

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

COUNCIL

Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 19th October, 2023 at 5.00 pm in the Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn

PRESENT: Councillor P Bland - Deputy Mayor in the Chair
Councillors B Anota, B Ayres, T Barclay, M Bartrum, A Beales, S Bearshaw, J Bhondi, P Bland, A Bubb, A Bullen, R Coates, Mrs J Collingham, S Collop, R Colwell, S Dark, M de Whalley, T de Winton, P Devulapalli, D Heneghan, P Hodson, H Humphrey, A Jamieson, B Jones, C Joyce, A Kemp, J Kirk, P Kunes, A Lawrence, S Lintern, B Long, J Moriarty, C Morley, S Nash, J Osborne, T Parish, J Ratcliffe, S Ring, C Rose, J Rust, A Ryves, S Sandell, D Sayers, Mrs V Spikings, S Squire, M Storey, D Tyler and A Ware

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Beal, R Blunt, F Bone, C J Crofts, A Dickinson, S Everett, J Lowe and M Wilkinson

C:46 **MINUTES SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE WAR IN PALESTINE AND ISRAEL**

Council held a minute's silence for the people Israel and Palestine who had lost their lives and the suffering which was continuing.

C:47 **PRAYERS**

Prayers were led by Rev Canon Ling

C:48 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: The Minutes of the meetings held on 24 August and 28 September 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Deputy Mayor.

C:49 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Beales, Dark, Heneghan and Moriarty declared non pecuniary interests in the Motion on the Town Deal Board.

C:50 **MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

C:51 **URGENT BUSINESS**

None

C:52 **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Under Standing Order 9 the Deputy Mayor invited the Public speakers to pose their questions as follows:

1) Question from Trudy Clark

“This question is to do with Biodiversity Net Gain - Projects already in the planning process will not be subject to the new Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), which comes into force in November. Will this council be following other council’s examples, and encourage those projects already in the planning process to adopt Biodiversity Net Gain into their plans?”

Councillor de Whalley commented that he would also respond to Ms Clark in writing fully but he explained it had been delayed to January 2024. This provided more time for training and the final legislation to come through. Mandatory BNG only apply to new applications for major development made after January 2024 and were working with DLUP on transitional arrangements to make sure that it would not be applied retrospectively. The council could only encourage and not insist on BNG.

An analysis by Carter Jonas found that ¼ of English Planning authorities were preparing for BNG in their local plans 18 months prior before the mandate was nationwide. Was the Council among those.

Councillor de Whalley confirmed the Local Plan would adopt the BNG as it was statutory, and the Local Plan was under review.

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

2) Question from Patricia Field

“Q1) with reference to the proposed 300- 4000 homes to be built by Hopkins on the new development. Who is going to be counting these homes as they go up?

Q2) with reference to the above proposed plans why when showing the plans to the general public are the council using 2018 maps of the area. They did NOT show my home nor the Lemuer Burt Estate plus other homes that have been built since 2018.

Q: 3) Who in the Council borough or County is will in to take up the challenge of crossing that A10 at peak time! Then tell us we don’t urgently need a crossing.”

Councillor Moriarty responded that the number of houses built on sites was monitored. Hopkins Homes application was only required to show the application site in their application. He confirmed that they were familiar with the estate and the proposed road and junction

arrangements. WSP the County's consultants were formulating the business case for the access road and were taking account of the existing junctions.

With regard to the third question Councillor Moriarty confirmed as he had discussed previously that a crossing was to be installed prior to the occupation of any homes on the site. He commented that the applicant couldn't be held responsible for the existing traffic conditions. He volunteered Councillors Parish and Dark to undertake the challenge.

By way of supplementary Ms Field commented on the lack of footpath along the A10 and the inability to

C:53 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES**

i **Cabinet: 26 September 2023**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Councillor Parish proposed the recommendations seconded by Councillor Rust

CAB42: Update to various Housing Standards policies to reflect procedural changes, best practice, case law and statutory guidance

Councillor Parish proposed the recommendations seconded by Councillor Moriarty

CAB43: Members Allowances 2023/24

Both recommendations were put to the vote and agreed.

RESOLVED: The recommendations from the Cabinet meeting on 26 September 2023 were agreed.

