Minutes of a meeting of the SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding on Wednesday 15 December 2010.

PRESENT

Councillors:

S G Marthews – Chairman
M D Seymour – Vice-Chairman

B Alcock               G K Dark               G A Porter
G R Aley               P A Espin               P S Przyszlak
M Bamber               R Gambba-Jones          R M Rudkin
F Biggadike            R Grocock               M R Taylor
M D Booth              A Harrison              D A Tennant
C J T H Brewis         S Keeble               D J Wilkinson
A Casson               C J Lawton              [S F Williams - Council
M G Chandler           A M Newton               19 January 2011]
R J H Creese           A R Woolf               C N Worth

The Head of Legal and Member Services, Anne Heard the Deputy Monitoring Officer and Roger Wilkin (Project Manager – Breckland/South Holland Shared Management Arrangements Project).

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors J E Avery, D G Best, S M Booth, R Clark, H R Johnson and G J Taylor.

In attendance: The Press and The Venerable T R Barker, Chairman of the Standards Committee.

336. MINUTES

The minutes of the Council meeting held on 17 November 2010 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

337. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Creese declared a personal interest in Item 14 due to his daughter working for Compass Point Business Services (East Coast). Councillors Wilkinson and Przyszlak both declared personal and prejudicial interests in Item 14, due to them being Directors of CPBS (East Coast).

338. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Refreshments

The Chairman wished all present a Happy Christmas and asked members’ to join him for refreshments after the meeting.

(b) Chairman’s Engagements

Members were informed that the Chairman’s Engagements were available to view on the noticeboard in the Council Chamber, Members’ teamsite and on the noticeboard in the Members’ Lounge.
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338. CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Continued)

(c) Spalding Magistrates Court

The Chairman advised of the good news that Spalding Magistrates Court would not now be closing and congratulated all those who had been involved in the consultation process.

(d) Speyer Visit

The Chairman said that himself and his wife had recently visited Speyer, Spaldings twin town, and had a most enjoyable time.

339. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY LEADER AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

Councillor Przyszlak announced that the budget grants had been reduced by 20.8%. He also reminded members that responsibility for the concessionary fare scheme was to be transferred to the County Council which would also mean loss of funding to the Council.

340. CHIEF EXECUTIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chief Executive told all of the departure of Sarah Naylor the Corporate Director. Mark Finch from Breckland had already been appointed as the Deputy S151 Officer until and depending on the outcome of Item 15 after which the S151 appointment would be resolved.

341. LICENSING COMMITTEE

The minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 16 November 2010 were submitted for information.

DECISION: That the minutes be received.

342. COMMITTEE OF THE LICENSING AUTHORITY

The minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 16 November 2010 were submitted for information.

DECISION: That the minutes be received.

343. SPECIAL JOINT PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the special joint Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel held on 18 November 2010.

DECISION: That the minutes be received and adopted.

344. GOVERNANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Governance and Audit Committee held on 24 November 2010.

DECISION: That the minutes be received and adopted.
345. SPECIAL JOINT PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANEL AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the special joint Performance Monitoring Panel and Policy Development Panel held on 30 November 2010.

DECISION: That the minutes be received and adopted.

346. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 1 December 2010 were submitted for information.

DECISION: That the minutes be received.

347. QUESTIONS ASKED WITHOUT NOTICE UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.8

Questions without notice pursuant to Council Procedure Rules 10.8 were asked and answered by the Leader and Cabinet members as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question by:</th>
<th>Answered by:</th>
<th>Subject:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Councillor Newton</td>
<td>Councillor P Przyszlak</td>
<td>CPBS details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councillor Newton said that at the Scrutiny Away Day there was a lack of contact details regarding CPBS and asked that a list be provided with all relevant contact details. Councillor Przyszlak advised that a list would be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question by:</th>
<th>Answered by:</th>
<th>Subject:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Councillor Newton</td>
<td>Councillor P Przyszlak</td>
<td>CPBS details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councillor Newton asked a supplementary question and requested an update on the progress of senior positions in CPBS. Councillor Przyszlak replied that an appointment had been made regarding the Managing Director. The position of Resources Director would be re-advertised on Friday/Monday of next week.

