough councils issued the bills.

- The Council was under very severe financial pressures and stories are often heard that borough and councils have plenty of money but that was not true. They also faced pressures.
- Meanwhile expectations of demand for local government services at all levels were rising and only a new council could meet them.
- Northamptonshire had 320 councillors claiming allowances and expenses of £2.8million. It had 8 Chief Executives earning £1.1million between them. Removing all that duplication without any other changes could save £2million a year.
- Some services required local control to be effective and there was no reason why some of the responsibilities could be passed down to parish councils.
- There were several options one being a unitary for the whole country which his group would support. There could also be 2 or 3 unitary authorities for the county. What they required was real hard facts about advantages and disadvantages hence the motion's request for an independent study. The people need to be able to read the report and make up their own minds.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Christopher Groom who referred to the main reason for the setting up of county councils which was Education. He was a great believer in local business making decisions on how they were governed. He felt there was now an opportunity for unitary government, particularly as Education was gradually being removed from the responsibility of county councils. He felt there was now the opportunity to concentrate on other areas such as transport infrastructure and health and social care. He felt it was correct to have a study that clearly states the opportunities and how best to take advantage of them. He felt that elected members should have the ambition to take on more responsibility and to carry that out for the benefit of those electing them,

The Chairman then informed Council of 3 amendments that had been received to this motion the first of which was proposed by Councillor Uldall as follows:

*"Councils in Northamptonshire are under unprecedented and increasing financial pressures.*

*There is also confusion amongst the public as to which Council is responsible for which service, and this damages democratic accountability for service delivery.*

*Integration of local government services into a unitary authority or authorities could release at least £50million a year for local services, eliminate the confusion about service responsibilities and provide further opportunities for collaboration with health and other public services.*

*This Council therefore agrees to commission, in conjunction with Districts and Borough Councils where at all possible, an independent study into the scope, benefits and costs of the various options for introducing unitary local government in Northamptonshire.*

*Council further agrees to report the outcome of the study to the public and ensure that their opinions are fully taken into account while retaining local democracy"*

In moving the motion Councillor Uldall stated 3 smaller unitary councils would be more effective than just the one.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Chris Lofts who stated that the Liberal Democrat Group had proposed unitary government be taken forward for a number of years.

Councillor Collyer accepted this motion

The Chairman then invited Councillor Bob Scott to propose the following second amendment on behalf of the Labour Group:

*“Councils in Northamptonshire are under unprecedented and increasing financial pressures.*

*There is also confusion amongst the public as to which Council is responsible for which service, and this damages democratic accountability for service delivery.*

*This Council therefore agrees to commission, an independent study into the scope, benefits and costs of the various options for a way forward for local government in Northamptonshire to include exploration of all relevant models.*

*Council further agrees to report the outcome of the study to the public and ensure that their opinions are fully taken into account.”*

In moving this amendment Councillor Scott referred to the letter from the county's MPs requesting this issue be explored further. He felt there was a need to consider all options, not just unitary councils. He felt an independent person would consider all the pros and cons in an unbiased way. He felt it was right and proper for all people across the county should be consulted. An independent report would also ensure a proper debate across the county. He also referred to LGSS and asked how all issues could be discussed properly without deciding what sort of model would be required across the council.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Mick Scrimshaw who felt the Council was on the dawn of new local government and every councillor present could recognise the efficiencies that could be made by different councils working together. He felt Northamptonshire was probably not large enough to bring in some of the powers and funding government could provide so it was right and proper to also consider 2 or 3 county councils working together.

Councillors commented that a lot of people in the chamber agreed to a lot of the motion and the amendment but agreement could not quite be found.

In reply Councillor Scott stated that he was disappointed that the Administration was unlikely to support the amendment.

Councillor Collyer stated there was a need to move on the study, gain some facts and make a decision in order to avoid missing the opportunities.

