



The Civic Centre
St Stephen's Place
TROWBRIDGE
Wiltshire.
BA14 8AH
info@trowbridge.gov.uk

9th March 2022

SUMMONS

To all members of the Council: Councillors: Allsworth, Bates, Beaver, Blackmore, Blakemore, Bridges, Bryant, Cave, Cavill, Cooper, Halik, Hill, Hoar, Jacob, Edward Kirk, Emily Kirk, Lincoln, Palmen, Piazza, Trigg and Vigar.

Dear Councillor,

You are hereby summoned to **The Meeting of Trowbridge Town Council** to be held on **Tuesday 15th March 2022**, at 19:00 in **The Council Chamber, The Civic, Trowbridge**.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lance Allan'.

Lance Allan
Town Clerk

Members of the public are welcome to attend meetings of the Council and Committees, unless specifically excluded due to the confidential nature of business. As a result of the restrictions imposed to control the pandemic, public access will be limited. **Please contact info@trowbridge.gov.uk by 16:00 on 14th March if you wish to attend this meeting in person. Where it is not possible for you to attend due to reaching the capacity limit, view and listen access will be available online via Microsoft TEAMS:** please go to the Town Council Website – Your Council – [Meetings](#) to find the link. Only those attending in person will be able to ask questions and make statements at the meeting during the public period. Questions and statements can otherwise be submitted in advance.

AGENDA

This meeting will be recorded.

1. **APOLOGIES**

- a. **To receive** apologies from those unable to attend.
- b. **To consider for acceptance** apologies received with reasons for absence.

2. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

- a. **To read and approve** as a correct record the Minutes of the Council meeting held on [18th January 2022](#). Copies of these Minutes have been circulated and Standing Order A6.5.2 provides that they may therefore be taken as read.
- b. **To consider any matters** relating to those minutes.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lance Allan'.

3. MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

To receive and consider reports, minutes and recommendations of Committees already circulated, enclosed herewith or to be circulated. There have been the following meetings since the last meeting of Council.

a. **Leisure & Information Services Committee** [22nd February](#)

Questions to Chair – Cllr Bates.

b. **Town Development Committee** Virtual Consultation Meetings: [25th January](#), [15th February](#), Full Committee meeting: 8th March (minutes to follow).

Questions to the Chair – Cllr Bryant.

c. **Policy & Resources Committee** [1st March](#)

Questions to the Leader – Cllr Palmen.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

a. **To receive Declarations of Interest** from members and officers (as per the agenda) as appropriate in respect of matters contained in this agenda, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 in respect of officers and the Local Government Act 2000 and the Trowbridge Town Council Code of Conduct in respect of members.

b. **To consider any Dispensation Requests** received by the Town Clerk and not previously considered.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

To receive such communications as the Mayor may wish to lay before the Council.

a. Mayor's Engagements (copy attached)

6. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM

To allow questions from the public which may be answered but not debated.

7. POLICE MATTERS

To receive a report from Sergeant Charlotte Chilton (copy attached).

8. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

To consider questions received from councillors by the deadline: Thursday 3rd March.

A. QUESTION: 220216 09:06 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following questions submitted by Cllr Stephen Cooper

Preamble:

There is still seemingly a lot of confusion regarding Trowbridge Town Council's liability to repay CIL monies received from Wiltshire Council if we were to cancel or curtail the Doric Park Project. We all seem to be quoting figures that range from £7k to £400k!

I would therefore be grateful if the following questions could be answered so as to once and for all make sure that all Councillors are in possession of accurate and exact information.

Questions & Town Clerk's Responses (sent on 16th February 2022 at 10:01 and circulated to all councillors at 10:59 the same day):

Doric Park and its potential CIL/S106 liabilities

1. If TTC were to cancel Doric Park, can you please quantify our liability to repay CIL money already received from Wiltshire Council?