348. REPORT FROM CABINET

It was reported that at its meeting on 9 November 2010 the Cabinet had made no recommendations which the Council had to consider.

349. FORWARD PLAN

The Cabinet Forward Plan for the period December 2010 to May 2011 was submitted. Councillor Newton asked if a decision had been made yet on the member allowances on page 3 of the Forward Plan. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Remuneration Panel had met and a report would come to the meeting of Council in January 2011.

DECISION: That the Forward Plan for the period December 2010 to May 2011 be received.
The report and the Business Strategy 2011-2014 (confidential background paper) considered how South Holland District Council (South Holland) and East Lindsey District Council (East Lindsey) shared services company, Compass Point Business Services (East Coast) Ltd and its trading arm, would position themselves in the public sector shared services’ market in the next three years. In October 2010 the Comprehensive Spending Review set clear and challenging national goals for the public sector, including local government. It was anticipated that local government would need to achieve total savings of 28% over the next four years. The creation of the shared services company with East Lindsey would see South Holland reducing its overheads for all council services. It would help to drive a more commercially minded ethos through the organisation and help to realise savings for the public purse. Working together with Compass Point Business Services (East Coast) Ltd and its trading arm, the Council could be innovative and lead the way for district councils. The Council was protecting its key front-line services and responding proactively to the national need that all public bodies should be as efficient and effective as possible in their service delivery.

By operating a jointly owned shared service Company that provided Customer Services, Revenues and Benefits, ICT, Human Resources and Finance for the two authorities, savings of £30.726 million would be achieved over the next 10 years. The Business Strategy 2011-2014 sets out how Compass Point Business Services (East Coast) Ltd, the Teckal company, would meet the Council’s need for Customer Services, ICT, HR, Finance and Revenues and Benefits and produce a new income stream of dividends from the trading arm. The trading arm would be the non-Teckal company approved to be established in the Business Plan agreed by Council on 28th July 2010. It was this that would tender for work with other bodies. This approach would ensure that the Teckal exemption for the Councils’ work would not be affected. There was still the option of offering ‘c’ shareholdings within the Teckal company. The Business Strategy set out how the Company would fast-track the consolidation of the five merged services while targeting future business opportunities. These would attract further work and jobs to Lincolnshire at a time when the public sector was being reduced.

Members of South Holland approved the annual 2010/11 Business Plan for Compass Point Business Services (East Coast) Ltd at their meeting on the 28th July 2010. The Business Strategy was a step towards producing next year’s Business Plan for the Company which the Council would consider on the 2nd March 2011.

A meeting of the Joint Cabinet and Executive discussed the confidential Business Strategy at their meeting on the 18th November 2010.

Councillor Brewis was pleased that CPBS was finally off the ground and there had been no off-set of Council Tax. Councillor Porter agreed and told all that he felt there had been fantastic forethought and a great job had been done on the set up of the company. He went on to say that the company would deliver what was wanted and would attract proposals from other authorities. South Holland and East Lindsey District Councils had placed themselves in the best place possible and in coming years significant savings and earnings would be made.
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350. COMPASSPOINT BUSINESS SERVICES (CPBS) BUSINESS STRATEGY 2011-2014
(Continued)

Councillor Brewis asked if there had been any proactive advertising? Councillor Porter replied that there was no point in formal advertising as the Local Government press had done a great job in publishing positive comments.

DECISION

(a) That the additional objectives for the Company of progressively developing business, in a managed way, in order to bring in further ‘profits’ and financial benefits to the two shareholders and creating local sustainable employment opportunities be agreed;

(b) That the business strategy, including the setting up of the trading arm and that the Board prepare the business plan for 2011/12 and beyond on this basis be agreed;

(c) That the appointment of Directors of the Board for Compass Point Business Services (East Coast) Limited to the Board of the trading arm be agreed;

(d) That authority be delegated to the Leaders, Chief Executives and Board to finalise the setting up of the trading arm.

(e) That authority be delegated to the Leader, Chief Executive and Board to amend the Management and Shareholders’ Agreements to comply with the updated business strategy.