Upon the vote the amendment to the motion was lost

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Harker proposed the following amendment:

*“Councils in Northamptonshire are under unprecedented and increasing financial pressures.*

*There is also confusion amongst the public as to which Council is responsible for which service, and this damages democratic accountability for service delivery.*

*This Council therefore agrees to commission, an independent study into the scope, benefits and costs of the various options for introducing unitary local government in Northamptonshire.*

*The independent study shall not be limited to the consideration of unitary government alone but will also take account of the wider aspects of public service reform, including integration with Health, Regional Transport Planning, Blue Light services, LGSS and wider shared service opportunities, and other possible devolved powers.*

*All the District and Borough Councils in Northamptonshire shall be invited to take part in, and contribute to, the study to ensure a full and open approach to the issue.*

*Council further agrees to report the outcome of the study to the public and ensure that their opinions are fully taken into account whilst retaining local democracy."*

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Ian Morris.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Some felt broadening the scope to include a whole range of other bodies over which the Council had no control would not be helpful to the review and there was a need to focus on areas the Council could control.
- Some felt borough and district councils should be fully involved in the study and the commissioning of the study and not as consultees as this amendment appeared to suggest.
- Concerns were raised that this amendment would mean the consultation was too big and too baggy and would take too long to deliver. Concerns were raised that anything outside of the Council's control would make the survey impossible to undertake and would prevent the Council from being able to focus on how best to deliver the best possible services for the people of the county.
- In noting that someone had to commission the survey it was also noted the survey would enable the Council to engage with all those the people of the county would want involved. It was noted town and parish councils would also be part of the scope.
- Concerns were raised that the survey would not deliver and reference was made to a failed joint waste management plan. It was felt the amendment did not give equality to district and borough councils which was for some not good enough.
- Some noted the amendment included all borough and district councils to ensure a full and open approach.
- It was also noted that during scrutiny of the budget two thirds of the people wished to have a combined authority as they felt it would make the Council more efficient..
- It was suggested many people agreed with the idea of a combined authority but not on the methods for making that work
- It was noted that should the Council do nothing, it would have something done to it.

In reply Councillor Collyer stated he was concerned that a big risk in the amendment was the widening of the scope which could result in either the survey taking too long or a report that did not include quality details. He voiced concerns that should the Council do nothing, something will be done to it taking away its right to have a say in the future shape of local government in the county. He felt the original motion had a very tight focus of study but

this amendment in his opinion was trying to push that motion into the long grass and prevent it from being discussed.

Upon the vote the motion was accepted.

Councillors then commented on the substantive motion as follows:

- Some referred to comments made during the recent scrutiny of the budget which they felt should not be ignored. It was noted that during this scrutiny borough and district councils stated they did not wish to work with the County Council and he queried the chances of the Council being able to successfully lead a debate with district and borough councils that did not wish to work with it.
- Reference was made to South Northants District Council considering a combined authority with Cherwell District Council and Northampton Borough Council agreeing to support a unitary authority for Northampton as well as the letter signed by all of the county's MPs asking for consideration of a unitary authority. There was a need in the view of some therefore to consider the Council's next generation working model and the whole question of public service reform across the county working with strategic partners possibly across neighbouring counties. And it was noted all of the borough and district, town and parish councils should be invited to take part in the survey and the Leader of the Council had e-mailed all district and borough councils to invite them to take part the previous day. To date he had already received a response from the Leader of Daventry District Council to state he was willing to take part in the survey.
- Some felt the survey should include the strategic direction of Central Government in particular with health. The process with health would continue no matter how many tiers of local government and it wasn't included the opportunity to improve services would be lost.
- Some felt this amendment did not give borough and district councils the equal say they deserved.
- The need to move quickly and ensure the County Council alongside all other councils in the county made decisions regarding the future of local government before it was done to them.
- It was suggested the real reason for the amendment was power which the Administration did not want to lose through any type of arrangement for the county that could take that power from them.
- There was a need to have a firm and fixed 4-year budgetary plan and recognise the situation the Council was in. Use of the old frameworks was not a good way ahead so there was a need to reform local council. Some felt it was about power but power of the people.
- It was noted the motion was not perfect but not many motions were. This however was the start of the opportunity to really discuss the opportunities there were to reform local government in the county.
- Concerns were raised that this motion would not deliver streamlined local government. Maintaining the current multi-tiered local council arrangements could cost more to local people but it was also felt that borough councils that did not have many parish or town councils below them could be left bereft if this motion was agreed.
- It was noted parish councils could set whatever precept they wished as there was no cap.
- Concerns were raised that the broadening of the scope would not provide adequate time to discover everything that was needed.