C:54 **REPLACEMENT OUTSIDE BODY REPRESENTATIVES: QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL GOVERNORS COUNCIL & NORFOLK COUNTYWIDE COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB PANEL**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Queen Elizabeth Hospital Governors Council

Councillor Parish nominated Councillor Kemp, this was seconded by Councillor Joyce. On being put to the vote this was agreed.

Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Kemp proposed Councillor Rose to the position. This was seconded by Councillor Jones. On being put to the vote this was agreed.

Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Substitute

Councillor Kemp was proposed as the Substitute by Councillor Joyce and seconded by Councillor Rose.

RESOLVED: 1) That Councillor Kemp be appointed to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Governor's Council.

2) That Councillor Rose be appointed to the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, and Councillor Kemp be appointed as his Substitute.

C:55

NOTICES OF MOTION

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

i) Councillor Rust proposed the following Notice of Motion (14/23), seconded by Councillor Kemp.

“This council notes the dire situation with NHS dentistry in King’s Lynn and West Norfolk. While the provision of dental services sits with the ICB and isn’t one that our Borough Council can control, we can seek to influence and shape the delivery of improved services and improved access to NHS dentists for our local community.

We know that a lack of access to NHS dentists impacts on other services such as more calls to NHS 111 and increased visits to Emergency Departments and general practice.

Norfolk and Waveney have the highest prevalence of dental decay in five-year olds in the region with King’s Lynn and West Norfolk having the second highest prevalence of dental decay in 5-year olds in Norfolk and Waveney.

King’s Lynn and West Norfolk also had the highest prevalence of 5-year olds with the dental decay affecting incisor teeth in 2022 in the Norfolk and Waveney ICS at 9.6% - higher than the national and regional prevalence.

The number of dentists in our area has declined at a greater rate when compared to the whole of the East and England. Yet our area has greater levels of need, more areas of deprivation and a higher number of older residents.

Our Council commits to taking action that will positively improve the local situation regarding NHS dentistry provision and actions will include:

Supporting the provision of Oral Surgery in King's Lynn, which is currently being provided in Wisbech, by locating a suitable council owned property for use.

Explore and support any funding initiatives in the Borough to provide premises for NHS dental services to operate from.

Write to the Department for Health and Social Care to establish a dental training school in Norfolk, mirroring the success of the School of Nursing based at The College of West Anglia.

Lobby for reform to the National dental contract to help reduce the number of NHS dentists giving up their contracts to deliver private contracts only.

Work with Norfolk County Council to establish preventative services such as school dentists."

In proposing the Motion, Councillor Rust explained that due to the urgency of the matter she had brought it to the Council as a motion rather than submitting it through the Panels process. She drew attention to the problems with dental provision in the Borough.

Councillor Kemp seconded the Motion and spoke on the issues being faced by families who couldn't access a dental service and often struggled to afford toothbrushes and toothpaste. She referred to the lobbying she had carried out on their behalf and the use of some of her grant to provide toothbrushes and toothpaste in schools in her ward.

Councillor Joyce spoke on the potential for the item to be referred to the Environment and Community Panel. He confirmed the urgency of the motion and that it needed to be decided upon at the meeting, but also suggested that the Panel have the subject on its agenda in the near future.

Councillor Colwell commented on the fact that West Norfolk dentistry was in decay. He drew attention to the level of tooth decay admissions of children to hospital. He drew attention to the parliamentary Health and Social Care Committee consideration of the high level of enquiries relating to dentistry. He suggested that an emergency scheme be launched for free appointments be provided for the children and pregnant women and young mothers, and the removal of VAT from children's toothpaste and brushes.

Councillor Beales proposed a minor amendment to include "on commercial terms" at the end of the 7th paragraph of the motion.

Councillor de Whalley seconded the amendment, which was accepted by Councillors Rust and Kemp.

Councillor Dark confirmed the dental crisis in the Borough. He explained that it was his expectation that the Motion would be referred to a Panel, but he understood the urgency of the situation. He confirmed it was a big challenge which the council needed to understand what was being done to improve the situation. It needed to be submitted to the Environment and Community Panel at a later date in order to properly engage with the correct people to make a difference.

Councillor Jones supported the motion.

Councillor Kemp, by way of personal explanation reported that preparation work had been carried out with the ICP.

