Councillors Adamou, Adje, Alexander, Allison, Amin, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Bloch, Brabazon, Browne (Mayor), Bull, Butcher, Canver, Christophides, Cooke, Davies, Demirci, Diakides, Dogus, Egan, Ejiofor, Engert, Erskine, Gibson, Goldberg, Gorrie, Griffith, Hare, Jenks, Khan, Kober, Mallett, McNamara, Meehan, Newton, Peacock, Reece, Reid, Reith, Rice, Schmitz, Scott, Solomon, Stanton, Stennett, Stewart, Strang, Strickland, Vanier, Waters, Watson, Weber, Whyte, Williams, Wilson and Winskill

Apologies Councillor

Absent: Councillor Error! No document variable supplied.

| MINUTE NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION | ACTION BY |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| CNCL40. | TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | |
| | There were no apologies for absence. | |
| CNCL41. | TO ASK THE MAYOR TO CONSIDER THE ADMISSION OF ANY LATE ITEMS OF BUSINESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 100B OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 The Assistant Chief Executive – Mr Young advised that there were 2 late items of business, which could not be available earlier, and which would need to be dealt with at the meeting. | |
| | <u>Item 12 – To receive reports from the following Bodies</u> <u>Report No 1 2012/13 of the Cabinet meeting – 13 November 2012</u> Mr Young advised that the report of Cabinet of 13 November 2012 required consideration and adoption by Full Council in respect of the Revision of Statement of Gambling Policy. The report was late for consideration and could not be forwarded to Full Council until Cabinet had considered the proposals on 13 November 2012. 13 – Questions and Written Answers | |
| | Mr Young advised that notice of questions was not requested until 8 clear days before the meeting, following which the matters raised had to be researched and replies prepared to be given at the meeting. | |
| | The Mayor agreed to take Item 12(ii) – Report No1 2012/13 under the | |

| | provision and in accordance with Section 100B (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972. |
|--------|--|
| | The Mayor MOVED a variation to the order of business to consider agenda Item 12 after Item 8, and this was agreed nemine contradicente. |
| | NOTED |
| NCL42. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST |
| | Councillor Rahman-Khan declared a personal interest in Item 14 – Motion C as a family member working full time received tax credits. |
| | The Chief Whip sought guidance from the Head of Legal Services and Monitoring officer in respect of deputation request from the Pinkham Way Alliance, and any issues for Members in respect of being members of the Council's Planning Sub-Committee, or the North London Waste Authority (NLWA). |
| | Mr Ryan advised the meeting that in noting the deputation from the Pinkham Way Alliance at Agenda item 9 and the more broad debate on Waste under the Haringey debate at Agenda item 11, in his capacity as Monitoring Officer he was giving advice to members on interests so that members may be clear on their ability to participate in the debate and not say anything to prejudice themselves from participation in future decisions in respect of waste disposal, in particular planning applications. |
| | Mr Ryan advised that it was important to be aware that the Haringey debate was not a decision-making matter but rather an opportunity for a general exchange of views on issues of importance to the Council. In these circumstances a broad range of views may be exchanged and it was possible that there would be at least passing reference to planning applications in relation to waste disposal in the borough, a matter upon which decisions would be made by planning members in the future. Similar comments applied to the deputation. |
| | Mr Ryan commented that in respect of the current members of the Planning Sub-Committee, or those trained to be substitutes, may be required at a future point to determine planning applications regarding waste disposal in the borough but that this would not prejudice them from participating in these items. Nevertheless those members needed to be careful not to express views which demonstrated a closed mind upon the subject as that may be regarded as amounting to predetermination of any question which would come forward for decision in the future. Other members who were not currently members of the Planning Sub-Committee, but may be in future years, might also wish to take account of this to safeguard their position should they be required to participate in future planning decisions relating to waste disposal in the borough. |

