
COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT on Wednesday, 13 November 2019 from 7.00pm - 8.09pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Baldock, Cameron Beart, Monique Bonney, Lloyd Bowen, Derek Carnell, Richard Darby, Steve Davey, Mike Dendor, Mark Ellen, Simon Fowle, Tim Gibson, Alastair Gould, James Hall, Ann Hampshire, Nicholas Hampshire, Angela Harrison, Alan Horton, James Hunt, Ken Ingleton (Mayor), Carole Jackson, Elliott Jayes, Denise Knights, Peter Macdonald, Peter Marchington, Benjamin Martin, Ben J Martin, Lee McCall, Pete Neal, Padmini Nissanga, Richard Palmer, Hannah Perkin, Ken Pugh, Ken Rowles, Julian Saunders, David Simmons, Paul Stephen, Sarah Stephen, Bill Tatton, Eddie Thomas, Roger Truelove, Tim Valentine, Ghlin Whelan, Mike Whiting, Tony Winckless and Corrie Woodford.

OFFICERS PRESENT: David Clifford, Robin Harris, Chris Lovelock, Jo Millard, Nick Vickers and Emma Wiggins.

APOLOGIES: Councillors Roger Clark (Deputy Mayor) and Simon Clark.

356 PRAYERS

The Mayor's Chaplain said prayers.

357 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Mayor outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

358 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 October 2019 (Minute Nos. 277 – 287) were taken as read, approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record.

359 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

360 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was a minute's silence in memory of Gill Harris, Spatial Planning Manager, and past Member Mrs Sylvia Butt who both passed away recently. The Leader paid tribute to Gill Harris, and another Member praised her work. Councillor Lloyd Bowen spoke about former Councillor Butt's work as a Councillor and advised that her funeral would take place at Bobbing Crematorium on 22 November at 11am.

The Mayor thanked the Members who represented the Borough Council at one of the many Remembrance Services held in the Borough. He spoke of the higher attendance at services this year and noted the higher proportion of younger people

attending. He thanked the Royal British Legion for their organisation of so many services.

The Mayor advised that, between them, he and the Deputy Mayor had attended an average of one function per day over the previous month. He highlighted the Swale Awards Gala, two 100th Birthday celebrations, the presentation of the Queen's Award for Industry to Trinity Fencing, opening new businesses and attending Faversham Carnival as particular highlights. He had also welcomed the new priest to the Church of the Sacred Heart in Sittingbourne as well as attending the inaugural meeting of the University of the Third Age at Sheerness.

As it was the last scheduled Council meeting before Christmas, the Mayor wished Members a Happy Christmas and reminded everyone that the Civic Christmas Service would be held at Borden Church on Saturday 21 December at 6.30pm, and all were welcome.

361 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC

The Mayor advised that two questions had been submitted and as Mr Tim Brown was unable to attend the meeting, his question (2) and response would be recorded in the minutes. Hannah Temple was invited to ask her question.

Question 1:

"The Annual Treasury Management Report considered by Council in October revealed that the Council has £17.99m invested in money market funds managed by Invesco, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Black Rock, Aberdeen and Amundi. It is very likely that, through these funds, the Council has substantial investments in companies operating in the oil and gas, tobacco and arms industries whose business models are inconsistent with the Council's commitments to a low carbon future, its priority to improve public health and the Climate and Ecological Emergency motion that it passed in June.

Will the Council agree to review the investments it holds, and adopt an ethical investment policy which screens out investments that are incompatible with its values while still providing a sound financial investment for public funds?"

Response – Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Roger Truelove

Thank you for your question and it is an important one and it is good to have the opportunity to respond.

So firstly I would like to say that the Council does not directly own any shares in companies or corporate bonds. I am happy to confirm that if the strategy did change to allow investments of this type then it would exclude the types of company you refer to. I will ensure this is reflected in the treasury strategy for 2020/21.

The Council has a very careful approach to managing its cash and with the exception of the Church, Charities and Local Authorities (CCLA) Mutual Investment Property Fund we only use bank deposit accounts or Money Market Funds. We

predominantly use Money Market Funds as they offer better returns than bank deposits and are more secure.

Money Market Funds are portfolios comprising of securities issued by governments and financial institutions. They are low risk ways of holding cash and they do not invest in equities or corporate bonds.

