

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

3 October 2012

5.00 - 9.55 pm

Present: Councillors Brown (Chair), Rosenstiel (Vice-Chair), Birtles, Boyce, Ashton, Benstead, Herbert and Blackhurst

Executive Councillors Present:

Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources – Councillor Smith
Leader of the Council – Councillor Bick

Officers Present:

Director of Customer and Community Services – Liz Bisset
Director of Environment – Simon Payne
Director of Resources – David Horspool
Head of Corporate Strategy – Andrew Limb
Head of Legal Services – Simon Pugh
Head of Tourism and City Centre Management – Emma Thornton
BID Development Manager – Luke Crane
Committee Manager – Martin Whelan

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

12/63/SR Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tucker, Councillor Blackhurst attended as an alternate member.

12/64/SR Declarations of interest

Councillor Boyce	Personal	Director of Kelsey Kerridge, a premises within the proposed business improvement district area.
Councillor Smith	Personal	Director of Love

		Cambridge in her capacity as Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources.
Councillor Brown	Personal	Member of Cleaner Cambridge Campaign.

12/65/SR Public Questions

Public questions were taken following the officer introduction, and for clarity are included in the main body of the minutes.

12/66/SR The CBbid, Business Improvement District Project (BID)

The Chair explained that a request to make a sound recording of the meeting had been received. All present at the meeting were given the opportunity to request that their contributions were not recorded. No objections were received. A request to film the meeting was subsequently received; no objections were received to the meeting to being filmed.

The Chair highlighted the tabled documents

- Letter received from the CBID task force
- Email from Malcolm Schofield, Chair of Cleaner Cambridge Campaign.

In response to a question regarding the status of the first tabled document, the Chair confirmed that the letter was not in response to a specific email or communication from her.

Objections were raised to taking the public speakers after the officer introduction.

The committee received a report regarding the proposed business improvement district project (BID) from the Director of Environment.

Public Speakers

1. Richard Taylor

Mr Taylor addressed the committee and made the following points;

- Was it still intended for there to be a public meeting, at which the Leader of the Council would take a decision on whether or not to veto the proposals?
- Concern about further loss of opportunities for the public to influence decisions about the city centre.
- The commitment to work through the Community Safety Partnership on issues of crime and public safety was challenged as not being strong enough.
- What level of support did the Leader believe the scheme have amongst the wider public?

2. Nick Allen – Sidney Sussex College (on behalf of the other Colleges)

Mr Allen addressed the committee and made the following comments in support of the proposal.

- The current funding arrangements for Love Cambridge were unsustainable, and the proposal provided an opportunity for a more equitable and sustainable funding arrangement.
- This was an opportunity to build a stronger partnership between the council, private sector and the colleges.

3. Alison Power

Ms Power addressed the committee and made the following comments regarding the proposal.

- Total lack of democratic influence on the proposals.
- Significant concerns about the activities undertaken by BIDs elsewhere in the country.

- Risk assessment and full financial assessment missing from the report.
- Concern about the potential displacement of existing issues, and the assertions published in the Cambridge Evening News that the City had “run out” of money for the management of the city centre.
- Councillors were urged to not rush into making a decision on the proposals.

4. Ian Sandison – Boudoir Femme

Mr Sandison addressed the committee and made the following comments in support of the proposal.

- Fully in support of the proposals, even though his business was below the threshold to vote in the ballot or pay the levy.
- Opportunity to simplify the organisation of major events such as the provision of Christmas lights.

5. Mr Abraham

Mr Abraham addressed the committee and made the following comments regarding the proposal.

- Significant concerns about the difficulty of securing employment locally.
- The cost incurred in developing and running the scheme would be better spent on reducing unemployment.
- Significant reservations about the ability of the BID process to deliver significant additional employment opportunities.
- The ballot outcome was already rigged due to the threshold being set at £20k, and that the proposals were not democratic or open to public scrutiny.

The leader responded to the points raised by the first five public speakers and made the following comments.