Councillor Devulapalli expressed support for the motion and expressed the plea to twin hatter County Councillors to raise it at the County Council. She undertook to raise the issue with the Norfolk Health Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Long agreed with the urgency of the matter and asked why the portfolio holder hadn't progressed the issue within her portfolio work. He supported its referral to the Environment and Community Panel and asked for it to look at some of the practicalities within the motion.

Councillor Ryves expressed concern that the amendment would mean any property would have to be at commercial rates when it could involve the Council assisting with the provision of premises.

Councillor Moriarty commented that Councillor Rust had been carrying out the work before bringing the Motion to Council.

In summing up Councillor Rust had been working on it behind the scenes, she had brought the motion to get access to Council support and resources.

The amended motion was put to the vote.

RESOLVED: That the Motion as amended at the end of the seventh paragraph with "on commercial terms", be agreed.

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

ii) **Councillor Dark proposed Notice of Motion (15/23), seconded by Councillor Joyce.**

“This council recognises the very real threat posed by coastal erosion and sea intrusion to human life and our historic coastal communities, vital tourist industry, important farming industry and wildlife.

We applaud the recent decision taken at the County Council that as a county Norfolk will now press the Environment Agency, government and local MPs strongly to find and invest sufficient funding to cater for the current level of threat posed and to enhance provision for future years so that coastal defences are up to the task.

In support of this we now instruct this administration to write to the Environment Agency and relevant Ministers as a matter of urgency, with follow up engagement, to the effect that West Norfolk unequivocally stands alongside Norfolk County Council on this matter on behalf of its residents and that ‘managed retreat’ from existing coastal protections, allowing any loss of land to the sea or elements is not an acceptable short, medium or longer-term strategy or tactic.”

In proposing the Motion he referred to a briefing from the Environment Agency where they reported that they were reviewing their commitment to sea defences along the coast including not carrying out the beach recharge which they had previously highlighted the risk of flooding.

He drew attention to NCC stance objecting to the stance of the Environment Agency’s managed retreat of the flood defences and encouraged the Council to support their action.

In seconding the Motion Councillor Joyce reminded members that the Conservative Government had slashed the Environment Agency budgets he spoke in supporting the motion and the fact that the recharges should be carried out. He drew attention to the Shoreline Management Plan urged council not to turn the back on the area.

Councillor Sandell proposed the following amendment to the third paragraph of the Motion, this was seconded by Councillor Jamieson:

“Council on this matter on behalf of its residents and that ‘managed retreat’ from existing coastal protections, allowing any (NB) **increased risk to life or property, or** loss of land to the sea or elements is not a **desirable** short, medium or longer-term strategy or tactic and **the matter of potential changes to shoreline management should now be referred to E&C’.**”

Councillor Dark and Joyce accepted the amendment, which then became the substantive motion. Councillor Joyce asked if the Leader

would write the letters and ensure councillors saw the letters before they were sent out.

Under standing order 14.6 Councillor Parish proposed the matter be referred to the Environment and Community Panel. This was seconded by Councillor Moriarty. Councillor Parish confirmed he was prepared to write the letters which he was happy for councillors Dark and Joyce to co-sign. He explained that as it was a complex matter it required more detail and support before taking a decision on the matter.

Councillor Long explained that he was not supportive of the proposal to refer to the Panel as the Council hadn't seen the proposals for the changes to the Shoreline Management Plan. He referred to his previous involvement in the Plan. He explained that the Councils would be asked to accept proposed revisions to the Plan in January. He considered the work would have to be re-done at that stage. He had attended a meeting on the issue that day, and expressed that it was vital to get things right procedurally. He waited to see the amended Shoreline Management Plan, and did not want to see it disappear.

Councillor Dark commented that the Motion had been submitted following a comment from the Leader and concern from parishes. He wanted to be able to support parishes. He wanted the chamber to say that it was going there and the Council would be engaging the Environment Agency.

Councillor Rust referred to the point raised by Councillor Long and that it should not be rushed and should therefore go to the Panel for full consideration, dependent on the Environment Agency report.

Councillor de Whalley drew attention to the underlying cause of sea level rise, and the need for an informed debate on flood defences when the documentation was available.