Supplementary Question and Response

Hannah Temple asked the Leader if the information on where the money was invested could become more transparent to the public?

The Leader replied that it would.

Question 2

“Why has free parking been allowed for remembrance services but not for Christmas shopping bearing in mind Councillor Valentine has stated that free parking will increase the number of cars into the town, which goes against the Council’s ‘Climate & Ecological Emergency’ statement?”

Response - Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question. My comment was included in the answer I gave at Council in response to a motion tabled by Councillor Hampshire. The motion called for free parking on 15 days in November and December and for shuttle bus services to be provided on one day. This proposal was costed at approximately £100,000. I have already provided you with a copy of research which showed clearly that free parking did not increase the footfall in our high streets. 99% of respondents would have visited the town centre even if there had been no free parking offer. However, 17% of respondents had travelled by car rather than use public transport, walking or cycling. It would be foolish to do the same again and expect a different outcome. Furthermore, it would be a reckless waste of public money to fund a scheme in the full knowledge that it would not achieve the aim of helping local businesses. It is entirely appropriate that the Cabinet based our decision on the available evidence.

In contrast, offering free parking on Remembrance Sunday cost less than £2,000 in lost income. There was a strong view in Cabinet that this offer was an appropriate way of encouraging residents to remember those who gave the lives in two world wars and more recent conflicts. Many who wish to attend Remembrance Day services are elderly and public transport on Sunday is more limited than that available during the week. The Cabinet took the view that the offer of free parking was the right thing to do for the community.

362 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

The Mayor advised that seven questions had been received from Members. Each Member was invited to put his/her question, which was responded to by the relevant Cabinet Member. The questioner was then invited to ask a supplementary question.

Details of the questions and responses are set out below:

Question 1 – Councillor Steve Davey

“Are there any more plans to install public and or private charging points for electric cars (EV Charge Points) in the Borough?”

Response – Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question. Electric vehicle (EV) charging points are a very topical issue at the moment and I can confirm the Council is working to be at the forefront of the changes. The recent Department for Transport figures show that Swale has 16 charging units per 100,000 population. This puts us slightly below the national average and mid table across Kent.

There are already a number of additional units in the pipeline that will improve this position. Swale Borough Council itself will be installing another 4 bays in Faversham Central car park and two further in Rose Street, Sheerness. These will be in place by the early summer 2020.

Through continuous analysis, Parking Services monitor environmental performance data from each EV unit which includes energy used, number of charging sessions, average charge time and estimates of the amount of carbon dioxide emissions saved. As the EV units demonstrate good usage, targeted growth of the EV charge point offer will keep pace with demand within each town centre location, further supporting clean air and greener transport in Swale. All of these points have been funded by Swale Borough Council (SBC).

We are also supporting others to follow our lead. Just recently the Planning Committee considered and approved permission for a care home, hotel and supermarket at Perry Court, Faversham on the A251. This is just off the M2 Junction 6 so is in a strategic location. The hotel will have 2 x 50Kw rapid chargers and 6 x 7Kw chargers. The supermarket will have 2 x 22Kw chargers. There will be car chargers at the care home as well. So, when this development is built, the Borough will be well served.

Finally, we are considering how we can encourage major employers in the Borough to provide workplace chargers for electric vehicles, and adopt EVs in their own fleet. Currently the Office for Low Emission Vehicles offers a grant scheme for workplace chargers. The Council is looking to set the standard by converting the majority of its vehicle fleet over to EV and therefore, we will also be providing further chargers for our staff to use.

Supplementary question and response

“Is there any feasibility in fitting extra charging points in more locations such as on streets?”

The Cabinet Member advised that there would need to be liaison with Kent County Council (KCC) as they were responsible for highways and he was due to have a meeting to discuss this with them. He advised that there were funding grants

available and also that some overnight car parks with charging points would not charge a parking fee overnight.

Question 2 – Councillor David Simmons

“Does the Chairman of the Planning Committee think that the Committee is conducting its business as well as it could, and if not are there any proposals to make improvements?”

Response – Chairman of Planning Committee

I am aware that the Planning Committee procedures were amended over a year ago to enable questioning of the facts relating to planning applications in advance of opening the Committee to debating an item. Whilst I believe that approach has enabled the Planning Committee to thoroughly review such applications, I acknowledge and accept that on occasions extended, repetitious discourse has ensued, particularly in respect of significant major planning applications.