- Whilst there had been a commitment to a public decision on whether to exercise the veto or not, a meeting hadn't been promised.
- The Council was committed to public decision-making, but on this occasion the Council was just one part of the decision making process and the proposals could continue without the support of the Council.
- The activities proposed were activities, which businesses and organisations could voluntarily provide at present without the consent of the council being required. The Leader highlighted that the BID proposal had originated from businesses and not the Council.
- Policing activities were not proposed and had never been proposed as part of the BID. The Leader welcomed the commitment of the task force to confirm that the consent of the Community Safety Partnership would be required to approve any activities of this nature in the future.
- The Leader, in reference to public support, it was suggested that the public would struggle to understand why the Council had declined to support significant improvements to the city centre, which business and commercial organisations were proposing to fund.
- The Leader confirmed that it was not the intention to transfer any powers, assets or statutory responsibilities from the City Council to the BID, nor was the BID motivated by economic necessity.
- The Leader noted the other comments raised by the speakers.

Mr Abraham in response to the Leader, re-asserted his opposition to public money being used to support the development of the proposals.

6. Malcolm Schofield – Cleaner Cambridge Campaign

Mr Schofield addressed the committee and made the following comments regarding the proposal.

- The Cleaner Cambridge Campaign conditionally supported the proposals.
- It was noted that the Council's annual liability was the equivalent of the cost of cleaning the market square 250 times.

- The issue of cleanliness paled into insignificance when compared with congestion.

7. Anne Bannell - Breeze

Ms Bannell addressed the committee and made the following comments in support of the proposals;

- She had operated an independent business for 27 years and was a member of the BID Task Force.
- The proposed fees would be cheaper than the existing arrangements for recycling and Christmas lights, so should not be seen as a tax.
- The proposed arrangements were much more equitable than the existing Love Cambridge arrangements,

8. Lucy McMahon

Ms McMahon addressed the committee and made the following comments;

- What assurances were available regarding the ongoing ability to undertake political protests in the city centre, particularly as they were already banned in the Grand Arcade and the Lion Yard?
- What assurances were available regarding the effect on the homeless and buskers in the city centre?

9. Andrew Watson – NO2ID

Mr Watson addressed the committee and made the following comments;

- Previous issues with difficulties in receiving consistent information from Council officers regarding street activities was highlighted, and specifically the likelihood of confusion about responsibilities in the future.
- Significant concern was raised regarding the community safety activities undertaken under the umbrella of other business improvement districts. Assurances were sought that the BID would not seek accreditation from the Home Office to secure any policing powers..

10. Christopher Powell – Powell and Bull

Mr Powell addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal. The committee were advised that the proposals were a gift from the retail community, and should be supported.

The Leader responded to public speaker 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and made the following comments.

- The proposals would not affect the management of the public realm, nor would they adversely effect the homeless or buskers.
- The proposals didn't include any quasi police power and this had been re-confirmed by the tabled letter from the task force. The Leader also highlighted that significant safeguards were proposed to manage any future proposals, which may arise.
- The leader asked for a new written undertaking from the BID manager that the BID would not seek to acquire quasi-police powers. The BID manager agreed to supply this undertaking.

11. Michael Wiseman – Grafton Centre

Mr Wiseman addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal and made the following comments

- There was a long history of collaborative city centre management going back to the 1990s and that the current arrangements were not sustainable, and that the proposal presented an opportunity to create a sustainable future.
- The funding proposals were more equitable.
- Councillors were encouraged to support the project.

12. John Preston

Mr Preston spoke in objection to the proposal and made the following comments

- The BID offers no clear vision or future direction.
- The BID does not seek to overcome the existing over crowding issues.

- A longer-term view was required.
- Elements of the proposals were effectively an acknowledgement that the licensing regime had failed.
- Members were encouraged to reject the proposal, and instead develop true “town and gown” partnership.

13. Katy Preston

Ms Preston addressed the committee on behalf of “Cambridge for All” and raised the following issues in objection to the proposals.

- Many of the smaller businesses visited were unaware of the proposals, or the existence of a dedicated officer leading on the project.
- Many of the eligible businesses visited were unaware of who within the organisation would be exercising the vote. It was noted that a number of business were under the impression that the ballot paper would be sent to the head office which may be away from Cambridge.
- Cambridge was now more expensive than London for retail, and that this restricted the ability of independent businesses to access the market.
- Cambridge should be accessible to all and not sterile.

14. Roy Badcock – Cambridge Building Society

Mr Badcock addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal and explained that Cambridge Building Society were fully in support of the proposal.