Councillors Wilkinson and Przyszlak declared personal and prejudicial interests in this item due to them being Directors of CPBS and left the meeting for discussion of the item.

351. JOINT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE WITH BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

In August 2010 Breckland and South Holland Councils agreed to the appointment of a joint Chief Executive. They required proposals to be brought forward for the Councils to approve and then implement a shared and joint management structure. The aims included:

- To make more efficient use of their investment in managerial capacity;

- To make savings in 2011/12 and beyond which would contribute towards the reduction in expenditure required of local government within the Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review. This was to be done through management savings with the aim of protecting frontline services delivered to the public;

- To achieve a leaner management structure capable of supporting democratic executive leadership; and

- To permit both the Council’s to continue to operate independently and respond to the needs of their communities.
JOINT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE WITH BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

The Councils had accepted that the structure of the new management arrangement should be built upon three core functions of the local authority:

- Commissioning services (internal & external);
- Local government of place (place shaping); and
- Organisational governance (democratic accountability).

A project team comprising officers from both councils had been working on the tasks necessary to bring about the joint management structure. This team had reported into a Board which included the two Leaders and two other elected members from each authority. A scrutiny chairman from each authority was also invited to attend to observe.

Staff where initially consulted on the proposal informally and then through a formal 30 day consultation period which concluded on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} December. Throughout the process the Trade Unions had been kept informed and consulted as appropriate. A copy of the staff consultation was also sent to all elected members. The proposals had been considered by the scrutiny committees at both Councils, and at Breckland by the General Purposes Committee and Local Joint Consultative Committee.

The Board had considered the views which had been expressed by those who had responded to the consultation and now presented, for Council approval, their proposal for joint management of the two authorities.

Councillor Porter said that the Councils should be proud of the situation as lots of local authorities where having to slash their budgets. South Holland had done more than any other local authority. He went on to say that the public were not interested in job losses as long as the authority where able to maintain and improve services. Less people were going to lose their jobs in South Holland than in other local authority. The sharing of the Chief Executive was a big step but the sharing of management would be a massive national step. Councillor Porter said that he was pleased and proud and the authority shouldn’t lose sight of a good job well done.

Councillor Alcock asked the following questions:

- Could staff apply for more than one job?
- What was the reason for only 2 job descriptions being included in the report and was there a reason why other job descriptions had not been included;
- Who appointed the directors as at Appendix C, as it appeared to differ from the paragraph 6.6 within the report;
- Appendix L pro-forma B referred to appendix J, but there was no appendix J. Was this report relevant to SHDC or just Breckland?
- What relevance had V of the summary of the same report?
- How was it intended that the S151 responsibility would work in conjunction with East Lindsey or had the authority abandoned that arrangement?
- How would the HR role work bearing in mind SHDC’s HR is within Compass Point and therefore had no need for another role of that nature. Specifically if a Breckland paid officer was in charge of a SHDC department and HR issues between the two cropped up who would advise who? Equally similar issues arise with IT.
JOINT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE WITH BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

In response to Councillor Alcock’s questions, the Chief Executive (CEO) confirmed that staff could apply for any number of jobs and the recommendation indicated preferably up to four jobs. The CEO confirmed that each job description had been written to build in technical competencies.

Councillor Porter said that there was no intention of appointing a Director in any way different to what was undertaken currently apart from the merging the two Appointment committees. Councillor Alcock noted that in Appendix C point E that the Project Board would interview applicants for the directors roles. The CEO replied that this would be corrected and confirmed that it would be the Appointments Committee. With regard to Councillor Alcock’s question about Appendix L and the reference to appendix J giving the overall financial costs, the CEO replied that Appendix L was a Breckland paper and was included with both councils papers – he confirmed that it should have said Appendix K and not J. Regarding the S151 issue Councillor Porter replied that East Lindsey was now sharing a S151 officer with Boston. The CEO explained that there would initially be some rough edges and some HR was undertaken in-house with some being outsourced. It would be dependent on staff issues. SHDC would deal with any issues through CPBS whereas Breckland currently had their own HR. In the longer term it would be looked at with perhaps the prospect of Breckland coming into CPBS.

