

Minutes of a meeting of the **SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL** held in the Function Room, South Holland Centre, Market Place, Spalding, Lincolnshire, PE11 1SS, on Wednesday, 24 November 2021 at 6.30 pm.

PRESENT

P A Redgate (Chairman)

B Alcock	H Drury	G T D Rudkin
J R Astill	R A Gibson	G P Scalse
J Avery	R Grocock	M D Seymour
F Biggadike	M Hasan	S-A Slade
H J W Bingham	J L King	E J Sneath
M D Booth	C J Lawton	G J Taylor
C J T H Brewis	J D McLean	J Tyrrell
T A Carter	A M Newton	S C Walsh
A Casson	N H Pepper	D J Wilkinson
P E Coupland	G A Porter	A R Woolf (Vice-Chairman)
A C Cronin	J L Reynolds	C N Worth

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors A C Beal, R Gambba-Jones and A C Tennant.

In Attendance: The Joint Chief Executive, the Interim Deputy Chief Executive (Communities), the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth), the Deputy Chief Executive (Programme Delivery) and SIRO, the Head of Public Protection, the Head of Delivery, the Democratic Services Manager and the Democratic Services Team Leader.

51. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillors Beal, Tennant and Gambba-Jones.

52. **MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of Full Council held on 22 September 2021.

**DECISION:**

That the minutes be signed as a correct record.

53. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

Action  
By

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

There were none.

**54. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- The Chairman thanked Councillor Newton for the work she had undertaken in relation to the memorial for Pilot Officer George Furniss.
- The Chairman thanked those who had provided assistance with the Remembrance Sunday event – Jan Whitbourn, Emily Holmes, Julia Knight, Democratic Services and all the bodies engaged in supporting the event.
- The Chairman reminded members that he was holding a Quiz Night on 25 November 2021 in aid of MIND – there were still some tickets available.
- The Chairman welcomed the Joint Chief Executive (Rob Barlow) to the meeting, who in turn introduced the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth) (Michelle Sacks) and the Deputy Chief Executive (Programme Delivery) and SIRO (Adrian Sibley).

**55. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY LEADER AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET.**

The Leader had no announcements to make.

Councillor Grocock advised that the Government had announced that all new houses built from 2022 onwards would need to include an electric charging point. This was a Building Control matter, officers would confirm when this would take effect, and Council would be kept updated.

**56. QUESTIONS ASKED ON NOTICE UNDER STANDING ORDER 6**

There were none.

**57. QUESTIONS ASKED WITHOUT NOTICE UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

**Question to:** Councillor Grocock

**Question From:** Councillor Newton

**Subject:** Key Decision Plan – Acquisition project to purchase s106 rented units

Councillor Newton referred to the item on the Key Decision Plan 'Acquisition project to purchase s106 rented units – To seek approval to commit capital to purchase s106 rented dwellings'. At

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

Performance Monitoring Panel on 9 November 2021 she had asked how many properties this related to – could the Portfolio Holder provide any feedback?

Councillor Grocock responded that this item related to the purchase of 3 s106 rented affordable homes at Albion Street in Crowland, and that this would provide 3 much needed one- bedroom units. He commented that the Capital Programme had been approved by Council and, the homes subject to this decision would be delivered through the approved budget. Officers were in discussions with the developer to agree a cost.

**Question to:** Councillor Grocock

**Question From:** Councillor Newton

**Subject:** Key Decision Plan – Property Acquisition to support Housing Options service delivery (A), (E) and (F)

Councillor Newton referred to the items on the Key Decision Plan ‘Property acquisition to support Housing Options service delivery (A), (E) and (F) – Acquisition of a second hand property’ and asked how many properties had been targeted or identified, and how much was in the budget?

Councillor Grocock responded that these items related to RSAP properties. Originally, six entries had been added to the Key Decision Plan, one for each unit to be delivered however, as decision B related to three units and D related to two units, six units had been acquired through three decisions. Decisions A, E and F had been kept on the Key Decision Planner in case any of the purchases of properties that had been part of the original three decisions fell through, and there was a requirement to purchase alternative properties. There were six identified property purchases to be undertaken by January 2022 and if decisions A, E and F were not required, they would be removed from Key Decision Planner at that point.