The Leader responded to the comments raised by public speakers 11, 12, 13 and 14.

- Strategic thinking would continue to be the responsibility of the relevant authorities, and it was important to not see the proposals as the city council shedding its responsibilities for the city centre.

- The Leader invited the BID Manager to respond to the comments about lack of visibility and awareness of the proposals. The BID Manager advised he had personally visited or spoke with between 400 and 500 business, and that all eligible business had already received communication regarding the ballot. It was also confirmed that ballot information and papers would be sent to local offices, rather than head offices.

Ms Preston challenged the information about the number of businesses visited by the BID Manager. The BID Manager clarified that the number of business visited included all visited by members of the BID task force, and not just those visited by the BID Manager.

15. Charles Anderson – La Raza

Mr Anderson addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal, and highlighted the potential benefits of the proposals.

16. Dr Dane Comerford – University of Cambridge

Dr Comerford addressed the committee and spoke in support of the proposal and made the following comments.

- The proposal could potentially streamline the pursuit of sponsorship for events and other activities

Councillor Herbert raised concern that speakers were not identifying themselves as members of the Task Force. The Chair acknowledged the concern and encouraged the remaining public speakers to explain if they were representing an organisation or business, or were members of the Bid Task Force. However it was noted that members of the public were not legally required to declare any interests.

17. Jannie Brightman

Ms Brightman addressed the committee and raised the following issues in objection to the proposals.

- There was a deficit of democracy in the proposals.
- The support expressed by the leader at the public meeting on 20th September, amounted to pre-determination.

- The Leader in his response was unfairly targeting speakers speaking in opposition, and the process was biased.
- Clarification was requested on the sustainable procurement elements of the report, and the exact nature of the investment made by the City Council into this process.

18. Tony Booth

Dr Booth addressed the committee and made the following comments in objection to the proposal.

- The proposals reflected the policy direction of central government and the coalition, and would contribute to the development of a clone town.
- The global financial crisis was not acknowledged in the report.
- The report should be re-written and focussed on the public sector leading the partnership.
- Expertise within the public sector should be used in preference to the private sector.

The Leader responded to public speakers 15, 16, 17 and 18 and made the following comments

- The BID proposals were designed to be dynamic and flexible.
- Statutory services would not be transferred to the BID organisation, and that accountability for core services would continue to sit with the public sector.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management responded and clarified the funding arrangements. The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management highlighted that the Association of Town Centre Management was the lead organisation on this project in the Eastern Region , and had secured European Regional Development Funding to support the the development of BIDs in three locations.

19. Teresa Mulliken

Ms Mulliken addressed the committee and made the following comments in objection to the proposal.

- Questions raised at the public meetings had been ignored and not included in the frequently asked questions document.
- The BID would adversely affect the smaller businesses under the threshold to be eligible to vote.

20. Jill Eastland

Ms Eastland addressed the committee and made the following comments in objection to the proposal.

- The BID could have an adverse impact on vulnerable members of the community such as the homeless.
- CCTV is often used to target young people unfairly.
- The process is poor and biased.

21. Barry Robinson – Millers Music

Mr Robinson spoke in support of the proposal. Prior to his submission he declared that he was not a member of the CBID task force. He raised the following points,

- Some businesses were being deliberately blind to the consultation and engagement activities.
- The BID was intended to complement the city, and not take over services.
- “Street ambassadors” would be appropriately called “Street Guides”
- The process safeguarded the interests of independent businesses.

22. Beverley Carpenter – Mill Road Society

Ms Carpenter addressed the committee and raised the following points.

- The proposals lacked democratic input.
- CCTV provision in the city had grown significantly since 1997. Concern was expressed about the use of cameras for tracking members of the public.
- The BID partnership was not based on a unique document.
- Labour Councillors were urged to positively reject the proposals rather than abstaining.

The Leader responded to public speakers 19, 20, 21 and 22 and made the following comments

- The businesses under the threshold would also benefit from many of the projects undertaken by the BID.
- An equalities impact assessment (EQIA) had been undertaken.
- CCTV was publicly owned and was not available for businesses to track footfall, and the BID taskforce had made a significant commitment to the protection of individual rights in the letter. It was also noted that it was hoped to incorporate the commitment into the founding document.