Councillor Alcock commented that he was not totally convinced by the proposals. He also felt that wording within the document and requirements seemed ok as far as they went but did not appear robust in requiring reviewing performance and monitoring. It seemed to be lacking in being cutting edge. Councillor Alcock said that it looked likely to shuffle a local authority pack and not necessarily get in new commercial managerial skills thereby perpetuating similar management practices that had been experienced. Councillor Alcock said that it must be of concern when shedding 16/17 posts.

Councillor Alcock said that he also found the line of management difficult to understand. If a Deputy Chief Executive was needed, he felt that all management should, at that salary, flow through that post. He also believed that, especially with the Director and Deputy Chief Executive Officer posts, they should be open to external as well as internal applicants and be subject to rigorous vetting, advice from experts as to suitability and support given to the Appointments Panel. Those two roles were key to get commercially minded managers with demonstratable attributes in man management needed to drive efficiencies and delivery.

Councillor Alcock said that the financial results were far from clear. The backfilling figure varied considerably and if the worse case scenario actually transpired, would be virtually non existent. It seemed likely to him that the budget would be required because common sense suggested that cutting 50% of roles either meant the authority had been totally inefficient or it was unlikely to work.

Councillor Brewis said that he felt the previous East Lindsey decision and now the Breckland proposals were both new and brave and he was excited that it crossed boarders. He asked that there be no embargo to outside people applying for positions.

Councillor Porter confirmed that commercialism would be within the job descriptions. There would be no guarantee that the jobs would be filled by internal applicants because if they
351. **JOINT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE WITH BRECKLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
(Continued)

did not meet the person specification they would not get the job. It could well mean that there would be more people losing posts than vacancies. The specifications were designed to be added to – it was about the future and not the past.

Councillor Worth referred to Appendix D and said that a long time was spent making sure that commercial and entrepreneurism were skills at the top of the competency framework. Councillor Worth acknowledged the amount of feedback received from staff on a variety of issues and advised that the Project Board had spent a lot of time considering the detailed feedback responses, some of which were incorporated into the structure now recommended by the Board to Council. Councillor Worth said the authority had two innovative leaders who were ahead of the game and a lot of councils wished they were in the same position. There were a lot of exciting possibilities going forward along with a lot of opportunities and risks but Councillor Worth was looking forward to the challenge.

Councillor Gambba-Jones said that he was wary and asked if it was a done deal? He added that it was impossible to say whether all concerns had been addressed and that it was a significant challenge not previously travelled. SHDC had got there sooner than others and it was flexible enough to adjust and look at different structures to maintain services. Councillor Gambba-Jones said that this was the way forward now and Portfolio Holders, if re-elected, had a significant challenge next May to do the job to the best of their ability and this would be a challenge. Councillor Gambba-Jones commented on Councillor Alcock’s comments and added that in fairness to the authorities officers, they could blossom in the circumstances. He added that time would tell if it was the right decision. He had concern regarding Appendix E and F and the Quorum only being 3. He asked that this be changed to at least 2 members from each authority and that this should also be presented to Breckland at their Council meeting.

Councillor Lawton said that it was networking on a grand scale and very innovative. The relationship had to be based on trust and work on a 50/50 basis. She also commented that she hoped the joint member meeting with Breckland would be re-arranged as soon as possible.

Councillor Alcock said that members had a paper emailed to them for comment from Unison. He commented that he had found the questions and comments constructive and commended and congratulated Unison for the way in which the questions were asked as he had found their point of view very positive.

**DECISION:**

(a) That the joint management structure as at Appendix A be approved;

(b) That the current posts that fall within the scope of the shared management proposals, as set out in Appendix B, be approved;

(c) That the structure be implemented using the process as described in Appendix C to the Report;
(d) That the core competencies as described in Appendix D be incorporated as requirements of all jobs in the new structure;

(e) That the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) be authorised to approve voluntary redundancies/early retirements subject to consultation with the two Leaders;

(f) That South Holland Council state their intention to follow their practice of 2 years pay protection (subject to caveats) where a person is assimilated into suitable alternative employment but where the grade is less than their present salary and that HR be asked to follow due process to introduce a written policy;