**Question to:** Councillor Grocock

**Question From:** Councillor Newton

**Subject:** Property acquisition in Monkshouse Ward

Councillor Newton commented that, in relation to her previous question, a property had been acquired by the Council in the Monkshouse Ward – she had originally been advised that it would be ready for occupation earlier in the year, that this date had been delayed twice and that it was still not ready. Could the Portfolio Holder advise when the property would be ready for occupation?

Councillor Grocock responded that an initial survey had been

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

undertaken on the property which had not identified all issues. Within the next few days, members will be invited to look at the finished property. The identified budget that the Council had originally set had been adhered to however, the property had overrun due to COVID and manpower issues, but it would be delivered shortly.

**Question to:** Councillors Coupland, Worth and Grocock  
**Question From:** Councillor Alcock  
**Subject:** Christmas shopping promotion in Spalding and Holbeach

Councillor Alcock commented that a comprehensive range of events was being held in Spalding and Holbeach, along with competitions, to encourage local shopping during the festive period. Why could the same not be done for the other towns in the district?

Councillor Coupland stated that community budgets and local regeneration were funding these schemes, and Councillor Worth confirmed that the Spalding and Holbeach Town Improvement Funds were being used. There were no improvement funds for other towns in the district.

Councillor Alcock commented that it was sad that funds could not be found for the other towns. As money was being spent in Spalding and Holbeach, he raised again a question that had been asked at a previous meeting of the Council – what was being done to address the mess made by pigeons, and the poor state of some of the empty shops in Spalding.

Councillor Grocock responded that the funding being used to welcome back shoppers into Spalding and Holbeach had been available to other towns and villages, and all Parish Councils had been contacted however, only one reply had been received. With regard to the pigeons, he advised that signs had been put out to not feed the pigeons, local businesses had been contacted where there were issues, and there had been discussions at the steering group. With regard to funding, Councillor Worth commented that money from the Welcome Back fund was still available, and he asked councillors to encourage the Parish Councils to respond if funding was required.

**Question to:** Councillor Astill  
**Question From:** Councillor Gibson  
**Subject:** Live streaming of meetings

Councillor Gibson commented that other Councils were holding many of their meetings within Council Chambers again, and were live-streaming the meetings – did the Council have a timeframe for

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

this to be happening at SHDC?

Councillor Astill commented that not all meetings were being held in the Council Chamber as it could not safely accommodate large numbers due to social distancing as a result of the Covid pandemic. An update of equipment was currently being undertaken by Democratic Services and PSPSL, to update the equipment within the Council Chamber, to enable improved technical functionality.

**58. COMMITTEE MINUTES**

The minutes of the following Committees and Panels were noted:

- Performance Monitoring Panel – 8 September 2021
- Committee of the Licensing Authority – 16 September 2021
- Policy Development Panel – 21 September 2021
- Planning Committee – 6 October 2021
- Special meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel – 19 October 2021
- Planning Committee – 10 November 2021
- Committee of the Licensing Authority – 11 November 2021

It was noted that the minutes of the meetings of Performance Monitoring Panel on 9 November 2021 and Governance and Audit Committee on 11 November 2021 were still to be finalised, and would be added to the next meeting of Council for noting.

**59. KEY DECISION PLAN**

Consideration was given to the Key Decision Plan.

**DECISION:**

That the Key Decision Plan be received.

**60. LEGAL STREET ART WALL PETITION**

The following petition had recently been submitted to the Council:

**Title:** Legal Street Art Wall

**Statement:** We the undersigned petition the Council to help us organise/find a designated area/wall/walls to become a legal spot in Spalding for street artists/artists to be able to paint there.