The speakers made the following comments in response

- The proposals would have a huge impact on smaller business. The BID Manager confirmed that businesses under the threshold would be able to access projects and services operated by the BID.
- Further clarification was requested on the use of CCTV cameras. The Head of Tourism and City Centre confirmed that certain business might choose to use their own cameras or other systems for counting footfall.
- Continued objection to the partnership being lead by private business interests were expressed.

23. Jeremy Waller – Primavera

Mr Waller addressed the committee and raised the following points in objection to the proposal.

- The proposals were part of the erosion of the role of local government in the UK.
- Opportunities for the public and business to influence the management of the city centre would be lost.
- The additional levy would have an adverse impact on the financial viability of small business and those operating on small margins.
- The Leader was encouraged to abstain on behalf of the City Council.
- Services already provided by the City Council such as street cleaning would reduce in quality.

24. Rob Birch

Mr Birch addressed the committee and raised the following points in objection to the proposal.

- The BID was not transparent or accountable and would not deliver on the promises made in the letter and supporting documentation.

25. Ana Terriente

Ms Terriente addressed the committee and raised the following points.

- Labour Councillors were encouraged to positively reject the scheme rather than abstaining.
- The BID would adversely impact on smaller businesses.

26. Robert Hallam – John Lewis

Mr Hallam spoke in support of the proposal and made the following comments.

- Highlighted that he was an existing member of the Love Cambridge Board and a member of the BID Taskforce.

- John Lewis was in favour of the proposals, and had invested heavily in Cambridge.
- Partners at John Lewis had expressed strong support for the proposals through a democratic vote.

27. Ian Ralls – Friends of the Earth

Mr Ralls spoke in objection to the proposals and made the following points.

- Cambridge Friends of the Earth was not a private company and never had been.
- Could not support the proposals.
- The partnership approach risks dilution of the good work undertaken by the City Council in the field of environmental sustainability.
- The BID if approved would be focussed solely on the maximisation of profits to the detriment of other interests.
- Councillors were encouraged to reject the proposals.

The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources spoke in response to the final group of public speakers and made the following comments.

- Clarification was sought from John Lewis about their use of CCTV. The representative of John Lewis confirmed that they did not use CCTV for tracking people, or have any other form of footfall monitoring arrangements. It was explained that the figures present were based on customers served.
- The proposals would not make the City Centre private or otherwise restrict the rights of individuals.
- The BID would not be able to reduce service levels, they could only enhance the level of service provided.

- The BID process provided a “twin-lock” approach, which safeguarded the interests of independent and smaller businesses.
- The management of the market square and the existing management arrangements for street trading would be unaffected.

At the request of the Leader, the BID Manager provided an overview of the sustainability activities such as the proposed use of cycle couriers and the co-ordination of deliveries.

In response Mr Waller made the following comments

- Major businesses and the Council would significantly influence the vote.
- Non-statutory services such as street cleaning were threatened by the proposals.
- The role of the BID would increase over time.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management advised the meeting of the process of renewing the mandate of the BID after five years, and amending the role of the BID.

The following additional comments were received in response to the responses from the Executive Councillor and Officers (on behalf of the Leader).

- The BID dis-enfranchised local residents and lacked democratic support.
- The City Council was under-represented on the BID structure.

In response to the final point, the Leader advised that the City Council representation was based on the proportion of the rateable value owned by the City Council. The Leader also reminded the meeting that the activities proposed by the BID did not require approval of the local authority, and does not change the responsibility for the city centre.

Matter for Decision: To consider the CBBid, Business Improvement District Project (BID).

Decision of the Leader:

The Leader resolved to

- i. Confirm that the BID proposal is compliant with the BID regulations
- ii. Vote “Yes” on behalf of the Council in the BID ballot.
- iii. Confirm that there is no material conflict or other grounds to veto the BID.
- iv. Note That the Council’s Medium Term Strategy as reported to full Council on 25th October is amended to reflect the financial implications as set out in this report.

Scrutiny Considerations

The committee received a report regarding the “CBbid, Business Improvement District Project” from the Director of Environment.

The committee considered the report and members of the committee made the following comments.