In reply Councillor Collyer stated he felt it had been an interesting debate and he was pleased to note that everyone was in favour of unitary councils. He still felt it would have

been better to have a much tighter study but as the only option in front of them, he hoped it could be supported.

**RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion as amended was approved.**

16/16 Business Items (including Budget & Policy Framework items, Appointments & Annual Reports):

(a) Constitutional Changes:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Bill Parker introduced the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating section 4 of the report was concerned with protocol regarding development control site visits, section 5 the next generation structure which would be adopted initially in shadow form on 1 April 2016 and section 6, moving powers of the Personnel Committee which had been abolished.

The report was seconded by Councillor Allen Walker who felt the development control site visit protocol would protect members of the Committee from outside influences.

Councillors commented that the development control site visit protocol rightfully protected members of the Committee.

In reply Councillor Parker clarified the development control site visit protocol protected both members of the committee and officers supporting it.

**RESOLVED that: Council:**

- 1) Agreed the changes to the Constitution as set out in sections 4, 5 and 6 of the report; and**
- 2) Agreed that these changes take effect immediately and agreed that the monitoring Officer be delegated authority to make these arrangements, any associated conforming amendments and to republish the Constitution.**

(b) The 2016/17 Pay Policy Statement:

At the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Bill Parker introduced this report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating this also agreed the corporate management structure. It was a report that was received on an annual basis under the Localism Act 2011. There was currently an ongoing cost of living discussion which would be brought to Council once those discussions had been completed.

The report was seconded by Councillor Allen Walker.

Councillors commented that they felt the number of people employed who undertook the role of full-time officers should also be listed.

In reply Councillor Parker invited the Chief Executive to confirm that one consultant was currently working with the Council on a temporary basis.

**RESOLVED that: Council:**

- 1) Agreed the Council's Pay Policy for the financial year 2016-17 (appendix 1 to the report); and**
- 2) Agreed the Corporate Management Team structure as of 1 April 2016 (appendix 2 to the report).**

(c) Arrangements for Milton Keynes Council to join LGSS Joint Committee shared services partnership:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Bill Parker introduced the report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it referred to arrangements for Milton Keynes to join LGSS from 1 April 2016. It had been discussed previously at both Cabinet and Council meetings. He also referred to a minor error in the report which had confused the current positions of Chair and Vice-Chairman of the LGSS Joint Committee. The Chairman's position was currently held by Cambridgeshire County Council and would move to Northamptonshire in August 2016. For that year 2016-17 Milton Keynes would take on the role of Vice-Chairman with them undertaking the role of Chair during 2017-18 with Cambridgeshire County Council undertaking the role of Vice-Chairman. In 2018-19 it would be Cambridgeshire County Council taking the Chairmanship and Northamptonshire County Council undertaking the role of Vice-Chairman.

The report was seconded by Councillor Andre Gonzalez de Savage.

Councillors commented that originally concerns had been raised when LGSS was formed in 2010 that it could over time become sold off. The more councils that joined, the less likely this was and keeping that control also kept the local authority culture.

In reply Councillor Parker stated a third authority had always been sought to join LGSS. Milton Keynes Council was very excited about joining and could encourage a few others who had hesitated in the past to also join. Scrutiny of LGSS would also be undertaken.