Councillor Beales commented that the issues were of importance, but the Notice of Motion was not the right way to go. Councillor Long and Dark cautioned against haste, therefore the referral to the Panel was a clear action, for a matter that was a complex area of policy for the council. He considered it was right to refer it to the Panel and hoped Councillor Long would bring his knowledge of the matter to that forum.

Councillor Squire referred to the fact that the proposer and seconder had not discussed it with her as portfolio holder when she had offered to do a briefing for all councillors at earlier meetings. She also reiterated that the Council was talking to the Environment Agency and other agencies about the coastline regularly, she considered it should go to the Environment and Community Panel for consideration, but that the Council was not a decision maker.

Councillor Dark as a point of clarification stated he did not insinuate the portfolio holder or officers were not working but it related to the statement from the Leader.

Councillor Squire confirmed she had spoken to Councillor Long and Kunes on the matter.

Councillor Kemp commented that the Leader should write to the Environment Agency as in a high level flood would affect a large number of properties.

Councillor Colwell supported the referral to the Panel. He considered Councillor Dark was whipping up unnecessary fear in the villages.

In summing up Councillor Parish confirmed he had replied to parishes to confirm he would write to the agency, but reminded members that this was about facts he had reported from the Environment Agency. He suggested that future work of the Local Plan Task Group could involve looking at potential land for the future use if the sea levels rose considerably.

The proposal to refer the amended motion to the Environment and Community Panel put to the vote.

RESOLVED: That the amended motion below be referred to the Environment and Community Panel:

“This council recognises the very real threat posed by coastal erosion and sea intrusion to human life and our historic coastal communities, vital tourist industry, important farming industry and wildlife.

We applaud the recent decision taken at the County Council that as a county Norfolk will now press the Environment Agency, government and local MPs strongly to find and invest sufficient funding to cater for the current level of threat posed and to enhance provision for future years so that coastal defences are up to the task.

Council on this matter on behalf of its residents and that ‘managed retreat’ from existing coastal protections, allowing any (NB) increased risk to life or property, or loss of land to the sea or elements is not a desirable short, medium or longer-term strategy or tactic and the matter of potential changes to shoreline management should now be referred to E&C’.”

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

- iii) Councillor Joyce informed the Council that he was withdrawing the Motion (16/23) for this meeting but Councillor Ware would be bringing an amended Motion to the next meeting. Council agreed to its withdrawal.

"This Council believes violence against women and girls is a problem for men and boys to fix, not a problem for women and girls to tolerate.

Therefore, this Council seeks to align itself with the values of the white ribbon campaign by becoming an accredited white ribbon organisation and commits to never use, excuse or remain silent about men's violence against women."

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

iv) Councillor Dark proposed the following Notice of Motion (17/23), seconded by Councillor Jamieson:

"This council recognises the significant work undertaken by the volunteers of the Towns Board, officers and partners to date to secure multi-million pounds of external investment into King's Lynn and to bring the associated transformational projects towards completion.

It instructs the new administration to get fully and unequivocally behind the Towns Board in its work at this crucial stage and in particular to do all it can to support the Internationally significant Guildhall project, by not withdrawing the £3m underwriting guarantee that full council had previously given to this project and allowing officers to continue actively supporting the Charitable Incorporated Organisation and Towns Board to achieve the funding necessary to complete it.

In furtherance of this securing the Guildhall project objective, this council now instructs officers to promptly explore creating a 'go fund me' type fundraising platform with the Towns Board, previously intended, to generate public and business donations off of the back of the recent significant media interest in this project and our area's historic principal Town."

In proposing the Motion Councillor Dark drew attention to comments made by the Leader which led to him submit the motion, he sought to get officers to continue doing all they could to assist with the work of the Town Board and projects in the town.

Councillor Osborne proposed an amendment to delete: .

"by not withdrawing the £3m underwriting guarantee that full council had previously given to this project and"

And adding to the second paragraph after promptly explore .. "all possible fundraising opportunities including..."

Councillor Jones seconded the amendments. Councillors Dark and Jamieson accepted the amendments. This then became the substantive motion.

Councillor Parish spoke on the amendment expressing his hope to get quality professional performers at the Guildhall, as well as allowing its use by amateur groups, whilst at the same time having to take account of the overall financial needs of the council. He hoped finances would be forthcoming from outside the council.