There is no CIL money that has been invested in the project (I use the word invested rather than spent as a number of councillors pointed out at yesterday's Wiltshire Council meeting that it is the correct term when referring to capital projects). The contributions that have been invested in the project so far are S106 planning contributions. We COULD be liable to repay the amount we have already spent IF and ONLY IF the council also decides to do nothing with the land in respect of developing new sports pitches and associated buildings. IF the council does not pursue the Doric Park 3G ATP option then £7418 is repayable as only one of the payments received was specifically for this project. The likelihood of the council paying back more than £7k is minimal. (Almost everything is possible, fewer things are probable and somethings are very unlikely.)

Additional response: Having double checked the accounts there have been allocations of CIL in 2018/19 £10,000 and in 2029/20 £5355

2. If TTC were to change the Doric Park project to remove the 3G pitch and replace it with a grass pitch, can you please quantify our liability to repay CIL money already received from Wiltshire Council?

Under option 2 only the £7418 would have to be paid back.

3. What is the total amount of CIL so far received from Wiltshire Council towards the Doric Park Project?

CIL – £15355

S106: Income	
04/01063/OUT Southview Farm	£225,000
04/02105/OUT Castle Mead (Land adj. Scrap Yard, Green Lane)	£465,802
05/00967/OUT Paxcroft Mead West (Land North of Paxcroft Way)	£147,294
07/03864/OUTES Abbey New Homes (Land North of Green Lane)	£55,991
14/10154/FUL 16 Holbrook Lane	£11,165
16/12263/FUL St George's Works	£7,418
Sub-total income	£912,670
Expenditure	
Completed purchase of 5 Acres at Devizes Road	£78,093
Completed purchase of Woodmarsh	£187,770
Development of Town Park tennis courts	£91,500
Sub-total expenditure	£357,363
Total available November 2019	£557,307
Spent 2018/19	£32,438
Spent 2019/20	£70,640
Spent 2020/21	£51,093
Spent 2021/22	£33,591
Balance Feb 2022	£367,545

4. What is the total amount of CIL so far received from Wiltshire Council that has been spend on the Doric Park Project?

As above

5. Is any balance of CIL received from Wiltshire Council for Doric Park but not yet spent held in a dedicated "ringfenced" account?

Yes, all of that balance is held in TTC accounts as an earmarked reserve.

6. Are there any further CIL funds expected from Wiltshire Council specifically for the Doric Park Project?

No further S106 is expected. CIL is received every year from Wiltshire Council and can be spent on anything TTC decides to spend it on – none of it is specifically ringfenced for any specific purpose or project.

7. Has TTC to date received funding from any other source than CIL for the Doric Park project..... if so how much and from where?

No other funding has been put towards the Doric Park project.

8. Would TTC have any liabilities other than CIL repayments due if it were to cancel the Doric Park project?

The town council would not have any other liabilities in respect of the Doric Park project if it was cancelled other than the repayment of S106 – but that would only be IF the council did not develop any pitches and associated buildings. (Other than the £7148).

9. Would TTC have any liabilities other than CIL repayments due if it were to amend the Doric Park project to remove the 3G pitch?

If the 3G pitch were removed then the council would need to renegotiate the deal with the rugby club and would have to repay the £7418.

10. If TTC were to cancel the project, what is the current market value of the land owned by TTC at Doric Park?

I do not know the market value of the land, it very much depends on its use. As pasture it is not worth as much as TTC paid for it, as housing land it is worth much more – but if TTC sold the land then it would have to repay the original purchase cost to Wiltshire Council as S106 (see above)

B. QUESTION: 220222 08:46 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk to the HOS.

Preamble:

Lance has already indicated that we have spent about £300k of S106 on the Doric Park site.

Question:

Please may I have a breakdown of these costs, together with any other funds spent on the site. Please may I have this information prior to the Leisure Services meeting tomorrow?

Town Clerk's Response:

This information was provided by Cllr Cooper in his email to councillors of 16th February at 10:59 which attached my information responding to Councillor Cooper.