**RESOLVED that: Council:**

- 1) Approved the proposed changes to the existing delegation and Joint Committee Agreement to reflect the addition of Milton Keynes Council as a full partner of the LGSS Joint Committee and the consequent updates to the constitutions of the Councils required to enable this, as reflected in Schedule 2 of the agreement; and**
- 2) Delegated to the LGSS Managing Director the power to make these and any other necessary or incidental amendment in order to finalise and implement the arrangements.**

(d) Municipal Bonds Agency Update:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Bill Parker stated this item had been withdrawn as a background paper that should have been attached to the report would be attached when it was represented in June 2016.

(e) Decisions taken at Cabinet under Part 4(B) Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution: Rule 16 – Special Urgency:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Suresh Patel introduced this report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it was a good news story that provided a much needed facility.

The report was seconded by Councillor Bill Parker who stated it was an exciting way forward.

**RESOLVED that: Council noted the report.**

## 17/16 Cabinet Business:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Jim Harker presented his report (copies of which were provided at the meeting) referring to the speech from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the previous day in which it was announced funding would be made available to schools to provide extra curricular activities outside of the usual school day.

The Chairman also referred to answers to questions raised prior to the meeting that councillors could find on their chairs that day. Supplementary questions to these were answered as follows:

- The Leader of the Council felt sure the cost was a careful consideration when the work was commissioned to move photographs in the Council Chamber.
- Councillor Heather Smith who had responsibility for refugees was aware of funding to assist in taking refugees as was he. The issue for the Council would be in providing houses.
- Some of the in-depth statistics relating to domestic violence were available online. Services to assist people who were victims of domestic violence was a serious matter and Central Government had put funding in this area and Northampton Borough Council had led on taking responsibility for this in achieving increased funding.
- Councillor Matt Golby was happy to pick up the issue of mental health in schools with colleagues outside of the meeting to move it forward.
- Councillor Michael Clarke could discuss the information provided in relation to the bus subsidies with Councillor Brookfield outside of the meeting.
- Councillor Clarke agreed that more money was required for the county's roads and repairs and an additional £5million had been added into the budget during the forthcoming year with a further £5million during 2017/18. He was happy to take any specific concerns to the relevant officers to review.

Further questions were answered as follows:

- Concerns had been noted in relation to the performance of white male working class students. Many schools had received grants to address the issues of performance of white male working class and English as a Second Language students. The issue of ensuring the values of English as a Second Language pupils was included in school structures was discussed at scrutiny the previous day.
- A great deal of work and calculation had been undertaken with regard to the provision of school places. There were approximately 12-14,000 new people to the county each year and 8-10% of these were young people requiring education and the equivalent of a new primary school every 5 weeks. The new school organisational plan which was a new strategy for considering school places moving forward was presented to scrutiny the previous day and the document would be passed to Councillor Stone following the meeting.
- The Council had diligently and enthusiastically followed the introduction of academies to the extent that 37 of the county's 39 secondary schools were now academies and the same rate of progress was expected with primary schools.
- The First for Wellbeing organisation was a company limited by guarantee. 51% ownership meant the Council effectively owned the company and over time more health services would be incorporated and the University of Northampton would continue to provide services such as preventative dentistry. The majority of the funding had come from the Council because it undertook the majority of the commissioning and therefore received the most services from it.

**RESOLVED that: Count noted:**

- 1) the report by the Leader of the Council and responses to questions raised both prior to and during the meeting; and**
- 2) that the Cabinet Member for Education would discuss with Councillor Scott outside of the meeting how the values of English as a Second Language pupils were reflected in the county's schools.**

19/16 Report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee:

At the Chairman's invitation, the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee proposed her report (copies of which had been previously circulated) stating it was traditionally the busiest time of the year for scrutiny. She thanked everyone for their continued support, particularly Councillor Hakewill for his hard work on budget scrutiny.

The report was seconded by Councillor Hakewill who invited members to attend scrutiny on 23 March 2016 to review the budget scrutiny process and agree how it should be undertaken in the future.