To that end I intend to undertake a review of the Planning Committee procedures in discussion with other Members, to consider how improvements can be made and to ensure that planning applications continue to be considered fully, fairly and expediently.

Supplementary question and response

In response to Councillor’s Simmons’s suggestions of scheduling more Planning Committee meetings in advance and providing more planning training sessions for Members, the Chairman of Planning Committee confirmed that all Planning Committee procedures would be reviewed.

Question 3 – Councillor Denise Knights

“Can the Cabinet Member for the Environment explain the reason why the ornamental cherry tree in front of the lodge on Faversham recreation ground is earmarked to be felled?”

Response – Cabinet Member for Environment

Thank you for your question. The tree is a large mature flowering cherry, located on the side of the path around the front of the Lodge which links the diagonal Longbridge path with the eastern promenade path. The tree is located approximately halfway along the footway and if viewed from the Whitstable Road boundary or generally anywhere to the north it is pretty much right in the centre, obscuring the view of the Lodge.

The strategy for tree removals and replanting was developed as part of the Heritage Lottery Fund project that is investing approximately £1.9m into the recreation ground. The main focus of the strategy is safety along with providing a sustainable tree stock into the future with trees of various ages and species. It identifies trees in decline and those of low vitality and seeks to replace with new specimens along

with replacing trees where there are planting opportunities that have been lost over the years from disease.

We fully recognise that this particular tree is not in decline and does not fit with these general principals. In the case of this particular tree, the decision was based on maintaining a historical aspect and view of the lodge from within the recreation ground and from Whitstable Road. The lodge was constructed on a raised mound and is the main and most significant heritage asset. It is subject to a considerable amount of investment as part of this project. Historical photos and plans identify that the Lodge was open and visible to the park and on balance we believed it important to maintain the visibility of this significant historical feature.

However, we are aware of the opposition to the removal of the tree and have engaged in many conversations with people around the merits of the decision. It certainly wasn't an easy decision, and in view of the engagement, the Project Board discussed the matter at its meeting earlier today.

I am pleased to report, the board decided to listen to the views of the community and have opted to keep the tree. This has always been a project about helping local residents to re-engage with the Rec and it shows that this administration is prepared to listen to the views of residents and consider all options.

As a compromise we are proposing to undertake some pruning works to lift the crown in order to provide a little more visibility, but also raise it from the footpath and a small amount of crown reduction to take it away from the nearby lighting. I hope this will achieve a consensus that all parties are happy with.

Supplementary Question and Response

There was no supplementary question.

Question 4 – Councillor Steve Davey

“What provisions are in place to house vulnerable young people (17/18) and recently released offenders or those on probation within the Borough?”

Response – Cabinet Member for Housing

These specialist services are commissioned by KCC, however in the recent recommissioning of services from April 2019 services for young people and offender accommodation has been changed.

We can no longer access supported accommodation for young people directly. We do have a protocol with KCC regarding homeless 16 and 17 year olds which involves joint working to try to encourage them to work with social services who can then refer them to a specialist housing scheme. However, if the young person does not want to work with social services, the duty to accommodate them falls with the Borough Council, and the most suitable temporary accommodation will be sought.

Prior to the KCC recommissioning there were some services offering specialist accommodation for some ex-offenders, however these services were not

recommissioned by KCC in April. Anyone that is homeless in the Borough will be entitled to make a homeless application but not all ex-offenders will pass the tests prescribed in legislation, for example, have a priority need for temporary accommodation, and a vast majority will be determined as intentionally homeless. Pre- April, some of these ex-offenders would have been accommodated at the KCC supported schemes but some would have ended up rough sleeping.

With the additional funding secured from MHCLG for rough sleeping, anyone that falls outside of Housing legislation will be given support and most will be offered accommodation (those without recourse to public funding will not be offered although in periods of extreme weather they will be).

Supplementary question and response

Councillor Davey paid tribute to the work of Housing Services, in particular, the Housing Options Manager and Housing Options Officer. He asked whether SBC would consider putting extra funding in the budget to plug the gap that KCC were no longer providing?