| | Mr Ryan further advised that Members of the NLWA may wish to declare a personal interest in both items arising from their membership of that authority. Under the current code of conduct there was no requirement to declare personal interests, but members may do so if they wished Mr Ryan concluded that he hoped that the advice would assist members to participate appropriately in the debate. | |
|---------|--|--|
| | Councillor Dogus declared a personal interest in Item 9 – Deputation from the Pinkham Way Alliance, and Item 11 – Haringey Debate as resident close to the area of Pinkham Way. | |
| | Councillor Meehan declared a personal interest in Item 9 - Deputation from the Pinkham Way Alliance, and Item 11 – Haringey Debate, as a Member of NLWA. | |
| | Councillor Canver, in rising to declare a personal interest in Item 9 - Deputation from the Pinkham Way Alliance, and Item 11 – Haringey Debate, as a Member of NLWA, was advised by the Mayor that it was not necessary for her to make the declaration. | |
| | NOTED | |
| CNCL43. | TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON 16 JULY 2012 & 16 OCTOBER 2012 RESOLVED: | |
| | That the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 16 July 2012, and 16 October 2012 be signed as a true record. | |
| CNCL44. | TO RECEIVE SUCH COMMUNICATIONS AS THE MAYOR MAY LAY BEFORE THE COUNCIL i. Presentation of Andy Ludlow Homelessness Award 2012 | |
| | The Mayor announced with pleasure that Haringey's Hearthstone centre, which offered domestic violence advice and support, had won a prestigious award. The Mayor advised that the Andy Ludlow Homelessness Award 2012 recognised the innovative approach Hearthstone had taken to help survivors of domestic abuse in the borough and help them avoid becoming homeless and this has been recognised with this award. | |
| | Councillor Bevan advised that for more than a decade, the Andy Ludlow Homelessness Awards had been established as the foremost awards recognising innovative work to tackle homelessness in London. The awards were sponsored by the London Housing Foundation, the 33 London councils and Shelter and were run by London Councils. Hearthstone developed a holistic approach to addressing domestic violence, encouraging | |

speak.

| | greater co-operation between the agencies to improve the experience for the survivor and this was recognised with this award. |
|-------|--|
| | Councillor Bevan advised that the award was especially poignant for Haringey Council as Andy Ludlow was a much respected director of housing and social services in the borough. |
| awaro | The Mayor asked the team to come forward to receive their d. |
| | The team were: |
| | Sophie Dixon, Hearthstone Manager Cynthia Greer, Senior Hearthstone Support Worker Karen Vincent, Hearthstone Support Worker Hayley Holohan, Hearthstone Support Worker Margaret Symister, Hearthstone administrator and one additional member of staff in the team who was on leave – Abigail Brennan, Hearthstone Support Worker |
| | Following a brief summary of how the award monies would be used within the centre, and further congratulations from Councillor Watson the team received a round of applause from members of the Council. |
| | NOTED |
| ii. | Presentation from the Mayor's Charity "Action for Kids" |
| | The Mayor introduced Mr David Budd from Action for Kids, the Mayor's Charity and ask him to give a brief presentation and answer questions on the work the organisation was doing. |
| | Mr Budd addressed the meeting highlighting the Mayor's positive involvement in the past 6 months by his visiting the Action for Kids Offices and getting to know the staff and better understanding the Charity's aims, and attending the Trustee Board meeting. The mains aims of the Charity were to work with kids in developing |
| | confidence and to equip them with the requisite skills to get them ready for a job in the world of work through the creation of jobs and opportunities. |

| | Ms Nolan commented on her experiences with Action for Kids since she was 16 (some 6 years) and the work they did to build self esteem and confidence, whichhad considerably low at that time. Through the Charity;s effort Ms Nolan advised that she had had worked in a voluntary capacity in a Charity in Muswell Hill together with a work experience placement at Sansbury's Musweell Hill, which she hoped would lead to a permant work position. Through gaining confidence in public speaking Ms Nolan commented on the large number of capacity events she had now spoken at to raise the profile of the Charity by detailing her own experiences. | |
|---------|---|--|
| | In response to questions from Councillor Egan Ms Read advised that most of the individuals referred to the Charity were from Schools and Colleges, and there was assistance given to people in their 20's and 30's as well, and also some referrals came from the Local Authority Social Services. | |
| | Councillor Winskill commented on the forthcoming fund raising carol concert event at Hornsey Town Hall on Saturday 8 December 2012 to which Action for Kids was supporting, and hoped that as many Councillors as possible would be attending. | |
| | The Council gave Mr Butt, Ms Nolan and Ms Read a resounding round of applause. | |
| | The Mayor thanked each of the representatives for their attendance. | |
| | 3. The Death of ex Councillor Ann Douglas | |
| | The Mayor, with regret, reported the death of Ann Douglas who was a former Labour Councillor for Green Lanes Ward (1986- 1987), who died peacefully on Wednesday 8 August 2012. As a mark of respect, the Council stood for a minute's silence. | |
| CNCL45. | TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND INTERIM HEAD OF PAID SERVICE There were no matters to report. | |
| CNCL46. | TO RECEIVE THE REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER AND HEAD OF LEGAL SERVICES There were no matters to report. | |
| CNCL47. | TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES | |

| | r | | |
|---------|---|--|--|
| | The Chief Whip – Councillor Egan MOVED the recommendation as set out in the circulated report. Councillor Wilson asked that the Minority Group's opposition to the proposed appointment be registered as whilst he had no doubt the nominated member – Cllr Egan would serve the position well, Cllr Egan served a Ward in the north the Borough, and it was not close in local vicinity to Finsbury Park and that the vacancy should be filled by a Liberal Democrat Councillor serving in the vicinity of the Park. Councillor Egan responded that he had been recommended as part of the commitment to the One Borough/One Future policy that the Council had adopted. | | |
| | It was then | | |
| | RESOLVED: | | |
| | That the appointment to the outside bodies be approved, as detailed in the Appendix to the report. | | |
| | The Mayor then advised that the meeting would next consider Item 12 as agreed earlier at agenda item 2. | | |
| CNCL48. | TO RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE FOLLOWING BODIES | | |
| | | | |
| | i <u>CORPORATE COMMITTEE REPORT NO 2 2012/13</u> Councillor Meehan – Chair of the Corporate Committee MOVED the recommendations as contained in the report of the Corporate Committee of 27 September 2012 in respect of Treasury Management 2012/13 Mid Year Activity &Performance Update. RESOLVED: | | |
| | That the Treasury Management activity undertaken during the first half of 2012/13 and the performance achieved be noted. | | |
| | ii. CABINET REPORT NO 1 - 2012/13 | | |
| | Councillor Kober – Chair of Cabinet MOVED the recommendations as contained in the report of Cabinet of 13 November 2012 in respect of the revised Statement of Gambling Policy 2013-2016 as detailed in appendix 1 to the circulated report. | | |
| | RESOLVED: That approval be given to the adoption of the revised Statement of Gambling Policy 2013-2016 as detailed in appendix 1 to the circulated report. | | |
| | | | |
| CNCL49. | TO CONSIDER REQUESTS TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS AND/OR | | |

PETITIONS AND, IF APPROVED, TO RECEIVE THEM There were two deputations to address the meeting, and one petition.

The first deputation was received from Jonathan Boswell and Nicky Pryce in respect of Second Annual Carbon Report. Mr Boswell commented that he was speaking on behalf of local environmental campaigners who try to live sustainably and raise awareness of climate change.

In advising that he was a member of the cross party Haringey 40:20 Steering Group together with other local and community /environmental groups, Mr Boswell commented on the excellence of the report before the Council. He also advised that as he and Nicky were Grandparents they were acutely concerned regarding the future the world was facing with the evident environmental crisis, the deepening recession, poverty levels both nationally and locally in Haringey, together with the direct and indirect changes in climate and extreme weather conditions, of floods and devastation in the wake of the recent Hurricane Sandy. Mr Boswell commented that whilst the 40:20 target was ambitious to meet this target, it required more than just Local Authority efforts. In praising the excellence of the Haringey Carbon Commission report, every effort was needed locally and nationally to achieve these goals in order to make Haringey a more environmentally sound place to live.

Mr Pryce emphasised that it was possible to change direction, to reduce carbon emissions while at the same time generating sustainable jobs and creating growth in the local economy. The 'green' economy was one of the few sectors of the economy that had shown growth in recent years, and measures such as reducing energy consumption would reduce utility costs, freeing up more money to be spent in the local community. More ambitiously, a community utility company, harnessing sustainable sources of power, could create new jobs and reduce people's bills, but would require partnership between the Council, local businesses, individual residents and the Government. The steering group praised the Council for its progress so far, but there was more to be done, and would require a national effort. All Councillors were invited to give this work their full support.