**Justification:** Many from around the area have commented on social media, after seeing some local work and talent, that it would be a nice attraction for the town to have a legal street art wall – somewhere people can go to paint. Peterborough has one and it has been a huge attraction for the city, with people coming from all over

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

the country to visit the artwork. Having something like this in Spalding will attract many big named street artists to come and paint here, and also be an attraction for the town, bringing more business/customers to the rest of the town whilst they visit. Schools can also use an area/wall to do art projects, and the local community could put on workshops, to teach the younger generation about the street art culture, to respect the artwork and to teach them how to do it.

In line with the Council's petition scheme, the petition organiser was invited to present the petition for debate at Full Council. The Chairman welcomed Karl Barfoot (petition organiser) and Adam Sadd to the meeting, and they raised the following points in respect of their petition:

- Karl and Adam had met through doing street art and painting in Peterborough. Their aim was do something closer to home and to give something back to the town;
- They had liaised with Spalding Wombles to do some artwork on arches behind the Spalding Rugby Club. This had resulted in a tribute to Captain Sir Tom Moore, which had received positive feedback;
- Public reaction to artwork undertaken had been positive – it had been publicised online, on the radio, newspapers and the BBC;
- They felt that street art would not increase the incidence of graffiti. Since doing projects around town, there had been no vandalism of the artwork, and very little increase in graffiti in the town;
- No Council funding would be needed for a legal street art wall – all that was required was a wall on which to do the artwork;
- The organisers would keep the wall tidy and were happy to maintain the area if any offensive material appeared on it. However, it was felt that the artwork would not be defaced;
- There was a large amount of public support for the proposal;
- Graffiti artists were looking for a site where they could legally express themselves
- Karl and Adam were happy to share pictures of work they had undertaken, and much of it was available to view on FaceBook;

Following the presentation, Council members considered the information, and the following points were made:

- Members congratulated Karl and Adam on their presentation to Council.
- The Leader commented that if the Authority was to provide a Council-owned wall to the individuals, it would have to be done with a certain amount of governance around it to ensure there

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

were no issues further down the line. He had spoken with the Chairman of the Policy Development Panel and suggested that the issue be considered by a sub-committee of the Panel. Issues to be considered would be how the space was managed, criteria, who could use it and where. The Panel was not due to meet again until after Christmas however, a special meeting would be set up to start the process off. After the Panel had considered the issues, the ultimate decision would be made by the Cabinet.

- It was important for the potential wall to be an asset to the town, and that it was not vandalised.
- Councillors Carter and Worth had met Karl and Adam and this had been a very positive experience. They wanted to work with the Authority to find out what was required, and then interpret this into their work. The Councillors were willing to assist with regard to Holbeach.
- People would have different opinions on art however, it was generally felt that this work was positive. Some street art in Peterborough had raised the profile of mental health, and the tribute to Captain Sir Tom Moore in Spalding had been well received and improved a run-down area.
- Councillor Newton commented that when she had been first aware of the petition, she had suggested that the Monkshouse Pavilion could be a suitable place for this artwork. This suggestion had been declined but she agreed that it was important for more detailed consideration to be given to the proposal – there could be many positive outcomes to it.
- Members agreed that the artists were very talented.
- There needed to be some control over the content on the proposed wall, and this could be considered as part of the work of the Policy Development Panel.
- Within East Lindsey and Boston areas, there were some examples of art work near the train station – it had not been defaced and looked positive. It was felt that if the work was good, it would not be defaced. It was encouraging to hear that the artists were happy to take responsibility for the wall.
- Councillor Taylor had spoken with Karl in the summer regarding ideas for his ward. They were talented artists, and it would be good for the Authority to work together with them.
- Members questioned whether this group of individuals would be the only ones entitled to work on the wall, or could other individuals contribute, and would content be shared before being added to the wall? It was felt that this was an area for the Policy Development Panel to consider as part of its deliberations.
- It was a good idea to use this type of art to tidy up untidy areas.
- Could consideration be given to using the skate park in Spalding for this type of artwork, in an effort to address graffiti issues?
- The Chairman of the Policy Development Panel confirmed that

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

he was happy for this piece of work to come through the Panel, to ensure that it was dealt with correctly.