1. The proposal had a democratic deficit with limited member involvement in the development of the proposals.
2. Resident involvement had been minimal, and no record had been produced of the public meetings, to allow for a more balanced consideration of the issues.
3. Resident involvement in the activities of the BID needed to be enhanced. Resident representation on the board was suggested.
4. The City Council needed to take a clearer control of the issues affecting the City Centre, and ensure that all interested parties were engaged in that process in an open and transparent manner. The re-instatement of the City Centre Scrutiny Committee was also requested.

The Leader responded to the first four comments made by members of the committee.

- In response to the concerns raised by lack of member involvement, it was explained that the concept of a BID had been included in the last two Customer Services and Resources portfolio plans. It was also noted

that a public question had also been raised at Full Council on the subject.

- Regarding resident involvement, the Leader indicated that the inclusion of a resident representative on the board would be inconsistent with the aim of proposal.
- In response to comments regarding the representation of the City Council, the meeting was reminded that the representation of the City Council was based on the rateable value of its properties in the BID area.
- Regarding the City Centre scrutiny committee proposals, the Leader stated that the issues regarding the Scrutiny Committee were totally separate from the issues under consideration.

Councillor Herbert proposed the following amendment and spoke in support of them.

- i. Recommendation 2.2 Amend after “That the Leader should” to read “That the Leader should abstain on behalf of the Council in the BID ballot”
- ii. Recommendation 2.4 Add the following wording after “Committee” in 4th line

“including if the overall turnout of business is under 40% and if a clear majority of smaller businesses have not voted, and including in the consultation other Committee Chairs and Spokes
- iii. Recommendation 2.6 (New) That the Council re-establishes its City Centre Scrutiny Sub Committee to improve decisions and delivery on central Cambridge services and policy, and including representation from residents, businesses and the County Council, and that Terms of Reference be agreed by the Leader, Chair and Spokes ahead of the next Scrutiny meeting report.

The Leader sought clarification from the Head of Legal Services regarding the power of veto on the part of the City Council. The Head of Legal Services advised that the City Council could only veto in very narrow circumstances. The meeting was advised that the veto could only be exercised in the following circumstances;

- i. Conflict to a material extent with any policy formally adopted by and contained in a document published by the local authority; or
 - ii. Places a significant disproportionate financial burden on any person or class of persons (as compared to the other non-domestic rate payers in the BID area) and;
 - That burden is caused by the manipulation of the BID area or by the structure of the BID levy; and that burden is inequitable.
5. Clarification was given on the proposed amendment to 2.4 and the reasons for recommending it.
 6. Further information was requested on the mechanism in the event of a change to the BID remit
 7. Clarification was requested on whether one of the 13 city council votes related to the market, and whether traders had been consulted on how that votes would be exercised.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management confirmed that one City Council vote did relate to the market.

In response to further questions regarding the potential use of the veto provision, the Head of Legal Services emphasised that the City Council only had a power of veto in very specific circumstance and did not have a general power of veto. In response it was argued that the additional financial burden would disproportionately affect smaller and independent businesses.

8. The circumstances in which the previous City Centre scrutiny arrangements were set up were clarified, and it was argued that their purpose was unrelated to the business under consideration. It was also noted that at least one of the businesses that had spoken, had indicated

that the additional financial charges would be less they currently pay for certain services so therefore would be a saving to them.

9. Concern was raised by the baseline provided on a range of services, and a lack of clarity on the service provided at present.
10. Clarification was requested on why public realm space had been included within the BID boundary on the plan, and noted that it had been confusing for members of the public.
11. Clarification was also requested on the equalities implications of the proposals.

The Director of Environment noted the concerns raised regarding the baseline information provided, but assured the committee that information had been prepared in detail. The committee were also assured that responsibility for public realm space would not transfer to the new organisation.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management confirmed that an equalities impact assessment (EQIA), had been prepared by the Strategy and Partnership Manager. The letter received from the BID taskforce was highlighted, which included a strong commitment to the promotion of equalities issues.

The Leader explained why the mapping had been produced in the style that it had been, and assured the meeting that it did not affect the status of the public realm.

12. The explanation regarding the reasons for the mapping being produced in a particular style was challenged.
13. Members claimed there had been a lack of member involvement and awareness of the process. Clarification was requested on why the City Council was intending to provide its contribution of £42,000 two months before it would become due and whether any other businesses or organisations would make a similar early contribution.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management confirmed that it was standard practice for the local authority to make its initial contribution early to cover the start up costs. It was also confirmed that no other businesses or organisations would be making an early contribution.