Members asked questions of the deputation and received responses thereto.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Carbon Reduction responded to the deputation and thanked both speakers for highlighting the need to take firm action on climate change. The carbon commission would continue to work with community bodies on these issues, and individuals also needed to take decisions to reduce carbon emissions and meet targets. There was a need for a political consensus in order to drive this forward, as ultimately these were issues affecting everyone's future.

The second deputation was received from Stephen Brice – on behalf of Pinkham Way Alliance in respect of the Waste Debate on the agenda

later in the proceedings. Mr Brice advised that the long term contract the Council was entering into with the North London Waste Alliance with regard to the Pinkham Way site would lead to the risk of financial penalties, were the Council to produce insufficient waste to meet the plant's capacity in future. It was reported that this had already happened in Stoke on Trent. The trends in London were for higher levels of recycling and a reduction in waste; these trends were likely to accelerate in the next few years and may lead to a shortfall in the amount of waste produced for processing. The proposed contract would therefore lead to the risk of councils being punished for reducing their levels of waste below the minimum level required in the contract, and would tie the Council in for many years.

Members asked questions of the deputation and received responses thereto.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Social Inclusion responded to the deputation. Cllr Strickland advised that estimating the amount of waste that would be produced throughout the duration of the contract was a standard way of contracting such an agreement, and would enable the authority to obtain better value for money and better environmental solutions. The risk of incurring financial penalties was felt to be low, as the estimates used had taken into account the anticipated increase in recycling rates and reduction in levels of household waste. Moreover, the guaranteed minimum tonnage had been set at 70% of the estimates. Compared with today's levels of waste, there would have to be more than a 50% reduction in waste levels in order to fall beneath the minimum levels of waste set out in the contract.

The Mayor reported that a petition had been received from Chris Ostwald representing traders and user/residents of Muswell Hill requesting the Council to reduce the extremely high cost of pay and display charges in Muswell Hill. The Mayor advised that as the petition was in excess of 2200 signatures a debate would follow receipt of the petition.

The Mayor asked that the named representative give a brief presentation to the meeting for no more than 5 minutes. Mr Ostwald spoke in respect the requests to the Council to reduce the extremely high cost of pay and display charges in Muswell Hill, which was putting customers off using the local high street and was having a detrimental effect on local shopkeepers, particularly in the current economic climate. Local shops were a source of local employment and it was therefore important to encourage people to support them; it was also more environmentally sustainable for people to use their local high street. The Council was asked to consider the strength of local feeling, represented by over 5,000 signatures.

Members sought clarification on points of clarification of the petitioner. A 15 minute debate amongst members of the essence of the petition took place.

| | The Cabinet Member for the Environment responded to the petitioners. Cllr Canver advised that this petition highlighted the difficulties facing local businesses in the current financial environment, across the country. The parking charges had been set on 2010, at which time demand was regularly exceeding capacity, and the consultation response at that time had indicated that turnover of parking spaces was the main concern. |
|---------|---|
| | At this point in the proceedings Councillor Wilson MOVED a variation to the order of business to consider Item 14 – MOTION D as part of this debate/discussion, in accordance with Part Four, Section A 3.2(ii) and 14 (c) of the Constitution. The MOTION was seconded by Councillor Bloch. |
| | Councillors Egan and Kober responded to the MOTION request. |
| | On a Vote there being 22 for, and 34 against the MOTION was lost. |
| | The Mayor thanked both the deputee and petitioners for their attendance. |
| | NOTED |
| | |
| CNCL50. | SECOND ANNUAL CARBON REPORT |
| | The Cabinet Member Finance and Sustainability – Councillor Goldberg presented Haringey's Second Annual Carbon report, which set out very clearly the actions the borough would take in order to reduce carbon emissions in Haringey by 40% by 2020. There was a very clear environmental and economic case for undertaking this work, as the economic cost to the UK, were climate change not addressed, would be severe. It was understood that this was the only report of its kind in the country to a Full Council, and demonstrated, in a transparent way, Haringey's commitment to this issue. As set out in the report, progress had been made, for example the zero carbon community centre, sustainable investment fund, green light business support and low carbon zone, but there was still much more to do, given the scale of the challenge. Climate change should change the way in which enterprise was thought about, and encourage the consumption of locally-made products, supporting local businesses. Climate change was real, and would continue to have an impact on the UK economy; the case for action was clear. ClIr Goldberg commended the report to Full Council. |
| | Mr Andrew Raingold - Executive Director at Aldersgate Group, addressed the meeting following Cllr Goldberg's introduction. Representing a diverse group of business and political leaders, Mr Raingold advised that environmental policy, if designed in the right way, was a key driver for the economy, and his group campaigned for policies that would improve companies' monitoring and managing of their carbon emissions. Being green and economic growth were not mutually exclusive; there was a need to frame what a green economy would look like, and what policies were required in order to achieve it. There were |