- The work had brightened up some areas that were more run down and had created a destination in some cases. It was important that the town was able to flourish and to be kept safer – if taken forward correctly, this would be a positive move forward.

Members supported the proposal made by Councillor Porter, that the issue be considered by a sub-committee of the Policy Development Panel.

**DECISION:**

That a special meeting of the Policy Development Panel be organised in order to consider membership of a sub-committee to look at the potential creation of a street art wall, and issues to be addressed. Potential issues raised for consideration included:

- Governance around the operation of the street art wall;
- How the space could be managed, to include – who could contribute to the artwork on the wall; content of the artwork; who would be responsible for maintaining the wall should it be defaced, and to keep it in a good state;
- Potential locations

**61. REPORT FROM CABINET MEETING ON 26 OCTOBER 2021**

Consideration was given to the report of Cabinet which sought approval for the Cabinet's recommendations in respect of the HRA Housing Delivery Framework. The report introduced a HRA Housing Delivery Framework to inform future investment decisions for the HRA Capital Programme relating to housing development.

The report was presented to the Council by the Portfolio Holder for HRA and Private Sector Housing.

The following point was made:

- At section 6.6.3 of the report, second item in the table 'Do we have the appropriate skillset in-house to deliver the range of different housing delivery models' – was this statement presently correct and if not, what action did the Authority intend to take?
  - The Head of Delivery advised that, when the report had been written, the appropriate staff had been available. Since then, the Housing Development Programme Manager had left her post. A recruitment process to fill this role was currently underway and, once this role was filled, the authority would again have the skill set required.



**DECISION:**

- 1) That the HRA Housing Delivery Framework, at Appendix A to the report, which informs and guides future Executive decisions for the HRA Capital Programme for housing development, be approved;
- 2) That the HRA Housing Delivery Framework be included as a local choice policy in the Council's Policy Framework and that the Constitution, at Article 4.3 be amended accordingly; and
- 3) That the Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate Development) and S151 be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, to negotiate, approve, enter into and sign grant agreements relating to grant allocations which have been approved by Council, Cabinet or Portfolio Holder relating to the delivery of homes for the HRA.

**62. GAMBLING ACT POLICY (STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES)**

Consideration was given to the report of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection, which requested approval of the draft revised Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles).

**DECISION:**

That the revised Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles), as shown at Appendix A to the report, be approved and adopted.

**63. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Portfolio Holder – Corporate and Communications, and the Assistant Director – Governance, and Monitoring Officer, which requested members consider an amended delegation to officers relating to the determination of planning applications.

**DECISION:**

- 1) That the amended officer delegation detailed in Appendix B to the report be approved with immediate effect;
- 2) That the Constitution be amended accordingly;
- 3) That the Head of Planning be authorised, in consultation with the Leader, to re-apply the previous officer protocol/delegation (i.e. the protocol/delegation that applied from 13 May 2020 to 24

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

November 2021) if at any time legal restrictions made it impossible to hold both physical and virtual meetings of the Planning Committee due to Covid, such protocol/delegation to extend up to and including the date on which the agenda for the physical or virtual meeting was issued; and

- 4) That the above delegation to the Head of Planning be applied as often as may be necessary.

**64. POLITICAL GROUP REGULATIONS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Deputy Chief Executive – Corporate Development and Section 151 Officer, which asked members to confirm, in accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, amended Political Balance calculations.

On 1 October 2021, Councillor Bingham joined the Conservative Group, and a review of political group seats was therefore required to be undertaken as soon as practicable.