14. Greater clarity on the terminology was requested, and it was suggested that the references to cleaning chewing gum were actually references to cleaning up vomit, and that the public may be more receptive to idea if accurate terminology was used.
15. Clarification was requested why the Orchard Street area had not been included, and whether the baseline information included this area or not.

The BID Manager confirmed that the references to chewing gum cleaning did, in fact, relate to the removal of chewing gum. The meeting was advised that the Orchard Street area was not included because it had very few eligible businesses and over extending the area could potentially result in the unrealistic expectations in terms of additional services in specific locations.

16. Further concerns were raised about the potential conflict between city council managed services and any services provided by the BID, particularly where different contractors were providing similar services.

The comments were noted, but officers assured the meeting that processes would be in place to prevent conflict of this nature.

17. The Labour amendment was challenged, particularly the reference to a 40% threshold.

Councillor Rosenstiel moved a further amendment, and spoke against the Labour Group amendment.

- i. Recommendation 2.3 Amend to read "That the Leader confirms that there is no material or other grounds to veto the BID"
- ii. Recommendation 2.4 Delete recommendation

18. Clarification was requested on whether the issue of the early payment had been raised at the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 9th July.

The Head of Tourism and City Centre Management confirmed that the issue had not been raised at that meeting because it had not been highlighted as an issue at this stage in the process

Following discussion regarding the legality of the proposed amendment to 2.4 moved by Councillor Herbert, the Labour Group agreed to withdraw the

amendment. It was noted that the proposed amendment to 2.2 and the new 2.6 were unaffected by the withdrawal of the proposed amendment to 2.4.

19. The representative of the Labour Group advised that they were not totally against the principle of the BID, however that the size of the proposed BID was a major concern. It was suggested that a number of smaller BIDs might be more acceptable.

Following discussion on the content of the proposed amendments, the amendments were put to the vote.

Amendments proposed by Councillor Rosenstiel

- i. Recommendation 2.3 Amend to read “That the Leader confirms that there is no material conflict or other grounds to veto the BID”
- ii. Recommendation 2.4 Delete recommendation

The Scrutiny Committee voted four in favour of the amendment and four against the proposed amendment. The amendment was carried on the Chairs casting vote.

Amendments proposed by Councillor Herbert

- i. Recommendation 2.2 Amend after “That the Leader should” to read “That the Leader should abstain on behalf of the Council in the BID ballot”
- iii. Recommendation 2.6 (New) That the Council re-establishes its City Centre Scrutiny Sub Committee to improve decisions and delivery on central Cambridge services and policy, and including representation from residents, businesses and the County Council, and that Terms of Reference be agreed by the Leader, Chair and Spokes ahead of the next Scrutiny meeting report.

The Scrutiny Committee voted four in favour of the amendment and four against the proposed amendment. The amendment was defeated on the Chair's casting vote.

The Leader concluded the debate and spoke in support of the proposals.

Substantive Motion

Recommendation 2.1	That the Leader confirms that the BID proposal is compliant with the BID regulations.
Recommendation 2.2	That the Leader should vote "Yes" on behalf of the Council in the BID ballot.
Recommendation 2.3	That the Leader confirms that there is no material or other grounds to veto the BID"
Recommendation 2.4	That the Council's Medium Term Strategy as reported to full Council on 25 th October is amended to reflect the financial implications as set out in this report.

The Scrutiny Committee voted on each recommendation separately.

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Committee endorsed the recommendation unanimously.
- 2.2 The Scrutiny Committee voted four in favour of the recommendation and four against the recommendation. The recommendation was endorsed on the casting vote of the Chair.
- 2.3 The Scrutiny Committee endorsed the recommendation by four votes to zero.
- 2.4 The Scrutiny Committee endorsed the recommendation by four votes to zero.

The Leader accepted the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee subject to the BID Task Force confirming in writing that the issues, which were raised regarding community safety and process for adopting any initiatives in the future, had been incorporated into the foundation document for the BID.

Conflicts of interest declared by the Leader (and any dispensations granted)

N/A

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm

CHAIR

This page is intentionally left blank