| | significant risks for the UK economy related to climate change, not least as a result of an increase in commodity prices associated with climate change. At the same time, there were significant economic opportunities around the ambitious targets set for the reduction in carbon emissions; the UK had a trade surplus with its key partners for environmental goods and services, and the industry was a key job creator, but this was a globally competitive market. Consistent policy around this issue was essential in order to deliver further development. Mr Raingold advised that he was delighted to be able to contribute to the Haringey Carbon Commission, which was a positive and ambitious initiative, which brought opportunities to develop the local economy, create jobs, reduce fuel costs and deliver health benefits to the borough, at the same time as reducing emissions. | | |
|---------|--|--|--|
| | In response to questions regarding the implementation of EU climate- change legislation at a national level, Mr Raingold advised that there was need for action at an EU-level in order to make climate change legislation effective, as the necessary drivers and policy signals were not currently there. | | |
| | Councillor Goldberg concluded the debate and thanked Mr Raingold for his presentation. There was a clear case for Haringey to take the lead on this issue, which related to inequality and social justice, as well as environmental and economic concerns. Cllr Goldberg commended the report to Full Council. | | |
| | The Mayor thanked Mr Raingold for his contribution to the debate. | | |
| | RESOLVED | | |
| | i. that the transparent progress being made by the Council and other organisations, in order to support work towards a 40% carbon reduction target by 2020 and associated local and economic benefits of this activity be noted; | | |
| | ii. that the issues and debate raised by the Second annual carbon report be noted and the Council's full support be given to implementing the recommendations of the Carbon Commission and 40:20 Action Plan; and | | |
| | iii. that in endorsing (ii) above this was on the basis that the wide ranging benefits of action on climate change will hit al the Council's priorities such as jobs and training, health and well being, in addition to environmental considerations. | | |
| CNCL51. | HARINGEY DEBATE - WASTE AND WASTE DISPOSAL IN THE 21ST CENTURY; ISSUES AND TECHNIQUES The Assistant Chief Executive outlined the procedure for the fifth occasion where the Council had a Haringey Debate. | | |
| | The opposition spokesperson – Councillor Solomon gave an introduction of the debate on the issue of waste and waste disposal and where the Council currently is with disposal and techniques, what is likely to happen with waste disposal in the future, and what the options are for | | |

solving any associated problems.

Councillor Solomon introduced Dr Andrew Tubb – from the University of the West of England.

Dr Tubb addressed the meeting and stated that one of the disadvantages of a 25-year contract was that you would be unable to take advantage of emerging technologies, and would be tied into what was in place when the contract was issued. It was not possible to predict what would happen in the next 25 years, and long term contracts were unable to take this into account. The level of risk associated with such a contract would depend on the estimates that had been made regarding anticipated waste amounts for the duration of the contract. Dr Tubb provided information on different waste technologies and their value for money, and indicated that MBT ranked among the lowest for value for money delivered. There were many factors which contributed to the level of waste generated, and the trend for a reduction in waste was likely to continue and even accelerate. It was possible, with the right technologies, to divert 95% of waste from landfill – these solutions were all open to the Council.

Following this the Mayor announced that there would be 45 minutes for debating, with a maximum of 3 minutes speaking time for each speaker. A 45 minute debate then took place.

In response to a question from Cllr Stanton regarding how the assertions made in his presentation could be tested, Dr Tubb advised that a full life cycle analysis of the various options was the only way to really test them, but that this might be difficult to undertake without assistance from external expertise.