Calculations for allocation of appointments for the Conservative Group, Independent Group and non-aligned were detailed within the report, the main points being as follows:

Calculation of total allocation of seats across all committees and sub-committees to which the Political Regulations applied, provided:

- The Conservative Group was entitled to 60 seats. The calculation of seat allocations at individual committee level resulted in a figure of 61, due to rounding up and rounding down. However, the overall calculation (of 60 seats) had to take precedence;
- The Independent Group was entitled to 30 seats. This figure was consistent with the calculation of allocation of seats at individual committee level;
- Two seats remained unallocated after the Conservative Group and Independent Group allocations. Under Regulation 16(3), these 'spare' seats are allocated to non-aligned members (i.e. Councillor McLean). At the individual committee level, the calculation resulted in the non-aligned member being entitled to only one seat. However, the overall calculation (of 2 seats) had to take precedence;
- As a result of the above, it would be necessary to allocate one Conservative seat (as calculated at committee level) to the non-aligned member.

Political Group calculations were included in Appendix A to the

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

report, and are detailed below:

<b>Political Balance</b>	<b>Members</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Allocated Seats</b>
Conservative	24	64.864	60
Independent	12	32.432	30
Non-aligned	1		2 remaining
<b>Totals</b>	<b>37</b>		<b>92</b>

<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF SEATS</b>	<b>SEAT ENTITLEMENT CONSERVATIVE</b>	<b>SEAT ENTITLEMENT INDEPENDENT</b>	<b>REMAINING NON-ALIGNED</b>
PMP	15	Cons 9.729 <b>(10)</b>	Ind 4.864% <b>(5)</b>	0
PDP	16	Cons 10.378 <b>(10)</b>	Ind 5.189 <b>(5)</b>	1
Planning	15	Cons 9.729 <b>(10)</b>	Ind 4.864% <b>(5)</b>	0
Licensing Committee	15	Cons 9.729 <b>(10)</b>	Ind 4.864% <b>(5)</b>	0
Committee of the Licensing Authority	15	Cons 9.729 <b>(10)</b>	Ind 4.864% <b>(5)</b>	0
Governance* & Audit	7	Cons 4.540 <b>(5)</b>	Ind 2.270 <b>(2)</b>	0
Chief Officer Employment Panel	3	Cons 1.945 <b>(2)</b>	Ind 0.972 <b>(1)</b>	0
Chief Officer Employment Appeals Panel	3	Cons 1.945 <b>(2)</b>	Ind 0.972 <b>(1)</b>	0
Shared Memo of Agreement Panel	3	Cons 1.945 <b>(2)</b>	Ind 0.972 <b>(1)</b>	0
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>61**</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>

\*Currently one vacancy seat on Governance and Audit Committee

\*\* Total seat calculations take precedence

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

**DECISION:**

- 1) That, subject to (2) below, the Council agree changes to the political balance of Committees in accordance with Appendix A; and
- 2) That as a result of calculations for the allocation of seats for each Committee and Sub-Committee to which the Political Group Regulations applied resulting in one more Conservative seat than the Group was entitled to, one seat (on the Performance Monitoring Panel), which would otherwise be allocated to the Conservative Group, be allocated to the non-aligned member.

**65. NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEES AND OTHER SEATS AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION.**

The following Committee changes were reported to Council:

- Councillor Bingham to replace Councillor King as a member of the Policy Development Panel;
- Councillor Walsh to replace Councillor Seymour as a member of the Planning Committee;
- Councillor Newton to replace Councillor McLean as a member of the Licensing Committee and the Committee of the Licensing Authority;
- Councillor Bingham to take the vacant position on the Governance and Audit Committee.

**DECISION:**

That the following appointments be approved:

- Councillor Bingham to replace Councillor King as a member of the Policy Development Panel;
- Councillor Walsh to replace Councillor Seymour as a member of the Planning Committee;
- Councillor Newton to replace Councillor McLean as a member of the Licensing Committee and the Committee of the Licensing Authority;
- Councillor Bingham to take the vacant position on the Governance and Audit Committee.

**66. HEALTH SCRUTINY FOR LINCOLNSHIRE REPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of Councillor Scalese in respect of Health Scrutiny for Lincolnshire.

**DECISION:**

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

That the report be noted.