Answers were provided to questions as follows:

- It was noted a flood toolkit was available on the Council's website.
- Scrutiny to hold officers to account in relation to services currently the subject of an Ofsted Inspection was welcomed.
- There was a need to raise the profile of the Council's work in terms of school improvement through the Local Government Association.
- There was a need to embed the work of the next generation council into scrutiny.
- It was confirmed all of the issues referred to would be picked up through scrutiny.

**RESOLVED that: Council noted:**

- 1) the report by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Committee and responses to questions raised at the meeting; and**
- 2) that next generation council would be included in the Council's scrutiny process.**

20/16 Motions submitted by Councillors under Rule 13.1:

(a) Motion submitted by Councillor Bob Scott:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Bob Scott submitted the following motion:

*"This Council notes that providers, in particular within the voluntary sector across Northamptonshire, have a long held concerns about the Council's annual approach to funding Organisations feel the Council's year on year approach absorbs their resources and makes it chronically difficult to plan strategically.*

*This Council furthermore notes the Administration's desire to receive a four year financial settlement from Central Government. Assuming government approves the Council's application or a four-year settlement, we believe that service areas should guarantee three years of funding to providers, including voluntary sector organisations from 17/18. Providing certainty about funding in the medium term will enable organisations to plan more effectively. We resolve to take the necessary steps to implement this proposal."*

In moving the motion, Councillor Scott stated the Council was required to submit a report to the Government setting out a 4-year plan in order to secure a 4-year settlement. The Council had heard about difficulties in applying resources and strategic planning and he

felt a 4-year settlement would enable the Council to give longer term assurances to voluntary sector providers. Savings would then be ploughed back into the services they provided and they would be able to plan more strategically.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Mary Butcher who noted the Council's eagerness to work with and support the voluntary sector who were an invaluable part of the county's communities. This would provide them with a longer timeframe and enable them to plan services over a 4-year period.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised that organisations might consider they have funding for a longer period than the 4 years.
- Concerns were raised that whilst the Council would work with the voluntary sector as best as it could, not everyone could support the motion.
- Some felt the motion was not difficult to support as the voluntary sector always required long term security. It would provide them with stability.
- An example was provided that illustrated problems in Youth Works in Kettering which had to be given notice of their contract ending which caused disruption even though they were delivering services well. Providing groups with a 4-year contract would enable them to better organise and improve their services.
- Concerns were raised that the motion was far too restrictive and did not accept the need to consider grants and contracts in a fundamentally different way. There was a need to become much more flexible about the way services were provided to give the outcomes the Council sought.
- It was noted there were a number of contracts provided on a longer-term basis.

In reply Councillor Scott recognised that new situations regularly presented themselves and he did not feel that 4-year funding would be taken for granted, particularly as it would be paid in segments and by results if so desired.

**RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was rejected.**

(b) Motion submitted by Councillor Brendan Glynnane:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Brendan Glynnane moved the following motion:

*"This Council recognises the significance of European Investment in our County and the fundamental role the European free trade area plays in underpinning our economy. Moreover, Council recognises the social and cultural benefits enjoyed by the whole of the Country due to closer relationships with our European neighbours, including easier movement across the continent, the Human Rights Act and an unprecedented period of peace in Western Europe.*

*Britain's membership of the European Union is a large part of the reason we have access to these benefits.*

*This Council therefore supports Britain remaining as a full and complete member of the European Union."*

In moving the motion Councillor Glynnane referred to peace in Europe for the last 66 years which had been achieved through nations working together. He referred to Winston Churchill stating in 1948 that movement for unity must be positive. He also referred to Harold MacMillan who had stated that Great Britain was European geographically and culturally and that Great Britain could not disassociate itself from Europe. He felt the

European Community had provided access to clear sources of food. It had provided more trade and more aid than any other group in the world. He felt Great Britain could play a role in developing Europe and turning its backs would prevent the country from being able to influence what was happening in Europe which was a powerful group of nations. Without Great Britain it would continue to develop and Great Britain could not complain if it developed in conflict with the country. He also felt the British would remain British with a British identity if it stayed in Europe.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Jill Hope who stated that for every £1 spent on ownership within Europe £10 was received back in terms of jobs and investment. She had a long list of what Europe had done for Great Britain but would not read it all. She felt that Norway paid the same as Great Britain but had none of the benefits back and this was therefore not an option for a way forward. She also noted that Canada had taken 10 years to broker their deal.