Cllr Erskine highlighted that there were a number of ways in which people could individually reduce the level of waste they produce, by choosing to buy products with less packaging, by buying less, by reusing and by repairing. People could always look back at the supply chain of products, and ask companies what they were doing to make their products more recyclable.

Cllr Wilson stated that it was important to bring people with you when introducing changes, and that to this end, consultation was essential. This had not happened when the fortnightly waste collection was rolled out; there should have been a specific pilot, with feedback taken into account and lessons learnt from. As a consequence, work by scrutiny indicated that 40% of residents were not satisfied with the new arrangements. There was a need to recognise that a one size fits all approach was not appropriate across the whole borough, and this had led to issues, which could no longer be called teething problems.

Cllr Jenks advised that he was awaiting a clear answer on the democratic accountability of the NLWA and its exact role, and also asked what Haringey was able to do regarding the present situation. It was suggested that there should be a greater focus on the recycling of

street waste, as debate generally centred on domestic waste arrangements, and it was suggested that a study be commissioned around how street waste recycling levels could be improved. It was felt that Haringey should be looking at all the possible options around increasing the level of recycling.

During the proceedings at 21.55hrs, the Mayor advised that he would use his prerogative and extend the meeting end time to 22.10hrs to allow the remaining Members who had indicated their wish to speak to address the meeting.

Cllr Bull stated that he was in favour of fortnightly waste collection in principle, but that there was a need for a more flexible approach in order to address particular issues in particular areas of the borough. As an example, the Council should be able to work with HMO residents regarding the number of bins they actually needed, rather than allocating a bin per unit, and liaise with residents where bins were identified as overflowing to see if allocating an additional bin would help. Culture change was difficult, but there were positive examples of recycling across the borough; it was necessary to do everything possible to encourage recycling, and to promote the items that could be recycled to raise awareness.

Cllr Hare raised a specific issue with regards to glass recycling, as the current method being employed was felt to be wasteful. It was requested that the Council given special consideration as to how to process glass more efficiently, taking on board technical advice in order to make the best decisions for local residents and the environment.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Social Inclusion addressed the Council on behalf of the Cabinet Member for the Environment, as Cllr Canver had a personal interest in this matter. Cllr Strickland advised that the procurement exercise for the contract was objective-based, with a target of recycling 50% of waste by 2020 and a reduction in the amount of waste going to landfill to less than 15% of current levels. The contract did not bind the Council to a particular technology; waste disposal technology was an issue the NLWA was looking into and the Council would work with the waste authority to ensure that they were able to take advantage of new technologies as these emerged. The points raised during the debate would be fed back to the NLWA. Haringey's target was to be recycling 40% of waste by 2015 and the Council was on track to meet this target. There were lessons for everyone to learn from the introduction of fortnightly collections, which would require culture change across the borough. It was not a consistent position to be in favour of increasing recycling levels, but opposed to fortnightly collections, and the Opposition were asked to reconsider their approach to this issue. This was a priority for all political parties, and it was necessary to work together on getting it right.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Mayor invited Councillor Solomon to

| | respond. | |
|---------|---|--|
| | Cllr Solomon agreed that this should not be a political issue, and that the objective of the debate had been to raise awareness of an issue that many people may not have given a lot of consideration to. If people were better informed, they would know the right questions to ask. There was a need to start changing behaviours from the bottom up. Waste had to be considered as a resource, and this was something that had not seriously been addressed to date. There should be an audit around reuse and recycling in order to get a better picture of the current situation. Publicity on these issues was limited, and could be improved. It was felt that the Council should work together with the NLWA, but should also have its own independent expertise on these issues and develop good practice, in consultation with all councillors. Communication with residents was a crucial matter, and it was not possible to adopt a one-size fits all approach if this were to be successful. The Mayor thanked members for their participation. | |
| CNCL52. | TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, IF ANY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NOS. 9 & 10 | |
| | | |
| | Due to the late hour oral questions 1-8 were not reached and written answers would be supplied to these questions | |
| | NOTED | |
| CNCL53. | TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE NO. 13 Motions C & D (2012/13) | |
| | Motions C & D were not reached due to the late hour. | |

COUNCILLOR DAVID BROWNE

Mayor