**67. NABMA ANNUAL CONFERENCE AND AGM**

Consideration was given to the report of Councillor Newton in respect of NABMA Annual Conference and AGM.

**DECISION:**

That the report be noted.

**68. SOUTH AND EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCILS PARTNERSHIP**

(The Joint Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth) and the Deputy Chief Executive (Programme Delivery) and SIRO left the meeting prior to discussion of this item).

Consideration was given to the report of the Joint Strategic Advisor which provided the Council with an update on the progress of the Partnership in conclusion of the Setting the Foundations stage of the approved business case, and to establish and recommend the key elements of the Set-Up stage for the Partnership.

Information was included within the report around the proposed Work Programme, Performance Framework, Financial Opportunities, Governance Framework and Employment Terms and Conditions (including pay) for the Integrated Shared Senior Management Team.

It was noted that Boston Council had considered the same report at its Council meeting on 22 November 2021 and the recommendations had been agreed unanimously. East Lindsey District Council would consider the report at its Council meeting on 15 December 2021.

Members considered the information within the report, and the following points were raised:

- Members had been advised of savings of £4.65million over 10 years – clarification was sought as to whether this was based on a particular scale, or upon an average.
  - Members were advised that the savings were a comparison to the cost of the senior management teams before they were shared, compared with the projected cost of the Integrated Shared Senior Management Team inclusive of the items detailed in the exempt appendix to the agenda. If the proposals within the report were agreed, £4.65million would be the total of savings achieved over a 10 year period.

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

- Members noted that Appendix A laid out the Strategic Programme for the Partnership, and Health and Wellbeing/Health and Leisure offer featured within the priorities. In Section 2 of the appendix (Corporate Priorities), there were a number of statements which in member views required modification in order to make them clearer when clarifying requirements in the future, and to not prohibit any potential solutions in the future.
  - (Page 164 of the agenda pack) - 'To target leisure facilities to provide a programme of activities to tackle obesity and inactivity in South Holland' – it was suggested that 'and to encourage participation therein' be added to the end of this statement. Although it was important to provide facilities, it was also necessary to follow this up by encouraging people to participate.
  - (Page 166 of the agenda pack) - 'To lead the provision of contracted leisure facilities and explore options for future delivery to enhance the wellbeing of South Holland's communities' – this statement appeared to pre-suppose that the Authority would be leading provision of contracted leisure facilities in the future. The following wording was suggested - 'To lead the provision of contracted leisure facilities and explore all options to create improved facilities for future delivery to enhance the wellbeing of South Holland communities'.
- Officers confirmed that, with regard to the Work Programme, what was being proposed was an opportunity across the partnership to work much more closely around leisure provision and health and wellbeing. Each Council would continue to have its own Corporate Plan, but there would also be the opportunity to work in partnership towards common priorities and goals.
- The Leader requested that the above point be noted, and agreed that the document for agreement not constrain ambitions in the future but add to them.

**DECISION:**

- 1) That the progress of the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership since approval by Council on 29 July 2021 be noted;
- 2) That the Work Programme priorities for the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership for the Set-Up stage, as set out in Appendix A, be approved;
- 3) That the Performance Framework and the frequency of performance reporting to Council for the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership, as set out in Appendix B, be

**SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL -**  
24 November 2021

noted;

- 4) That the financial opportunities for the MTFS for each partnership Council to be developed as part of the budgeting setting process for each Council, as set out in Appendix C, be noted;
- 5) That the governance framework for the South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership and proposals for the scrutiny of the partnership on an annual basis, be noted; and
- 6) The employment terms and conditions (including the pay structure) for the Integrated Shared Senior Management Team as set out in Appendix D be approved.

**69. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT**

There were none.

**70. RESTRICTED MINUTE**

Consideration was given to the restricted minute of the meeting of Full Council held on 22 September 2021.

Members agreed that there was no requirement to discuss the content of the restricted minute and there was therefore no need for the meeting to go into private session.

**DECISION:**

That the restricted minute be signed as a correct record

(The meeting ended at 7.55 pm)

(End of minutes)