The Cabinet Member for Housing agreed to give a follow up response.

Question 5 – Councillor Cameron Beart

Given the recent news that Queenborough has been rated 'the best place to buy property in the south east', does the Cabinet Member for Economy and Property believe that now is the right time to revisit the viability assessments on the Queenborough and Rushenden regeneration scheme?

Response

There are currently no viability issues with the Queenborough & Rushenden regeneration scheme as the financial gaps previously identified have been bridged through the securing of additional funds such as the Housing Infrastructure Fund grant of £5.1million recently finalised. The methodology utilised by PropCast in the Kent Online article is a calculation based on properties that are 'Sold STC' and 'Under Offer' as a percentage of 'total stock' for sale, down to postcode district level. There is no reference to or emphasis placed on how much those properties sell for either directly within an area or comparatively with another area. Viability assessments are carried out based on the expected values achievable for the properties being built. For the Queenborough & Rushenden viability assessment, the figures used are comparable to the values achieved in the sale of the properties in phase 1 and are still significantly less than those being achieved in almost all other areas of Kent. The phase 1 sales values are still recent and appropriate for the area so it is not considered necessary to carry out any further assessments at this point.

Supplementary question and response

Councillor Cameron Beart referred to the significant changes from the original masterplan for the area carried out in 2007 and to the review carried out in 2017

which had removed the focal point marina and significantly reduced housing units. He asked whether a more current review was now required?

The Cabinet Member for Economy and Property agreed to provide a follow up response.

Question 6 – Councillor Mike Whiting

“Can the cabinet member reassure my residents that he will get their bins collected on time?”

Response

Thank you for your question. Councillor Whiting will be aware that the waste collection contract was commissioned 5 years ago by the last administration, and that we are tied into it for another 5 years ending on March 2023. As with any major contract, there will be periods of reduced service whether that be in situations outside of people’s control e.g. inclement weather or emergency roadworks or due to a host of reasons that can and need to be managed accordingly. It is fair to say that we have inherited some legacy issues from the contract, that have needed close management. We are working with the contractor to overcome the elements that are within our control. There were similar periods last summer and it is regrettable that these have re-occurred again this year.

In terms of your residents however, we are aware that many roads in your ward are serviced by one of the narrow vehicles and this is one of the legacy areas on which we are working due to vehicle reliability issues. We have received assurances from the contractor that prevention plans are being put in place and that service delivery over the last week has been back to expected levels. We are using all available means under the terms of the contract to ensure service delivery.

Our advice to all residents is exactly the same. To leave your wheeled bins out on the requested day and if missed, then to keep them there, as our crews will get to them as soon as possible. Crews work Saturdays and Sundays to catch up collections when necessary.

Supplementary question and response

Councillor Whiting sought reassurance that that contractors would deliver on the contract.

The Cabinet Member for Environment referred to the incompatibility between the ten-year contract and the six-year average vehicle life. He said that everything was being done within the current contract to provide the best service.

Question 7 – Councillor Paul Stephen

“In view of the recent reports in the media of sub-standard new housing developments, has the Council got any monitoring in place to check the quality and safety of new builds on all development sites across Swale Borough?”

Response – Chairman of Planning Committee

There is clearly something broken with the housing market whereby developers are being able to develop housing to sub standard build quality and that these issues are not being detected until very late on the build process, often at completion when transferred to a buyer.

SBC does have procedures in place to monitor the quality and safety of new builds. We adhere to current legislative requirements in terms of how sites are inspected and it may be helpful for me to provide an outline of the processes involved.

Anyone wishing to build has two choices, they can use Local Authority Building Control (LABC) who provide an independent, publicly accountable service operating on a cost recovery basis. Alternatively they can use a private company (Approved Inspector) who operate in competition with the LABC on a profit making basis. The Building Regulations, do not cover all aspects of quality, but do set minimum standards for things like structural stability, fire safety, energy efficiency and acoustic performance. The primary responsibility for compliance with the Regulations rests with the builder, but the role played by building control bodies provides an important check for compliance.

Where a site is being overseen by an approved inspector the LABC are not permitted, under the legislation, to become involved and any issues that may arise have to be resolved directly with the inspecting body. If an approved inspector is unable to complete the work, legislation permits reversion of the work to the LABC to endeavour rectification.