Councillor Ring not support the motion because of the language used within it. He supported the work of the Town Board and happy to see changes that recognise the delivery phase. He drew attention to the history of the building whilst in the council's tenancy. He drew attention to and recognised the work of the volunteers such as the Shakespeare Guildhall Trust, which he considered were not recognised in the motion. He drew attention to the fact that a lot more money would be required for the building. He also commented that the dedicated officers who were working on the projects were working hard on the project and did not need instruction but support.

Councillor Morley drew attention to the fact that works had not been undertaken on the Guildhall and the complex over the years. He indicated he would support the motion but had reservations about the proposed funding, when serious funding was required. The CIO was now beginning its work and fundraising was part of their role. He reminded members that there was no underwriting agreement for the shortfall, but there was unsupported borrowing in the accounts, but the original costs associated with the project were totally different now.

Councillor Moriarty reminded members no one was authorised to speak on behalf of the Town Deal Board but he felt that with the new make up of the Board he was disappointed the motion was in the papers today. He said he would abstain from the vote.

Councillor Kemp said she would not support the Motion but considered the MUCH building should be scrapped and its funding put into the Guildhall.

Councillor Beales recommended that the politics be taken out of the Guildhall situation. He requested support from the conservatives on the Town Deal Board, and taking account of those points would support the amended motion.

Councillor Colwell considered that the National Trust should fund the works required.

Councillor Bullen drew attention to the recognition the floor was receiving internationally. He hoped they could be held in the area and not lost nationally like other treasures from the area.

Councillor Dark in summing up explained that the word instruction was designed to give clarity. He did not consider it was political but would help the CIO and officers and help get the finances.

A debate ensued on whether those who had left the room were able to vote. The Monitoring Officer agreed to take it up with group leaders after the meeting. Those who had left the room should abstain.

On being put to the vote the motion as amended was carried.

RESOLVED: That the following Motion be approved:

“This council recognises the significant work undertaken by the volunteers of the Towns Board, officers and partners to date to secure multi-million pounds of external investment into King’s Lynn and to bring the associated transformational projects towards completion.

It instructs the new administration to get fully and unequivocally behind the Towns Board in its work at this crucial stage and in particular to do all it can to support the Internationally significant Guildhall project, and allowing officers to continue actively supporting the Charitable Incorporated Organisation and Towns Board to achieve the funding necessary to complete it.

In furtherance of this securing the Guildhall project objective, this council now instructs officers to promptly explore all possible fundraising opportunities including creating a ‘go fund me’ type fundraising platform with the Towns Board, previously intended, to generate public and business donations off of the back of the recent significant media interest in this project and our area’s historic principal Town.”

At 7.30pm Council adjourned and reconvened at 7.41pm.

C:56

CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Councillor Parish proposed all Cabinet Members reports en bloc and explained there would be two updates.

Councillor Moriarty informed members that there would be an additional planning Committee on 16 November to deal with a large number of applications.

He drew attention to the Parish event held the previous day for planning training, and also the very well attended consultation event in West Winch where there were some comments that not all homes had been leafleted, however notices had been erected during the day. He indicated he was minded to hold a further event once the West Winch access road planning application was submitted, both he and Councillor Kemp would deliver notices.

Councillor de Whalley informed members that the EV point in Hunstanton was now working.

Councillor Morley responded to a question from Councillor Dark on the funding of the Gaywood Remembrance service, to which he suggested that the King's Lynn members could discuss special expenses in their forthcoming meeting.

Councillor Sayers asked if there was ambition to increase the level of recycling in the borough. Councillor Squires confirmed there was.

Councillor Bullen asked for an update on the Tosca barge. Councillor Anota confirmed the contractor was appointed and following due diligence the project should be completed later in the month or early next month.

Councillor Lawrence asked what the situation with the night shelter funding was. Councillor Rust responded that the operating model had changed in the pandemic, the funding for it was mainly from central government. More preventative measures were now needed to move people on to more long term independent but supported accommodation. She referred to rough sleeper numbers that those who had complex needs which couldn't be accommodated within the Council's means.

Councillor Sayers asked when the next round of Household Support Fund would be available. Councillor Rust confirmed it was already being distributed, but there was no self referral system so residents had to be referred by GPs or 3rd parties. All the information was available on the web site.

Councillor Rust responding to Councillor Lintern who drew attention to the Beat the Bills Roadshow which showed what was available, she had written some articles on beat the bills resulting in enquiries on energy efficiency. She welcomed any further ideas.

Councillor Dark referred to a press comment that £30,000 for the Night Shelter was being withheld, and anonymous spokesperson making press comments. He asked who had taken the decision to put it into the press domain. Councillor Rust commented that as Portfolio Holder and long term volunteer she backed the decision. She again drew attention to the operating model on which there was concern. She reminded members that the Council had to see value for model, and there was no sustainable financial model for it.

At this point in the meeting Councillor Parish proposed the meeting continue to complete the questions, this was seconded by Councillor Moriarty. On being put to the vote it was agreed to continue.

Councillor Colwell asked Councillor Squire about the water sampling in Hunstanton for E Coli in the water. Councillor Squires confirmed the result was disappointing, it was an anomaly which couldn't be explained. She expressed concern on the issue and was due to take the issue up with the Environment Agency at their next meeting.

Councillor Long asked if Councillor Squire agreed that rather than the Environment Agency engaging with those property owners who had moved the shingle ridge at Heacham, they should fine them. Councillor Squire agreed that enforcement should have taken place earlier, the issue of fines or replacement was under review.

Councillor Collop asked that less acronyms could be used in reports.

Councillor Colwell asked Councillor Ring about the second 3G pitch being built at Lynnsport King's Lynn which was close to the Gaywood River, would he ask the FA what other options were available such as using a school site. Councillor Ring responded that he would be discussing with Lynnsport alternatives to the plastic pitches. He commented that in recent years schools had removed access to their facilities for the public or other groups so in the event it was recommended to place them on school sites the FA would need to ensure suitable access arrangements.

Councillor Kemp asked Councillor Anota about a condition survey from the County Council on the Carnegie Library. Councillor Anota undertook to give a response in writing.

Councillor Long asked what the occupancy level of the KLIC and any arrears for the building. Councillor Anota informed members there was a waiting list to go into KLIC, all arrears were on payment plans, undertook to give a more detailed written answer.

Councillor Sandell Asked Councillor Moriarty what the financial situation for the GIRAMS was and how the money was being spent. Councillor Moriarty informed members that there was now a countywide group chaired by Councillor de Walley which was trying to agree to a precise way of spending the £130,000 where the borough had been collecting the majority of the money in recent months and were looking to identify appropriate projects.

Councillor Ryves asked if there was any intention to restore the tenancy base to innovative businesses at the KLIC. Councillor Anota commented that the building was full, and the transfer of businesses within it would be an issue. He undertook to find out more and come back to him.

Leader's Questions

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Councillor Dark asked what the detail of the Corporate Plan was and whether they had been costed. Councillor Parish responded that as previously informed the overarching Plan would be supported by more detailed documentation which would be costed against resources and priorities. It would be reviewed at 6 and 12 month intervals. He

confirms it was on track. He referred to a comment on a town council for King's Lynn, he reminded members that he had said it would be looked at.

Councillor Sayers asked of the leader would partner with the constabulary to better equip and train for antisocial behaviour, Councillor Parish confirmed that the Council was accredited on the Community Safety Scheme for those matters which the police were happy to transfer to the Borough.

Councillor Lintern thanked the Leader for the meeting with Parish Chairs, and asked for an update. Councillor Parish informed that minutes had been sent to the parish councils. He undertook to have another meeting in six months. He referred to discussions regarding legal support for parishes, he had asked for the Bronze level to be set up for parishes.

Councillor Dark referred to people taking issue with things said by the Leader and asked how that would mean working well with partners. Councillor Parish responded that he did not agree with everything everyone said and would be honest in his responses. He made a comment that he spoke on behalf of the borough and he considered business rates were not distributed in an equitable manner.

Councillor Sayers referred to derelict drinking fountains in the area and asked if they would be re provided. Councillor Parish explained that 3 water filling stations had been provided in the borough and some shops provided bottle filling stations. He referred to the old style fountains which were not covid safe.

C:57 **MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

No permissible questions.

The meeting closed at 8.42 pm