(g) That a joint Appointments Committee be established in accordance with Appendix E subject to (i) a quorum of 4 members (two from each authority) and (ii) appointments not being in accordance with Political Group Regulations and that nominations be given to the Head of Legal and Member Services by Group Leaders;

(h) That a joint Appointments Appeals Committee be established in accordance with Appendix F (as amendments to G above) and that nominations be given to the Head of Legal and Member Services by the Group Leaders;

(i) That the principles set out in the Memorandum of Agreement in Appendix G covering the way in which the two Councils intend working with each other be approved subject to the CEO be authorised to finalise the details of the Agreement;

(j) That each Council pays from its reserves the sum of £400,000 into a transformation budget to be controlled by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leaders of the Councils; and

(k) That consequential changes be made to the Constitution.

Jim Scarsbrook, Head of Legal and Member Services advised that because his post was affected by the proposals he would take no part in the matter, but the Deputy Monitoring Officer, Anne Heard, was in attendance to answer questions.
Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972 provided that if a member failed to attend a meeting of the authority for a period of six consecutive months then, unless the failure was due to some reason approved by the council, that member would cease to be a member of the authority.

As members were aware, Councillor Jones had over recent months been unwell and had not been attending meetings. Councillor Jones last attended a meeting, as a member, on 12 May 2010 (Governance and Audit Committee). Councillor Jones was a member of the Development Control Committee, Licensing Committee, Committee of the Licensing Authority, Governance and Audit Committee, Performance Monitoring Panel, Spalding Town Forum, and the ICT Working Group.

In view of Councillor Jones’ failure to attend a council meeting for six consecutive months, she had ceased to be a member of the authority with effect from 12 November 2010. As stated above, although there was provision, in the Local Government Act 1972, for the Council to authorise the period of absence, this could only be done within the six month period, and was therefore no longer available to the Council.

Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1972 provided that, where a member ceased to be a member of the authority by reason of failure to attend meetings, the authority must ‘forthwith’ declare the office to be vacant. The seat did not automatically become vacant, it must be declared so.

Section 89(3) of the Local Government Act provided that, ‘where a casual vacancy in any such office occurred within six months before the day on which the councillor whose office is vacant would regularly have retired, an election shall not be held’. As the forthcoming district elections were due to be held on Thursday 5 May 2011, the date of retirement of councillors would be 9 May 2011. It would therefore not be necessary to call a by-election in the meantime.

Due to the vacant seat left by Councillor Jones the group representation on the Council was amended to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Previous %</th>
<th>Revised %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group (24)(-1)</td>
<td>67.57</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Group (10)(same)</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (2)(same)</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulation 1990, a review of the allocation of seats on Committees and Working Parties needed to be undertaken. The changes were marginal and did not affect the allocation of seats between the political groups but there was a need to fill the vacancies on the committees, panels, etc., left by Councillor Jones.

DECISION: (a) That Councillor Jones’ seat be declared vacant and it be noted that due to the fact that the date of retirement of councillors would be 9 May 2011 and as the forthcoming district elections were due to be held on Thursday 5 May
352. **COUNCILLOR JANE JONES** (Continued)

2011 it would not be necessary to call a by-election in the meantime;

(b) That Councillor R Rudkin be appointed to the Development Control Committee;

(c) That Councillor R Rudkin be appointed to the Governance and Audit Committee;

(d) That Councillor R Grocock be appointed to the Performance Monitoring Panel;

(e) That Councillor A Harrison be appointed to the Licensing Committee and Committee of the Licensing Authority;

(f) That Councillor M Chandler be appointed to the ICT Working Group; and

(g) That the Chairman send a letter to Councillor J Jones recognising the work she had done for the authority and expressing members' regret that poor health had resulted in her ceasing to be a councillor.

353. **REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council were currently in the process of formulating a new Market Town Transport Strategy (MTTS) for Wisbech, as the existing strategy had reached the end, and a new one was needed.

The MTTS's are designed to provide a programme of transport-based improvements that could be implemented over the life time of the strategy, which in this case, was likely to be up to ten years. This new strategy for Wisbech would reflect the current economic climate and the localism agenda. The new strategy, it was hoped, would be ready for adoption in winter 2011.