This has happened on an unprecedented scale this year with seven approved inspectors, being unable to secure the required insurance to operate, for reasons unknown. This means that where work has commenced on site the Approved Inspector is unable to issue a Final Certificate as they are effectively uninsured. Legislatively that work now has to revert to the local authority (as a reversion application), as the Approved Inspector is unable to carry out their function. Unfortunately, under the legislation there is no requirement for the Approved Inspector to provide any of their information to the local authority which means the LABC need to inspect to ascertain the status of the build in terms of what site inspection records (if any) are available, plans, calculations etc and what may have already been covered over and require exposing in order to confirm compliance.

The LABC always endeavour to keep what they require to expose to a minimum and only request information that is needed, however, they have to be able to satisfy themselves that the build meets the requirements, as if they are unable to then they will not be in a position to issue a completion certificate.

Supplementary question

There was no supplementary question.

363 LEADER'S STATEMENT

The Leader reminded Members that at the last Council meeting, some time was spent reporting on and scrutinising the 'do or die' preparations for exiting the European Union on 31 October. He said that there were thoughts about road congestion, curtailment of food and medical supplies, delivering our own services and even possible civil disobedience.

He said that, as suspected by many, it didn't happen and it was very inclusive of Westminster politicians to devolve down to local authorities the politics and governance of futility, even though they had better things to do than use up resources on hypothetical non-events.

In considering the future position, the Leader questioned what was next - leaving with a deal, where a transition period might follow with regulatory alignment ruling out the need for emergency measures?; or leaving with no deal?; or not leaving and a new deal?; or maybe to remain?

The Leader referred to the General Election and acknowledged the intrusion into the Council's day to day work. He explained that slight changes had been made to the Council's meetings schedule to observe the purdah conventions and the need for space, just prior to the poll. The Leader reminded Members of the long-term absence of the Chief Executive and departure of the Democratic and Electoral Services Manager prior to the election and highlighted the challenges facing the new team in delivering the election. He asked for everyone to be supportive of the team.

The Leader referred to political campaigning and stated that whoever was elected in Sittingbourne and Sheppey, and Faversham and Mid-Kent, he hoped they would engage with what the current administration at SBC was trying to achieve.

It was now six months since the Coalition brought forward its plans for the next four years and the Leader gave a review. He said that he welcomed the work being done by the Policy Development Review Committee on Area Committees, and he hoped that this would come to fruition and that he then looked forward to working on the intention to have Council committees involved in decision making. He said he welcomed the critically constructive part played by the Scrutiny Committee at the previous week's meeting in determining the way forward on some major steps for SBC.

The Leader said that very good progress was being made in several other areas: in bringing forward more affordable and social housing, forging good links with the community, establishing a strategy for health improvement and leading the way on climate change and biodiversity. He added that the Council wanted to affect a change in the local economy, towards more diversified, better paid and more secure employment for residents and he reported a very constructive meeting with Christ Church University, where there were discussions around the role that higher education might play in providing more local GPs, more engineers and more recruits to tourism, heritage and creative employment in Swale.

In acknowledging the earlier question that the waste collection contractors had let the Council down again, the Leader questioned what kind of business organisation was unsustainable because of half term school holidays. He said that employer/employee relationships must be improved and said that public services were not necessarily best delivered through a private sector contract, especially if the public sector made unwise long-term contracts. He questioned how much easier it would have been to meet social housing targets if SBC had not been cajoled out its housing stock 30 years previously and, referring to the current issue at Westlands School, Sittingbourne ejecting school buses from its site, reflected on the benefits for local democracy if Academy Schools were brought back into local government.

The Leader gave his good wishes to all those campaigning.

Finally, the Leader paid tribute to former Minister Frank Dobson, who agreed the funding of the Sheppey Community Hospital, and had sadly passed away this week. Members applauded his support.

In response, the Leader of the Conservative group encouraged the support of staff through the management of the election process. The Leader acknowledged the well-run election process at SBC.

364 REVIEW OF FEES & CHARGES 2020/21

The Leader advised that the report had been considered by Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee, and he referred to the minor amendments in the tabled paper. He explained that most charges were unchanged and drew attention that the fee in the multi-storey car park in Sittingbourne was reduced to a more realistic level, from £15 to £7 per day. He proposed the recommendation. The Deputy Cabinet Member for Finance seconded the recommendation.