Councillors commented as follows:

- It was noted that when Great Britain first joined the European Union (EU) it was to trade with them and the notion of ever closer political union was not accepted.
- Some felt there was no need for a court of rights with sovereignty over Great Britain.
- It was also noted that NATO and not the EU had been responsible for brokering deals that kept the country safe.
- Some felt the savviest in Europe were the Swiss who were not a member of the EU but one of the richest in Europe who exported chemical products, chocolates and many other goods to the EU.
- Concerns were raised that voting for this motion would provide the public with knowledge of how a person might vote in the upcoming EU referendum which was a secret ballot. Some councillors might therefore decide not to remain for the vote, particularly if a recorded vote was requested.
- It was noted Europe was large, diverse and rich in culture and opportunities. It was further noted that 80% of businesses in the county wished to remain in the EU.
- Some felt being part of the EU did keep the country safer. It was noted global warming which was really serious could not be tackled alone and it was only as part of the EU that Great Britain could consider muscling up to larger economies such as the USA and China.
- Some felt the EU would provide a future for the next generation and offer them huge opportunities and it was for their sake that the motion should be supported.
- Some felt some really good laws had come out of the EU that had affected Great Britain for the better.
- It was noted that irrespective of any decision that came out of the EU referendum a major company like Avon was moving its headquarters from the US to the UK.
- Concerns were raised that this motion should never have been put on the agenda because it asked people to make a decision that they should make privately on the day of the European Referendum.
- It was noted no organisation including the EU was perfect and many organisations required reform. When asking a group of young people whether they were in favour of the EU 99% said they were and it was felt their views should be taken account of.

At this point Councillor Lawman proposed that the motion be put.

This was seconded by Councillor Bill Parker.

In reply Councillor Glynane stated he found it disappointing that some councillors could not support or debate the motion. He referred to the fact that they all lived in a democracy and they could if they wished choose to make their views known and he felt it was part of their human right to stand up and say how they felt.

*(Councillors Judy Shephard and Allen Walker left the meeting at this point)*

**Upon a recorded vote of 14 for and 28 against with 10 absentees, the motion was defeated.**

(c) Motion submitted by Councillor Chris Lofts:

At the Chairman's invitation Councillor Chris Lofts proposed the following motion:

*"Council recognises the pain and distress caused to our residents by the swinging cuts and near collapse of services provided by this County Council. Council further recognises that members of this Council taking home tens of thousands of pounds a year of tax payer money over the period is unacceptable.*

*Council will therefore convene the Independent Panel for Councillor Allowances in order to review the scheme of allowances with a view to capping the combination of travel experiences and Special Responsibilities Allowances at £6,873 per year per person – bringing the highest salary amongst Councillors in line with the National Living Wage for our area.*

*Where additional income is earned from appointments made by virtue of a Councillors position within this organisation, they should be allowed to choose that allowance over any SRA or travel expenses from NCC should they wish to do so, and as long as the County Council is not funding the position."*

In moving the motion Councillor Lofts stated the motion did not aim to criticise any individual councillors for the allowances and expenses they received as they were only claiming the amounts the Council as a body had stated they were entitled to. Although they could be refused, the reality was that they wouldn't be and that's why he believed a corporate body had a duty to set the rates. He noted that in 2014/15 just under £1million was paid by the Council to councillors. In 2016/17 residents were facing the largest increase in council tax for several years as well as real cuts to services. The Liberal Democrat group felt the Council should show leadership and he understood the process for setting allowances was set in law. He felt that this motion if passed could save £200,000 per year. He also noted that the motion did not bind the Council to a particular scheme but set the scene for an independent panel.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Sarah Uldall.