A Member Steering Group had been established to assist in the review and development of the Wisbech Market Town Transport Strategy. The main role of the Group was to provide guidance and represent concerns of members' constituents, and to give input regarding their local knowledge of the transport services within Wisbech and the surrounding area.

The group would comment and provide guidance on the content of the consultation material, draft strategy and the final strategy, but would not be responsible for the decision making on the final strategy.

South Holland District Council had been invited to nominate an elected member to sit on the Steering Group along with representatives from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Association of Local Councils (CPALC), Norfolk County Council and West Norfolk and Kings’ Lynn Borough Council.
353. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES (Continued)

DECISION: That Councillor S Marthews be appointed as South Holland District Council’s member representative on the Wisbech Market Town Transport Strategy Member Steering Group.

354. LICENSING - SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUES

Since November 2005, the Licensing Act 2003 had required a wide range of regulated entertainment to be licensed by the Council acting as the Licensing Authority. This included live and recorded music as well as dancing and dance performances.

Sex shops, in contrast, were licensed under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982. This regime gave the Licensing Authority a wider discretion in determining whether to grant or refuse licenses (including the statutory grounds for refusal), a power to set a limit on the number of premises that may be suitable for a particular locality, greater flexibility on applying licence conditions and the ability to accept representations from a wider scope of the community. Sex shop licences were only valid for up to a year at a time, meaning there was scope for regular review. Currently these premises also had to advertise annually their renewal applications publicly.

Parliament had addressed concerns about the growth and operation of lap dancing venues, by amending Schedule 3 to the 1982 Act through the Policing and Crime Act 2009. A new class of licensed sex establishment – the Sexual Entertainment Venue (SEV) – had been created which would require lap dancing venues and similar premises to be licensed under the more flexible 1982 Act rather than under the Licensing Act 2003. New powers had been introduced nationally for lap dancing and other sexual entertainment venues to be licensed in the same way as licensed sex shops rather than as pubs and clubs. This gave local authority’s greater scope and discretion as to how such venues were controlled within their areas.

Section 2 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 [The 1982 Act] allowed a Local Authority to adopt Schedule 3 of that Act. If this Council had not adopted the provisions by 6 April 2011, then it would be legally required as soon as reasonably practicable to consult local people about whether or not it should make a resolution.

There was a frequency exemption where premises were allowed no more than 11 events where ‘relevant’ entertainment had taken place and at least one month since the last time such an event took place. If this number was exceeded and the council adopted the provisions, then the premises would require to be licensed.

The authority were not currently aware of having any sexual entertainment venues within the district of South Holland. The adoption of the provisions would allow the regulation, refusal and control of any proposed future establishments.

DECISION:

(a) That the provisions contained in the Policing and Crime Act 2009, in relation to Sex Entertainment Venues, be adopted;

(b) That the resolution comes into effect on 14 February 2011; and
354. **LICENSING - SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUES** (Continued)

   (c) That officers be asked to prepare a draft sexual entertainment venues policy for consultation.

355. **LICENSING POLICY STATEMENT**

   The Licensing Act 2003 placed a duty on the Licensing Authority to have in place and publish a Licensing Policy Statement at least once every three years. The Policy had to be approved by Full Council. The authority currently had a policy statement which came into force and was published in January 2008. The policy had been reviewed and updated and now needed to be approved and published. On 16 November 2010 the Committee of the Licensing Authority (CLA) considered a report on this matter. The CLA agreed that the draft Licensing Policy Statement (Licensing Act 2003) should be recommended to Full Council for approval and subsequent publication.

   **DECISION:** That the Licensing Act 2003 Policy Statement attached at Appendix A to the report is approved for use and publication.

356. **REPORTS FROM MEMBERS ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

   (a) **ENGLISH HERITAGE NATIONAL CHAMPIONS CONFERENCE**

   Consideration was given to the report of Councillor Lawton detailing matters discussed at the English Heritage Champions Conference on 15 November 2010.

   **DECISION:** The report was noted.

   (Meeting ended at 7.50pm.)

   (End of Minutes.)