The Leader of the Conservative group acknowledged the long process of consideration of the Fees and Charges report before being reported to Full Council. He referred to the parking fee in the multi-storey car park and said that the previous charge set was to deter all day parking. He gave his full support for the fees and charges 2020/21.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19(5), a recorded vote was taken, and voting was as follows:

For: Baldock, Beart, Bonney, Bowen, Carnell, Darby, Davey, Dendor, Ellen, Fowle, Gibson, Gould, Hall, A Hampshire, N Hampshire, Harrison, Horton, Hunt, Gould, Ingleton, Jackson, Jayes, Knights, Macdonald, Marchington, Benjamin Martin, Ben J Martin, McCall, Neal, Palmer, Perkin, Pugh, Rowles, Saunders, Simmons, Paul Stephen, Sarah Stephen, Tatton, Thomas, Truelove, Valentine, Whelan, Whiting, Winckless and Woodford. Total equals 45.

Against: 0.

Abstain: 0.

Resolved:

(1) That the proposed fees and charges 2020/21 set out in this report be approved.

365 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND PLACES - TEYNHAM AND LYNSTED WARD

The Leader introduced the report and supported the convenience the additional polling district would provide to residents. He proposed the recommendation. The Deputy Leader seconded the recommendation.

Ward Members supported the recommendations.

A recorded vote was taken:

For: Baldock, Beart, Bonney, Bowen, Carnell, Darby, Davey, Dendor, Ellen, Fowle, Gibson, Gould, Hall, A Hampshire, N Hampshire, Harrison, Horton, Hunt, Gould, Ingleton, Jackson, Jayes, Knights, Macdonald, Marchington, Benjamin Martin, Ben J Martin, McCall, Neal, Palmer, Perkin, Pugh, Rowles, Saunders, Simmons, Paul Stephen, Sarah Stephen, Tatton, Thomas, Truelove, Valentine, Whelan, Whiting, Winckless and Woodford. Total equals 45.

Against: 0.

Abstain: 0 .

Resolved:

(1) That the proposed addition of a polling district and place in the Teynham and Lynsted ward be approved.

366 APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER S151 OFFICER

Mr Vickers, the Chief Financial Officer S151 Officer, left the room whilst discussion and voting on this item took place.

The Leader introduced the report and advised that previously Mr Vickers was employed by KCC and SBC paid a fee for his services, but as Mr Vickers was retiring from KCC and his services were necessary during the financing of the Spirit of Sittingbourne and in facing serious budget challenges in the future, his appointment at SBC was vital.

The Leader proposed the recommendation which was seconded by the Deputy Leader.

The Leader of the Conservative Group fully supported the recommendation but raised concerns over the lack of transparency of the selection process. The Leader explained the selection process in interviewing for a senior post and acknowledged that there should have been more involvement and transparency with other

Members on this occasion. He gave his assurance to follow the correct procedure and engage more fully with Members in the future.

A recorded vote was taken:

For: Baldock, Beart, Bonney, Bowen, Carnell, Darby, Davey, Dendor, Fowle, Gibson, Gould, Hall, A Hampshire, N Hampshire, Harrison, Horton, Hunt, Gould, Ingleton, Jackson, Jayes, Knights, Macdonald, Marchington, Benjamin Martin, Ben J Martin, McCall, Neal, Palmer, Perkin, Pugh, Rowles, Saunders, Simmons, Paul Stephen, Sarah Stephen, Tatton, Thomas, Truelove, Valentine, Whelan, Whiting, Winckless and Woodford. Total equals 44.

Against: 0.

Abstain: 0.

Resolved:

(1) That the Council approve the appointment of Mr Nick Vickers as Chief Financial S151 Officer.

367 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL/NOTING

The Council was asked to note the recommendations from the Appointments Sub-Committee, General Purposes Committee and Cabinet meetings held on 30 October 2019 as separate reports on the items had been considered earlier in the meeting.

Resolved:

(1) That the recommendation in Minute no. 319 of the Appointments Sub-Committee, Minute no. 325 of the General Purposes Committee and Minute no. 331 of the Cabinet Meeting, all held on 30 November 2019 be noted.

Chairman

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel