

**Medway Council**  
**Meeting of Medway Council**  
**Thursday, 17 October 2013**  
**7.00pm to 10.35pm**

**Record of the meeting**

**Subject to approval as an accurate record at the next Full Council meeting**

**Present:** The Worshipful The Mayor of Medway (Councillor Iles)  
The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Etheridge)  
Councillors Avey, Bowler, Brake, Bright, Carr,  
Mrs Diane Chambers, Rodney Chambers, Chishti, Chitty,  
Clarke, Colman, Cooper, Craven, Doe, Filmer, Gilry,  
Christine Godwin, Paul Godwin, Griffin, Adrian Gulvin,  
Pat Gulvin, Harriott, Hewett, Hicks, Hubbard, Igwe, Irvine,  
Jarrett, Juby, Kearney, Kemp, Mackinlay, Mackness, Maisey,  
Maple, Murray, O'Brien, Osborne, Purdy, Royle, Shaw, Smith,  
Stamp, Tolhurst, Turpin, Watson, Wicks and Wildey

**In Attendance:** Neil Davies, Chief Executive  
Dr Alison Barnett, Director of Public Health  
Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and  
Culture  
Mick Hayward, Chief Finance Officer  
Wayne Hemingway, Democratic Services Officer  
Richard Hicks, Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure,  
Culture, Democracy and Governance  
Perry Holmes, Assistant Director Legal and Corporate  
Services/Monitoring Officer  
Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services  
Simon Wakeman, Marketing and Public Relations Manager

**457 Record of meeting**

The record of the meeting held on 25 July 2013 was agreed and signed by the Mayor as correct.

**458 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Baker, Griffiths, Mason, Price and Rodberg.

**459 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests and other interests**

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

Councillor Christine Godwin declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) in paragraph 4.1.1 (Outcome of NHS Consultation on Acute Mental Health Inpatient Beds Redesign in Kent and Medway) of agenda item 9 (Report on Overview and Scrutiny Activity) because her husband (Councillor Paul Godwin) was a Non Executive Director of Kent and Medway NHS and Social Care Partnership Trust and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this report

Councillor Paul Godwin declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) in paragraph 4.1.1 (Outcome of NHS Consultation on Acute Mental Health Inpatient Beds Redesign in Kent and Medway) of agenda item 9 (Report on Overview and Scrutiny Activity) because he was a Non Executive Director of Kent and Medway NHS and Social Care Partnership Trust and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this report.

Councillor Murray declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in paragraph 2.2.1 (Medway Adult and Community Learning Ofsted – Update on Improvements) of agenda item 9 (Report on Overview and Scrutiny Activity) because the report referred to her employer (Mid Kent College).

Councillor Stamp declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in agenda item 13 (Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 – Update) because the report referred to his employer (Environment Agency).

Other interests

Councillor Adrian Gulvin declared an interest in agenda item 16B (Motion on Royal Mail) because he had subscribed to the recent Royal Mail share issue.

Councillor Kemp declared an interest in agenda item 16B (Motion on Royal Mail) because he had subscribed to the recent Royal Mail share issue and had subsequently sold his shareholding.

Councillor Mackinlay declared an interest in agenda item 16B (Motion on Royal Mail) because he had subscribed to the recent Royal Mail share issue and had subsequently sold his shareholding.

Councillor Turpin declared an interest in agenda item 16B (Motion on Royal Mail) because he had subscribed to the recent Royal Mail share issue and had subsequently sold his shareholding.

**460 Mayor's announcements**

The Mayor announced two fund raising events coming up to raise funds for her chosen charities: A Charity Pig Race Night on 21 October at Medway Rugby

## Council, 17 October 2013

Club, Rochester and an Indian Night on 21 November at the Shozna Restaurant in Rochester. Tickets were available from the Mayor's Office .

The Mayor asked Members to speak clearly into the microphones to ensure people in the public gallery can hear.

The Mayor reminded Members to ensure that written copies of any amendments are provided to the Head of Democratic Services and that copies are brought up to the top table first.

### **461 Leader's announcements**

There were none.

### **462 Petitions**

Councillor Osborne submitted a petition containing 183 signatures which asked Medway Council to carry out a full Community Impact Study before spending £4.4m on Rochester Airport.

### **463 Public questions**

#### **A. Janet Stephens of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett:**

"Rochester Airport Masterplan is a public infrastructure project. Can Councillor Jarrett confirm that he understands the financial implications and liabilities that the Land Compensation Act 1973 (part 1) may impose on the airport operator?"

Councillor Jarrett stated that the Council was aware that the Land Compensation Act 1973 provided for compensation to be paid in limited circumstances to certain landowners where the value of their land was depreciated by the physical impact of public works including private airports by a relevant responsible authority.

It was not clear at this stage whether or not any compensation would be payable and, if so, to whom as a result of the proposed development at Rochester Airport. Councillor Jarrett stated that the legal advice that he had received confirmed that the airport operator would be responsible for any claims arising under the Act.

Ms Stephens asked whether Councillor Jarrett believed that local property values close to the airfield would be affected by this project and asked if he could confirm that adequate provisional funding for compensation to residents for property value reduction would be included in budgetary estimates by Rochester Airport Ltd and Medway Council to cover such an event.

Councillor Jarrett stated that this would be a matter for the airport operators and that he was sure they would be prevailed upon to deal with things in the proper way.

**B. Colin McEvoy of Rochester had submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett:**

"No supporting documentation has been provided by Medway Council to validate claims of creating 1000 jobs cited in the Rochester Airport Masterplan post 2016 when the Council will take back the land on the west side of the airfield. It is therefore unlikely that people in Medway desperate for new employment opportunities will see any jobs created on the land until post 2019 or beyond.

As you have publicly stated at the last Council meeting July 2013 that Medway Council has looked at options for the airfield will you therefore tell Medway Job seekers how many new jobs could possibly be created and by what date if the entire airfield closed January 2014 with the full 110 acres available for development".

Councillor Jarrett stated that the Council had made a manifesto commitment to retain the airport, in order to maintain aviation, create jobs, and enhance heritage aspects of the site. As the entire airport would not be closing, no estimates of future job numbers had been produced for the entire site.

The number of jobs that could be created at Rochester Airport would depend on the quantum of commercial development and the types of commercial uses that were realised as a result of future negotiations with developers, and potentially with individual businesses that expressed an interest in an opportunity to develop freehold units on the site.

Mr McEvoy was not present at the meeting, therefore Mr Markey asked a supplementary question on his behalf: Why could the Council not explain why in the Rochester Airport future publicity material that it did not mention the creation of jobs and the fact that they would be years away?

Councillor Jarrett stated that the position and expectations on the creation of jobs had been made clear and this would come to fruition in due course.

**C. Anthony Finbow of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty:**

"Medway Council have stated "having a paved runway means that aircraft will be able to accelerate more quickly than on grass and take off earlier. That means they will have climbed much higher before they pass over homes near the airport - which will result in less noise than at the moment."

The perception of loudness by the human ear is related to the sound pressure level, frequency and duration of sound. It is an extremely complex calculation. An aircraft might be slightly higher as it passes over homes at the end of the runway, but due to the processing of sound by the human ear, local residents will not detect any beneficial reduction in noise or disturbance, especially those at the end of the runway.

## Council, 17 October 2013

Do you have evidence such as calculations or measurements which support the noise benefits purported by the Medway Council publicity material?"

Councillor Chitty stated that a full and detailed noise impact study would be required as part of the planning application process, which would include recommendations for noise mitigation measures if these were required.

Mr Finbow stated that if there was no evidence that the Medway Council publicity statement was valid then one had to conclude it had been designed in a way to mislead the public. Looking at the statement from a different perspective, he asked Councillor Chitty to please tell the public how she believed that there would be less noise than at the moment when 30% more flights displaced by the removal of the cross-runway would be flying over the properties at the end of the new paved runway.

Councillor Chitty referred to her previous answer in that this would be subject to consideration by environmental health as part of the planning application process and that noise mitigation would be an important part of the planning stage.

### **D. Rita Mew of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty:**

"The results of the "Rochester Airport the future" public consultation show an overwhelming disapproval by the public for the current Rochester Airport Masterplan. Almost 90% of the 900 returned forms cited in the interim report to the Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 3 October were in disagreement with the plans. The following table shows a breakdown of the results.

Results of Rochester Airport Masterplan Public Consultation		
Perspective	Total	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	745	81.7%
Disagree	64	7.0%
No Opinion	1	0.1%
Support	23	2.5%
Strongly Support	79	8.7%
Total Forms Submitted	912	

Accepting there may be some minor refinement to the figures in the final report, will Councillor Chitty confirm she will act in accordance with and be bound by the majority of the "Strongly Disagree" electorate wishes stated in the Medway Council "Rochester Airport the futures" response forms received by the Council?"

## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Chitty stated that as the process of evaluating the responses received by members of the public to the public consultation was ongoing, it was not appropriate to pre-determine the outcome of this work.

Mrs Mew stated that the wording of the public consultation results for the Rochester Airport Masterplan provided at the last Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting appeared to discredit the hard work of people opposed to the Rochester Airport Masterplan in a negative manner because 760 council responses had included pre-printed text.

She stated that she was one of the volunteers who helped local residents by offering them the opportunity to complete the form. From her own experience she stated that each of the 760 forms on average took about ten minutes of explanation time, that equated to a staggering 126 man-hours of volunteers time alone. She asked Councillor Chitty how she thought the volunteers, petitioners and those taking the time to complete the council response forms were likely to vote at the next local election if this Conservative-led council ignored an overwhelming no to the masterplan?

Councillor Chitty stated that all voters would vote as their conscience guided them and that was their privilege and their right.

### **E. Darren Welch of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett:**

"The Regeneration, Community and Culture Overview and Scrutiny Committee report from 3 October "Rochester Airport Masterplan Consultation Update" paragraph 1.2 states;

"The Masterplan is being developed in partnership with BAE Systems, and the costs of doing so are being shared with BAE."

Please tell us what percentage of the £4.4 million of ratepayers money BAE Systems are contributing given that the company may be released from a large financial obligation on the land which does not expire until 2079?"

Councillor Jarrett stated that BAE Systems had agreed to contribute towards the costs of the Masterplan work but was not contributing to the funding of airport infrastructure.

Mr Welch asked if Councillor Jarrett could tell the public the name of all the organisations involved in the Rochester Airport Masterplan, in its design going forward, which of those organisations had no financial benefit in its ongoing success?

Councillor Jarrett stated that he could not answer the supplementary question without researching the matter and undertook to respond in writing.

**F. Mike Ongley of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Educational Improvement, Councillor Tolhurst:**

“Do you think Medway will see Educational Improvement if Michael Gove's mission for dismissing hardworking Teaching Assistants is fulfilled?”

Councillor Tolhurst stated that not to see any educational improvement was not an option. The research into the impact of teaching assistants was clear. Whilst children obtained better outcomes when they were taught by a qualified teacher, often, but not in all cases, children with the most difficulties were provided with teacher assistants for support within the classroom. Sometimes, but again not always, those children followed programmes that were not necessarily overseen by qualified teachers in regards to monitoring and correction.

With limited school budgets and the need to enable all children to be provided with a differentiated curriculum, focussed on enabling the children to achieve their full potential, schools would now have to look at their staffing and make decisions based on to the actual children's needs within that school.

In some cases it may be found that Teaching Assistants were replaced by qualified teachers to improve the outcomes but in other cases those Teaching Assistants and their work would be monitored and directed by qualified teachers. But in all of those cases the decision lied firmly with the school and with their governing bodies.

However, the Council was clear, and this was emphasised within the Ofsted framework, that any adult working in schools needed to be outcome focussed and they needed to add value and also contribute to the academic achievement of those children in Medway's schools.

Mr Ongley stated that by the Councillor's statement it appeared that she had no idea what Teaching Assistants actually did within a school.

Councillor Tolhurst stated that she had supported a child at five with mental health issues within a school for a whole year in a very challenging part of the country. She stated that whilst she was not qualified in education, she had seen how Teaching Assistants could work and that there were some extremely talented Teaching Assistants in Medway and all over the country. She stated that those talented Teaching Assistants should be encouraged to skill up, train up and become teachers in the future.

**G. Ben Pranczke of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty:**

“What representations have you or officers of the council made to the government regarding the potential impact on jobs across Medway, including the regional sorting office, with the proposed privatisation of Royal Mail?”

## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Chitty stated that Medway Council had not made any representations to government. However, in 2010, Royal Mail announced major investment totalling £70million to modernise services in Kent and Medway. This included a purpose built state of the art sorting office just off the M2 junction at Strood, which consolidated services for Canterbury, Maidstone, Dartford and Tonbridge. This facility opened in September 2012 and Royal Mail stated that the centre employed up to 850 staff.

She stated that this clearly demonstrated the confidence that Royal Mail had in Medway as a strategic location and Medway Council had no reason to believe that the current share issue would have an adverse effect on employment in the area.

Mr Pranczke asked if Councillor Chitty could guarantee that no postal workers would lose their jobs as a result of the privatisation?

Councillor Chitty stated she could not answer the question as it was not an area in which she had any influence.

### **H. Harrinder Singh of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe:**

“Will the Portfolio Holder confirm the programme of public consultation on the proposed changes to Strood Library to its new location?”

Councillor Doe thanked Mr Singh for his question and advised him that the Council had a longstanding aspiration to establish Community Hubs in each of the main town centres. Community Hubs provided a gateway to Council services and those provided by other public service agencies that were near at hand to a consumer, and they were a clear demonstration of the Council’s commitment to providing a vibrant library service across Medway. He stated that experience elsewhere in the country of course had shown that libraries were closing. Medway Council was not closing libraries but was making sure that those services based in the neighbourhoods and communities were actually more productive and that this was the way forward.

The proposals for Strood followed on from Tesco’s change of heart over their store development, and represented a considerable investment into Strood High Street, which would provide a welcome fillip both in terms of additional footfall and by refurbishing and enhancing an existing dilapidated shop.

The proposals up until a certain point had necessarily been confidential, given the negotiations over the property, but the planning application was publicly available, and of course Medway Matters, which was delivered to every household in Medway, carried a two page article setting out the proposals.

He stated that once the Council secured the necessary planning permissions, assuming that this would happen, there would be ample opportunity for people to provide their views on the broad shape of the proposals as the Hub would



## Council, 17 October 2013

not open until early 2015. There would be an exhibition stand in the existing library setting out the detailed proposals.

### **I. Paul Chaplin of Rainham asked the Chairman of the Employment Matters Committee, Councillor Wicks:**

“Following the Government’s announcement that there will be an immediate review of controversial Zero Hour contracts, can the Chairman tell us why over 10% of Medway Council’s workforce, in excess of 700 people, are employed on such contracts?”

Also why it is only the lower paid employees subjected to these contracts whilst higher grades retain full employment rights on permanent contracts?

Councillor Wicks thanked Mr Chaplin for his question. He advised that there was some confusion over the definition of a zero hour contract. The concern expressed about these contracts was that some employers required these employees to be available even when there was no guarantee of any work and that such employers required people to work exclusively for one organisation.

He stated that this was not the case at Medway Council. He confirmed that Medway did have employees on no set contracted hours and this equated to 11% of the workforce. These employees were not required to be available for work and could decline the offer of work. There were no restrictions placed upon them to prevent them being employed by other organisations and they had employment rights.

By their very nature, there were more lower paid employees on contracts with no set contracted hours but they did have the same employment rights as those on permanent contracts.

He stated that the Council legitimately used this approach for a number of good reasons, such as in theatres, at the Corn Exchange and adult education as these had need of these casual employees to ensure continuity of cover at short notice. These contracts provided flexibility for both employers and employees and they could play a positive role in creating more flexible working options. This could, for example, allow for parents of young children, carers, students and others to fit work around their home lives and there were clear benefits for these employees. For example they were paid at the rate for the job and they received statutory annual leave and statutory sick pay entitlements. They could also join the Local Government Pension Scheme and they could apply for permanent posts in the council as internal applicants before posts were advertised externally. In addition, HR and the Payroll Team reviewed these contracts every six months to ensure that they were being used appropriately.

Mr Chaplin asked that given the huge number of staff involved, over 700, did the council think it fair or ethical to deny its workers basic employment rights with no real security or guaranteed wages preventing them from obtaining a mortgage or rental agreement and with insufficient money to live on. These

## Council, 17 October 2013

staff worked just a few hours and presumably the staff involved understood this but should the tax payer be seriously expected to believe that the Council was a real equal opportunities employer when 10% of its staff were employed in this way?

Councillor Wicks stated that Medway Council was an equal rights employer. He stated that these 700 contracted employees only represented 1.5% in terms of full time equivalent employees and it was a sensible way for the Council to work and that it had been done for quite some time.

### **J. Sue Groves MBE asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services, Councillor Doe:**

“The lack of information in Medway Matters on the annual firework display regarding blue badge parking is in itself a deterrent for people with accessibility issues from attending. This is not unique across Medway Council run events.

Could the Portfolio Holder commit to ensuring that suitable parking provision is made and that provision is promoted actively in Medway Matters and other Council communication mediums?”

Councillor Doe thanked Mrs Groves MBE for her question. He stated that this provided an opportunity to remind people of the provision made by the Council. The annual firework display usually attracted approximately 50,000 visitors and in order to accommodate large numbers attending, as safely as possible, the roads surrounding the perimeter of the event had to be closed to all moving traffic, including local residents, prior to the event and after it. The intention was always to ensure that all Medway’s events, including Bonfire Night, were as inclusive as possible and he stated that Medway had a good track record of achieving this.

He stated that the literature for the fireworks display clearly set out the disabled access points on to the site, and there were a number of car parks around the site that had disabled parking provision. Medway Park, for example, had 10 disabled spaces. It was an excellent location to park and gave ready access on to the Great Lines Heritage Park and two members of the Events Team would be on hand to provide any assistance required for people with disabilities.

He stated that the Council would endeavour to ensure clear communication about disabled parking provision at all of Medway’s events going forward and that it was something continually worked at.

Mrs Groves MBE stated that when she had asked for this information from Medway Council it took a day to be sent a link to the “A-Z Find My Nearest” on the Medway Council website. Once she had eventually navigated her way to a specific car park there was no information on the website for that car park on how many spaces were available. Therefore, what was the point of sending her the link?

## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Doe apologised but stated that he was not aware of that particular exchange of information. He stated that this would be pursued with the appropriate service heads to provide a response.

### **K. James Brewood of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett, the following:**

“It appears you are presiding over a projected overspend of £3.6 million of ratepayers’ money for this financial year. Councillor Chitty has stated that ratepayer money invested in Rochester Airport will be recovered by higher fees for those that use the airport.

To avoid any future surprises similar to this year’s "unacceptable" overspend publicly stated by yourself, can you confirm that you have approved a timely Return on Investment (ROI) calculation for ratepayers’ £4 million investment in the airport infrastructure alone which does not lose the ratepayer money and leave us with another "unacceptable" financial situation?”

Councillor Jarrett stated that with regard to the first part of the question, it was a projected overspend only and that the Administration had presided over a balanced budget for many years in succession.

He stated that with regards to the second sentence in the question, he was not aware that Councillor Chitty had stated that ratepayers’ money invested in Rochester Airport would be recovered by higher fees for those that use the airport. If she had then she was wrong as that would only be part of the return. The Council had assessed a number of options during the masterplan process. It had chosen the preferred proposal that gave an opportunity to provide a return on investment via the disposal of employment land, increased income from the airport itself and not least through an additional income from business rates.

Mr Brewood asked if Councillor Jarrett would like to answer, with a “yes” or “no” answer, whether the investment return on the ratepayers’ money on the airfield alone would be better than putting the money into a building society?

Councillor Jarrett stated “yes”.

Councillor Chitty asked for it to be recorded in the minutes that she had not made the comment attributed to her in Mr Brewood’s question. The Mayor agreed to this request.

### **L. William McLennan of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty, the following:**

“Councillor Chitty purports to be concerned about residents’ safety giving assurances the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) will be involved. However, at the Rochester Airport Masterplan Public Consultation on 22-23 July, it was clear to most people that individuals and organisations invited by Medway Council to talk with the public all had a financial or beneficial interest in its adoption.

## Council, 17 October 2013

Why were no impartial or independent representatives from the Civil Aviation Authority or Air Accident Investigation Branch at the event to offer unbiased guidance to the residents?”

Councillor Chitty stated that the CAA had been consulted and would be consulted again regarding the planning application. The CAA was a regulatory body and they stood alone in their determination of whether the operational practices of an airport were safe or otherwise. If “otherwise” was the answer then they would close an airport down. They were a regulatory body and kept their independence. She stated that her concern was that the Rochester Airport Masterplan followed the correct and due process.

Mr McLennan stated that prior to asking a supplementary question, Councillor Chitty needed to answer “Why were no impartial or independent representatives from the Civil Aviation or Accident Investigation Branch at the event to offer unbiased guidance to the residents?” Why were they not at the public consultation?

Councillor Chitty stated that the CAA would not consider it to be correct to take part in such a consultation. They were a regulatory body which acted independently, therefore, they would not get into a discussion as to the rights and wrongs of any masterplan.

Mr McLennan stated that from this he assumed they were never invited. He asked a supplementary question in that the Rochester Airport Consultative Committee acknowledged at their 24 July meeting that there would be an increased risk if the Medway Council masterplan was adopted. Over the years there had been deaths associated to microlites, helicopters and aircraft based at or originating from Rochester Airfield, this was fact not fiction.

Whilst Councillor Chitty purported to be concerned about residents’ safety, he stated it was clear to many people that her actions belied her words. She appeared more obsessed by a vanity project which protected the airfield at great expense to the public purse than for residents’ safety. He asked Councillor Chitty to say what she would say to his children if an aircraft from Rochester Airport crashed into his house killing him and his wife.

Councillor Chitty stated due process involved ensuring that this Masterplan went through properly with due consideration and that any further work that was done, either through planning or environmental health, was done properly. The purpose of a Masterplan process was setting down the principles of the development of the airport. Any planning application that came forward as a result of the Masterplan would need to be assessed in terms impact, including safety, noise, deliverability and so forth. This masterplan was laying out these principles. Other than that, she stated that she could not answer Mr McLennan’s question.

## **Council, 17 October 2013**

### **M. Michael Fowler of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty, the following:**

“Can Councillor Chitty please confirm that she understands by approving the current Rochester Airport Masterplan, the Council will have no power under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 or the Noise Act 1996 to protect local residents from the intensification of pollution, noise, and trespass of aircraft over local schools, elderly care centres and homes near to the airfield.”

Councillor Chitty stated that if the airport was in Local Authority ownership then Section 80 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 could not be invoked. However, local residents could evoke Section 82 of the Environmental Protection Act and the local authority could use planning controls to protect local residents from unreasonable noise. She stated that as far as she was aware, the law of trespass did not apply to airspace.

Mr Fowler asked with the extra concentration of flights from the paved runway and the recommended cap on air movements to 50,000 per year, could Councillor Chitty explain how Medway Council would be able to protect the community from the intensification of flights on an ongoing basis for 25 years when there were no statutory laws to protect residents.

Councillor Chitty stated that she had no figures as to the precise number of flights that would be taking place and undertook to investigate further and answer in writing.

### **N. Lauren Wright of Walderslade asked the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer:**

“Will the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services look to put additional double yellow and single line markings on King George Road and Meadow Close in light of increasing parking concerns during weekdays near the Walderslade Hook Meadow library?”

Councillor Filmer stated that he understood there was a problem in King George Road and Meadow Close regarding the parking around by the library. He stated that he was very happy to ask officers to monitor the situation. If it was found to be a problem and it merited double yellow lines or single lines the Council would do the necessary consultation and what it could to alleviate the problem.

Councillor Filmer also stated that there was an extra piece of land in front of the library that could be used for parking which may in the long term help the situation. Therefore, he stated that he was happy to look at both points.

### **O. Jonathan Primett of Chatham had submitted the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following:**

“Does the Leader of the Council feel that public consultations are a legitimate expense and of any real value when in the eyes of many residents in Medway,

## Council, 17 October 2013

they are seen to be largely disregarded and overlooked, and in the case of Rochester Airport, the decision seems to have been made and the money allocated before a consultation has even concluded?

Councillor Rodney Chambers stated that he did believe that public consultation was a legitimate expense. When the Council was minded to prepare a Masterplan, which may in due course become Supplementary Planning Policy, the Council was required to follow procedure as set out in National Planning legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement."

The Council had consulted on the Rochester Airport Masterplan in line with its requirements for planning policy documents.

Councillor Chambers advised that the Council publicised the airport consultation widely, including the distribution of over 7000 flyers to local residents and businesses, to ensure that people were aware of the proposals and given the opportunity to make their comments. An initial consultation on emerging proposals was arranged in Spring 2013, including a two-day staffed exhibition in the local area. This was in addition to the formal 8 week consultation period on the draft Masterplan.

He stated that the Council would take account of all responses made to the consultation. It would publish this information together with a statement of how the issues raised had been considered.

In respect of consultations in general, the result was often that amendments were made in the light of competing opinions and views received.

### **P. Robert Heathfield of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett, the following:**

"Will the Portfolio Holder confirm the potential sum of money being returned to Morrisons due to failure to deliver improvements for Strood residents?"

Councillor Jarrett stated that the Council was currently working up the detailed design for the pedestrian accessibility improvement scheme at Darnley Arch. At this stage there was no suggestion that funding would be returned to Morrisons, since it would all be spent delivering these local accessibility improvements.

Mr Heathfield stated that he recently attended an overview and scrutiny meeting where they discussed the improvements and requested that the Council make sure that no public money was used for the improvements because there was quite a lot of Morrisons money. He stated that should Council give money back to Morrisons could the Council state how much and why?

Councillor Jarrett stated he had been quite clear in his first answer. The Council did not anticipate any funding being returned to Morrisons because the scheme would be undertaken.

## Council, 17 October 2013

### **Q. Rachel Garrick of Rochester asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member), Councillor O'Brien the following:**

"At this point in time, Ofsted has stated that some 8,000 children in Medway receive primary education which is of a poor quality. The area has a high correlation between the receipt of means tested free school dinners and failure to attain national average results in GCSEs. The area now has a grammar school which has been placed in special measures. What plans does the Council have to secure the education and future employment prospects of the area's children?"

Councillor O'Brien stated that Ofsted had brought in a new framework for inspecting schools, with a much higher bar. Schools were now judged against grade criteria which rank them as "Outstanding", "Good", "Requires Improvement" or "Special Measures".

Ofsted reported publicly on what percentage of schools in each area were good or outstanding and at other times they reported the percentage of children who met national standards in tests. He stated that in Medway there were:

45 good and outstanding primary schools  
14 good and outstanding secondary schools

19 that required improvement to be good primary schools  
1 required improvement to be a good secondary school

12 primary schools were satisfactory under the Ofsted rules  
1 secondary school was satisfactory

There was 1 pupil referral unit in serious weaknesses with capacity to improve and 1 new primary school which awaited an inspection.

Medway's primary results at KS2 were improving - they rose by 2% this year and narrowed the gap to the national average by 5%.

Medway's KS1 results were improving - these rose by 2% this year and narrowed the gap to the national average. Reading and writing was 1% off the national average and Maths was 1% above the national average.

Medway's results for GCSEs were not yet validated so these could not be formally reported. However, last year Medway schools achieved 61.2% 5A\*-C (or equivalent) including English and Maths. This was 2.4% above the national average and provisional results showed a pass rate of 60.5%, but these were yet to be validated so they may increase or decrease.

He also stated that two of Medway's schools, St John Fisher and The Howard School both enjoyed their best ever A-level results this year.

The grammar school placed in special measures was a standalone Academy. Whilst the Ofsted judgement categorised the school as being in special

## Council, 17 October 2013

measures, 95% of pupils achieved at least 5 GCSE A\* - C including English and Maths.

He stated that there was much the Council was doing to support schools and this year was showing a continual improvement in results across all phases. In the current educational system, the responsibility for raising attainment and narrowing any gaps between the achievement of children on free school meals and other pupils rested with the school and the governing body.

Councillor O'Brien advised that the Council was committed to be ambitious for all children and took seriously its continuing role as a champion for children. In an ever changing and demanding school environment the Council would do all it could to work with headteachers and governors to enable them to have staff who were able to deliver the outstanding education for children and young people in Medway.

Mrs Garrick stated that this was not acknowledging the 29 primary schools not providing adequate education in the area or the 8,000 primary school children that Ofsted had cited as not receiving good education. Moreover, she asked how could it be justified that when there were 34% of children eligible for school meals failing to attain grades A-C at GCSE in five subjects, including Maths and English, that enough was being done. She asked Councillor O'Brien, as a grandfather, if he was happy with his answer.

Councillor O'Brien stated that, as a grandfather, and having visited nearly all of the schools in Medway since his appointment, that he was satisfied and pleased with the response that he had received from all the headteachers, the fantastic teaching staff and the fantastic teaching assistants in Medway, all of whom were working very hard to achieve the best possible outcome for children and also the children themselves.

He stated that they were all working extremely hard, that was why they had achieved the fantastic results he had referred to.

He stated that he wished that this constant negativity of running down pupils would be stopped. Medway's pupils were fantastic and they were working fantastically hard. He stated that everyone should be really proud of them, extremely proud of their results and that he was confident that they would continue to be offered the best education system in the country.

### **R. Vivienne Parker of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Development and Economic Growth, Councillor Chitty, the following:**

"Now that our Local Plan has lapsed and we are now operating according to paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework which means there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development particularly where policies are out of date, does this mean that the development at Lodge Hill can now go ahead in any event?"



## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Chitty thanked Ms Parker for her question. She advised that 'saved' policies from the Medway Local Plan had not lapsed and so continued to be applied to decisions on planning applications. Decisions could be based on these saved policies provided that they did not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework set out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development, regardless of whether or not there was a local plan in force.

In the current situation, if the Council was minded to approve a planning application on Lodge Hill or there was a planning appeal, it would have to be referred to the Secretary of State and so any decision on whether development could go ahead is a matter for the Government.

### **S. Mike Ongley of Chatham will asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member), Councillor O'Brien, the following:**

"Do you support the GMB Campaign to defend the role of Teaching Assistants in Medway schools which are under threat from Michael Gove?"

Councillor O'Brien stated that the decision to employ or not employ Teaching Assistants was entirely for the school and its governing body. Teaching Assistants were valued members of the school workforce and he referred to a previous answer regarding the fantastic Teaching Assistants in Medway. The role of any support staff in school was very important but their work needed to be planned, targeted at need and then monitored and evaluated in terms of impact."

Mr Ongley thanked the Councillor for his response to this and the previous question (question Q) and he stated that he was glad that somebody actually recognised the hard work that Teaching Assistants did in Medway.

### **T. Vivienne Parker of Chatham asked the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer, the following:**

"Why has the Council not so far sprayed 2 sites of Japanese knotweed on Street End Road, Chatham and at the bottom of Napier Road, Gillingham which I reported to Front Line Services earlier this summer?"

Councillor Filmer thanked Ms Parker for her question. The Council's method of treating Japanese Knotweed was to inject into the stem and then this went down to the rhizome to kill it off. This method took approximately 18 months to two years to actually kill it off after which it could be cleared from the site more safely so it did not spread. Street End Road was injected in July 2013 using this method.

He stated that officers had investigated the second site in Napier Road and found it was a privately owned site and had made recommendations to the owner regarding what should be done. The owner had been provided with the

## Council, 17 October 2013

list of qualified contractors. He stated that he would ask the officers to return to see if any work had been completed and if it had not been completed the Council would take enforcement action.

Councillor Filmer advised that Japanese Knotweed was extremely invasive and would rapidly spread if it was cut as a result. The sub contractor injected the treatment directly into the stem and repeated this operation for a period of up to 3 years - most cases were usually eradicated within 18 months to 2 years but the Council allowed for additional treatments to ensure the best control possible. No cutting back and clearing took place until all the plant material was dead which may, in some cases, explain why residents may think the Council had not acted.

Ms Parker asked that given that Japanese Knotweed was very persistent could the Council confirm that they would be revisiting these sites until the Japanese Knotweed had been completely eliminated?

Councillor Filmer stated that he had said that the Council would do this.

### 464 Leader's report

#### Discussion:

Members received and debated the Leader's report, which included the following:

- Education and employment opportunities
- Economic Development and growth
- Health and wellbeing
- Pay Day lending
- Children's Services improvements
- Rochester Airport Masterplan
- Local Plan
- Zero hour contracts
- Strood Community Hub
- Social Workers – the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member) asked that his appreciation of the work undertaken by the Council's Social Workers be placed on record and conveyed to the staff.

### 465 Overview and scrutiny activity

#### Discussion:

Members received and debated a report on overview and scrutiny activities, which included the following:

- Outcomes of NHS consultation on acute mental health inpatient beds redesign in Kent and Medway
- Member development session 10 September 2013

## Council, 17 October 2013

- Rochester Airport Masterplan
- Procurement Strategy
- Overnight short breaks provision for disabled children and young children (Preston Screens)
- Medium Term Financial Plan
- Accident and Emergency pressures
- City Deal
- Parking
- Snow Angels
- Pay day lending.

### 466 Members' questions

**(A) Councillor Juby asked the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services (Lead Member), Councillor O'Brien, the following:**

"Whilst welcoming the new Liberal Democrat initiative for free school meals for all early years children, will the Portfolio Holder be conducting a thorough review of our primary schools to ensure that they all have sufficient space and facilities to provide this service?"

Councillor O'Brien stated that the Council would watch with interest the development of this scheme and the Council would do all it could to make best use of it in Medway.

The proposal was still in its infancy and the Council awaited details of how this was to be implemented and funded. Once there was clarity the Council would be in a position to assess and scope the space and facilities needed to deliver the project. As kitchens were constantly under review the Council already knew where the challenges would be, but the solutions would be different depending on how the project was to be delivered.

**(B) Councillor Osborne asked the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Filmer, the following:**

"Can the Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services, Councillor Phil Filmer, confirm how many miles of road the Council manages?"

Councillor Filmer stated that the Council had a total carriageway length of 831km (516 miles), which included single, dual carriageway and roundabouts."

The total pavement length was 1,042km (647 miles). Obviously, the pavement length was not exactly double the carriageway length, because there were, for example, country lanes.

As some roads were dual carriageway, the total "Lane length" was 1,714km (1,065 miles). For Highways Maintenance Budget purposes the Council looked at the highway / pavement linear distance as a total and this was often referred to as a total distance of approximately 1,500-1,600 miles.

## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Osborne stated that he appreciated the answer. He stated that there was a lack of clarity in the public realm about how many miles of road not highway that the Council managed, largely because of irresponsible press statements indicating that the Council had three times the amount of road than the actual total. He asked if Councillor Filmer could ensure that future statements made by the Conservative Group had the right level of number of roads and the right length.

Councillor Filmer stated that he was quite happy to send Councillor Osborne a copy of the exact figures by email.

**(C) Councillor Osborne asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, the following:**

“Can the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, confirm whether he will co-sign a letter to the Chief Executive of Gillingham Football Club in support of the Stonewall 'Right Behind Gay Footballers' campaign?”

Councillor Rodney Chambers stated that all forms of discrimination whether they be sexist, racist or homophobic had no place in a modern society, and the Council worked hard to eradicate such discrimination.

Gillingham FC had already in February 2013 committed itself to opposing homophobia by signing up to the Football Association initiative 'Football v Homophobia' campaign. In addition Gillingham FC backed the 'Kick it Out' organisation which campaigned to end all forms of discrimination in the game.

He stated that for the reasons just stated he did not consider it necessary to write to the Chief Executive of Gillingham FC as they were already supporting two campaigns to stamp out homophobia in the football game.

Councillor Osborne stated that he welcomed the support of Gillingham FC to anti-homophobia campaigns in football. This council had a significant profile within the area, including the Medway Matters publication and that a co-signed letter would reach a significantly larger number of people if the Council was to offer support to this cross-party campaign backed by the government and opposition alike, therefore, he asked again whether Councillor Rodney Chambers co-sign the letter?

Councillor Rodney Chambers stated that he had already given a reason for this not being necessary.

**(D) Councillor Igwe asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett, the following:**

“Please could you advise me on the number of households with rent arrears or the total amount owed to the Council in rent arrears since the implementation of the bedroom tax?”

## Council, 17 October 2013

Councillor Jarrett stated that Medway Council's HRA rent arrears as at 31 March 2013 were £279,209.01 including Homes for Independent Living/Sheltered Accommodation. This equated to a total of 828 tenants in arrears.

HRA rent arrears as at 6 October 2013 had fallen to £269,368.64 (including Homes for Independent Living/Sheltered Accommodation) with 733 tenants in arrears. This represented a reduction overall of £9,840.37.

Councillor Igwe asked if he could be told how much in legal fees would it cost the Council to recover debts associated with this?

Councillor Jarrett stated that he would provide a written answer to the supplementary question.

**(E) Councillor Igwe asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Deputy Leader, Councillor Jarrett, the following:**

"Please advise me on the total number of food bank sites across Medway and the total number of households known to depend on food banks each month?"

Councillor Jarrett stated that he had been provided this information by Helen Gallagher, the Medway Foodbank Co-ordinator.

Medway Foodbank comprised a warehouse and office on the Medway City Estate and six local Foodbank Centres, which was where clients came to receive food donated by Medway people to support those in need.

The Medway Foodbank opened in December 2011 and on average 93 vouchers had been issued each month.

One voucher equated to sufficient food for 3-4 days, sufficient for the size of the household to whom the voucher had been issued, a basic amount for a single person, more proportionately for a family. Clients were not given more than four vouchers in succession, although voucher issuers had the discretion to issue more if they felt it was necessary.

Councillor Igwe asked how long would Medway continue to have a Foodbank?

Councillor Jarrett stated that there would be one for as long as there was a need and he suspected that this need would run for as long as it took the Conservative-led government to dig the country out of the mess it was left in by the last Labour government.

**467 Additions to the Capital Programme**

**Discussion:**

This report provided details of three schemes to be added to the Council's Capital Programme: the Housing Revenue Account Development Programme, Strood Community Hub and Solar Photovoltaic Energy Systems.

The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, supported by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

Councillor Maple, supported by Councillor Harriott, proposed the following amendment:

(Retain recommendations 10.1-10.3) and add new recommendation 10.4:

“Council notes the decision taken by Council officers under urgency powers that future capital projects will come forward for the refurbishment/relocation of Riverside 1 and expansion of Twydall Community Hub”.

Under Council Rule 11.4.2 and with the consent of the Council, Councillor Jarrett and the seconder of the substantive motion agreed to alter the substantive motion to include the proposed amendment.

**Decision:**

- a) Council approved the addition of a £5.5m Housing Development Programme to the Council's Capital Programme funded by utilising the £5.5m borrowing Headroom available to the Housing Revenue Account.
- b) Council approved the addition of £1 million to the Capital Programme to fund the refurbishment and fit-out costs of the Strood Community Hub.
- c) Council approved a funding envelope for the Solar Photovoltaic Energy Systems scheme by adding £230,000 to the capital programme.
- d) Council noted the decision taken by Council officers under urgency powers that future capital projects will come forward for the refurbishment/relocation of Riverside 1 and expansion of Twydall Community Hub.

**468 Constitutional Matters**

**Discussion:**

This report provided details of a recommendation to amend the terms of reference of the Employment Matters Committee and a number of proposed changes to co-opted/added members on the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## **Council, 17 October 2013**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, supported by the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

### **Decision:**

- a) Council agreed to amend the terms of reference of the Employment Matters Committee as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.
- b) Council agreed the changes to Co-opted and Added Members positions on the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee as set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

## **469 Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 - Update**

### **Discussion:**

This report informed Members of the new legislative requirements of the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013, including necessary changes to the Licensing and Safety Committee's Terms of Reference, Scheme of Delegations and the fee setting process.

The Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Customer Contact, Councillor Hicks, supported by the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

### **Decision:**

- a) Council agreed to add responsibility for dealing with all matters relating to the functions of the Council under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 to the terms of reference of the Licensing and Safety Committee.
- b) Council noted that the Licensing and Safety Committee has agreed:
  - the powers and duties of the council as the licensing authority relating to the determination of applications made under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 be delegated to the Assistant Director, Legal and Corporate Services.
  - the setting of fees under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 be delegated to the Assistant Director, Legal and Corporate Services.
  - that the Licensing Sub Committee should consider and determine the action to be taken when representations are received from an applicant where it is proposed to refuse, vary or revoke a scrap metal licence.
- c) Council agreed the consequential changes to the Council's Constitution as set out in Appendix D to the report.

## 470 Composition of the Independent Remuneration Panel

### Discussion:

This report set out proposed changes to the composition of the Independent Remuneration Panel along with recommendations about recruitment arrangements.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, supported by the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

Councillor Maple, supported by Councillor Craven, proposed the following amendment:

Recommendation 7.1 – delete paragraphs (a) and (b) and replace with:

- a) to amend the membership of the Panel to a maximum of five for an initial appointment of four years and specify that applications are encouraged from people with experience in specific sectors like the business community, the charity or not-for-profit sector, or Human Resources.
- b) to authorise the Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance to make arrangements with the South East Employers organisation to provide support by way of assistance with recruitment and induction of Panel members.

During discussion on the amendment and in response to a Member's question, the Monitoring Officer advised that it was possible for the Panel to have a non-voting Chairman.

During debate on the amendment, as permitted (under Council rule 11.4.2) the Leader of the Council with the consent of the meeting and the seconder of the substantive motion agreed to incorporate a proposal that the Panel should comprise a non-voting Chairman from South East Employers and five other voting members. On that basis, Councillor Maple indicated his support for the revised substantive motion. The Mayor then put the revised substantive motion to the vote.

### Decision:

- a) Council agreed the membership of the Panel should comprise five people plus a non-voting Chairman (from South East Employers) for an initial appointment of four years and specified that applications should be encouraged from people with experience in specific sectors like the business community, the charity or not-for-profit sector, or Human Resources.
- b) Council agreed to authorise the Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance to make arrangements



## Council, 17 October 2013

with the South East Employers organisation to provide support by way of Chairing the Panel (in a non voting capacity) and assistance with recruitment and induction of Panel members.

- c) Council agreed to authorise the Deputy Director, Customer Contact, Leisure, Culture, Democracy and Governance to make necessary arrangements to recruit to the vacant positions on the Panel as set out in paragraph 3.2 of the report.
- d) Council agreed that Panel members be offered a fee of £50 per session and be entitled to claim back travel and subsistence costs at the same rate as elected Members.

### 471 Special Urgency Decisions

#### Discussion:

This report provided details of the recent use of urgency powers by the Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture with reference to a HR matter in July 2013 and a Housing Revenue Account issue in September 2013.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Rodney Chambers, supported by the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Jarrett, proposed the recommendations set out in the report.

#### Decision:

Council noted the report.

### 472 Motions

#### (A) Councillor Chishti submitted the following:

This Council notes that Medway has a proud military history and has maintained strong links with the Armed Forces.

This Council also notes that Medway's commitment to the Armed Forces Community Covenant ensures the needs of those residents of Medway who serve, or have served, the country are recognised and supported at a local level.

This Council further notes that many other residents have, through a range of professions, served the country in equally significant measures, such as in national security and defence – including those who participated in the testing of Britain's nuclear weapons in the 1950s and 1960s.

This Council welcomes that, following a Ministry of Defence commissioned Health Needs Analysis in 2011 of British nuclear test veterans, the NHS has introduced a number of practical measures to support them.

## Council, 17 October 2013

This Council believes that other parts of the public and voluntary sector should seek to introduce a similar measure to support nuclear test veterans – and that the Council should lead this at a local level by extending the provisions of the Armed Forces Community Covenant to those veterans who live in Medway.

Councillor Maple, supported by Councillor Harriott, proposed an amendment as follows:

Add new paragraph below current paragraph no. 4:

This Council further notes the significant number of residents affected by the medical conditions related to exposure to asbestos and radiation. This exposure was prevalent in the Chatham Naval Dockyard. The individuals affected were those employed at those sites, in both military and non military roles and often their immediate family members in the worst cases leading to terminal medical conditions.

Add the following text (underlined) to current paragraph 5:

This Council believes that other parts of the public and voluntary sector should seek to introduce a similar measure to support nuclear test veterans and those families impacted by exposure to asbestos and radiation – and that the Council should lead this at a local level by extending the provisions of the Armed Forces Community Covenant to those veterans who live in Medway.

During consideration of the motion and in response to a Member's question whether the amendment could be agreed by the Council, the Monitoring Officer suggested that the word "alleged" be added to the amendment as follows:

"The alleged individuals affected..."

Under Council rule 11.4.2 Councillor Chishti, with the consent of the Council and the seconder of the substantive motion agreed to alter the substantive motion to incorporate the proposed amendment.

The mover of the motion also confirmed his support for the amendment including the Monitoring Officer's proposed wording.

### **Decision:**

This Council notes that Medway has a proud military history and has maintained strong links with the Armed Forces.

This Council also notes that Medway's commitment to the Armed Forces Community Covenant ensures the needs of those residents of Medway who serve, or have served, the country are recognised and supported at a local level.

This Council further notes that many other residents have, through a range of professions, served the country in equally significant measures, such as in

## Council, 17 October 2013

national security and defence – including those who participated in the testing of Britain's nuclear weapons in the 1950s and 1960s.

This Council welcomes that, following a Ministry of Defence commissioned Health Needs Analysis in 2011 of British nuclear test veterans, the NHS has introduced a number of practical measures to support them.

This Council further notes the significant number of residents affected by the medical conditions related to exposure to asbestos and radiation. This exposure was prevalent in the Chatham Naval Dockyard. The alleged individuals affected were those employed at those sites, in both military and non military roles and often their immediate family members in the worst cases leading to terminal medical conditions

This Council believes that other parts of the public and voluntary sector should seek to introduce a similar measure to support nuclear test veterans and those families impacted by exposure to asbestos and radiation – and that the Council should lead this at a local level by extending the provisions of the Armed Forces Community Covenant to those veterans who live in Medway.

### **(B) Councillor Igwe submitted the following:**

This Council recognises that the Royal Mail is part of the fabric of our nation and believes that plans for its privatisation will lead to high prices and a reduction in services for the people who need those services the most.

Council agrees to formally sign the “Save our Royal Mail” petition to put pressure on the Government to reverse its decision and protect the country's postal services; and that the Leader of the Council should write to the Secretary of State for Business and Enterprise conveying the terms of this motion.

Under Council rule 11.4.2, Councillor Igwe proposed the following alteration to the motion:

Delete original motion and replace with:

This Council notes the regrettable flotation of the Royal Mail and believes that this privatisation will negatively impact residents, businesses and those working for the Royal Mail in Medway. Council agrees that the Leader of the Council should write to the Secretary of State for Business and Enterprise conveying the terms of this motion.

Council rule 11.4.1 states that a Member may alter a motion of which he/she has given notice with the consent of the meeting. The meeting's consent will be signified without discussion. On being put to the vote, the meeting did not give consent for the motion to be altered.

The original motion was withdrawn.

## **Council, 17 October 2013**

### **(C) Councillor Murray submitted the following:**

Council notes that over 80 councils have introduced the living wage of £7.45 an hour outside of London and £8.55 inside London.

Council agrees to introduce the living wage to all directly employed Medway Council employees from 1 January 2014 and instruct officers to explore options to move all those who carry out work on behalf of Medway Council to also be paying the living wage.

On being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

**Mayor**

**Date:**

**Julie Keith, Head of Democratic Services**

Telephone: 01634 332760

Email: [democratic.services@medway.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@medway.gov.uk)