Councillors commented as follows:

- Some stated sympathy for the motion although they felt unable to support it because they considered it to be badly worded. It was also felt unfair that a member of the Council living in Northampton would have a better deal than someone in Brackley or Oundle because they lived further away. It was also noted that some members of the Council attended meetings in Northampton twice a week and it was only fair they have their expenses reimbursed.
- Concerns were also expressed that the motion would be setting too much for the independent review panel which defeated the object of an independent panel.
- Concerns were raised that services whilst under pressure were not close to collapse.
- It was noted that many councillors had to take unpaid time off work to attend meetings hence the allowance that was paid to recompense them
- It was noted that following an independent review in 2005 the basic allowance would be increased but cabinet members would not take an increase. During the following

years a number of recommended increases had been rejected. Following a boundary review in 2012 the number of councillors was reduced and to reflect the increased size of divisions, the basic allowance was increased. It was also noted the Liberal Democrat Group had awarded themselves Special Responsibility Allowances increases of up to 63% at Northampton Borough Council.

- Some felt it was important to keep allowances in order to attract younger people to the role of councillor. Young people who had children, mortgages and jobs and who therefore required an allowance to recompense them for money lost and enable them to continue to pay their bills.

In reply Councillor Lofts he was not proposing to take away any allowances but to set them at a ceiling of £16,000.

Upon the vote the motion was rejected.

**RESOLVED that: Upon the vote the motion was defeated.**

21/16 Urgent Business:

The Chairman informed Council they would be notified of details of a celebratory event taking place at Wootton Centre for the Queen's 90<sup>th</sup> birthday in April.

22/16 Exempt Items:

There were none.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 2.55pm.

Jenny Rendall  
Democratic Support

**Chairman's Signature:-**

**Date:-**



## NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Recorded Votes for Council:	
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	17 March 2016
<b>Item No:</b>	12(b) Motion submitted by Councillor Brendan Glynane in respect of membership of the European Union

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Beardsworth	Sally				√
Bell	Paul				√
Brackenbury	Wendy		√		
Brookfield	Julie	√			
Broomfield	Jim				√
Brown	Michael		√		
Brown	Robin		√		
Butcher	Mary	√			
Clarke	Michael		√		
Collyer	Adam		√		
Coombe	Elizabeth	√			
Eales	Gareth				√
Glynane	Brendan	√			
Golby	Matthew		√		
Gonzalez de Savage	Andre				√
Groome	Christopher		√		
Hakewill	James		√		
Hales	Eileen	√			

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Hallam	Mike		√		
Harker	James		√		
Heggs	Stanley		√		
Hills	Alan				√
Homer	Sue		√		
Hope	Jill	√			
Hughes	Dudley		√		
Hughes	Sylvia		√		
Irving-Swift	Cecile		√		
Kirkbride	Joan		√		
Larratt	Phil		√		
Lawman	Graham		√		
Lawson	Derek		√		
Legg	Stephen				√
Lofts	Chris	√			
Longley	Malcolm				√
McCutcheon	Arthur	√			
McGhee	John				√
Mackintosh	David				√
Matthews	Allan		√		
Mercer	Andrew				√
Meredith	Dennis	√			
Morris	Ian		√		
Osborne	Steve		√		
Parker	Bill		√		
Patel	Bhupendra		√		

Surname	First Name	For	Against	Abstain	Absent
Patel	Suresh		√		
Roberts	Russell		√		
Sawbridge	Ron		√		
Scott	Bob	√			
Scrimshaw	Mick	√			
Shephard	Judy				√
Smith	Heather				√
Stone	Danielle	√			
Strachan	Winston	√			
Tye	Michael				√
Uldall	Sarah	√			
Walker	Allen				√
Waters	Malcolm		√		
<b>Totals</b>		14	28		15