C. QUESTION: 220222 08:52 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Question:

Please can you let me have the breakdown on what has been spent on the Doric Park Project/Site to date (estimated at £300k)? I understand it is all from S106, with no other costs except Officer time.

Town Clerk's Response:

This information was provided by Cllr Cooper in his email to councillors of 16th February at 10:59 which attached my information responding to Councillor Cooper. If the level of detail provided in that response is insufficient you would need to be more specific about what detail you require.

D. QUESTION: 220222 12:23 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Question:

I was hopeful that I would receive an actual breakdown of how much has been spent on purchasing the land including legal fees, the planning application, the legal agreement with TRFC and any other matters? The lump sum figures don't really give anyone an understanding of where the money has been spent. Residents have asked where their money has been invested. Doric Park is still just a field, which doesn't appear to have changed since the Council purchased it.

Town Clerk's Response:

Cllr Kirk was provided sight of copies of the full ledgers for nine years detailing all payments in respect of the land at Doric Park which was summarised as follows:

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22 Q3	TOTAL
Purchase of Land										
Business Rates	452	-452			1067	1174	1316	1531	1190	6278
Water Rates	448	360	36	25	13	12	37	17	29	977
Electricity		152	86	110	-57					291
Insurance		77	69	70	67					283
Other			43		8387	8814	4002			21246
Capital	78093				0	32438	70640	51093	33591	265855
										294930

In addition to the above it should also be noted that £5,355 of Community Infrastructure Levy was allocated to the project as at 31/03/2020 and as recorded in the CIL statement on the website:

<https://www.trowbridge.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/210810-CIL-SUMMARY.pdf>

This covered operating costs included in Business Rates, Water Rates and Other sections as above.

E. QUESTION: 220222 13:49 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Question:

Sorry, I still make the amount spent £224,410 and the S106 allocation £187,762?

I'll ask in the meeting how we get to £300,000.

Town Clerk's Response: (sent on 22nd February at 13:58)

Expenditure	
Completed purchase of 5 Acres at Devizes Road	£78,093
Completed purchase of Woodmarsh	£187,770
Development of Town Park tennis courts	£91,500
Sub-total expenditure	£357,363
Total available November 2019	£557,307
Spent 2018/19	£32,438
Spent 2019/20	£70,640
Spent 2020/21	£51,093
Spent 2021/22	£33,591
Balance Feb 2022	£367,545

Total spent on Doric Park so far £265,855
The items in red add up to £265,855
£300,000 was only ever a rough rounding up.

F. QUESTION: 220222 13:59 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk. (To Cllr Cooper)

Preamble:

Thank you for this. Please can you assist with my questions below.

As you are already aware, this is the statement from the Town Clerk a month ago:

If S106 is invested in pitch and changing facilities it can be used.

If the whole project is cancelled the Council would have to give back the £400,000 S106 not spent and also the £300,000 already spent on pursuing the project (including purchase of the land).

We COULD be liable to repay the amount we have already spent IF and ONLY IF the council also decides to do nothing with the land in respect of developing new sports pitches and associated buildings.

Questions & Town Clerk's Responses (sent 220222 14:09)

What is the exact amount, with a breakdown of the S106 money already spent in the pursuance of Doric Park?

This information was provided by Cllr Cooper in his email to councillors of 16th February at 10:59 (three hours before the email from Cllr Kirk) which attached my information to Councillor Cooper.

What constitutes 'sports pitches' and 'associated building'?

As per my email of 10th February at 14:51 any interpretation of definitions in a legal agreement to which the Town Council is not a party will need to be resolved by Wiltshire Council's legal department.

Is access required to the site to satisfy the S106? If this is the case, we either need an agreement with Trowbridge Rugby Club or spend a £1,000,000 on a separate entrance (which Highways had concerns with).

As with all planning applications, once approved it should be implemented in accordance with the submitted plans. This is not a matter for the S106 agreement. It should be noted that; Highways have never expressed any concerns with a separate entrance. They suggested a cost figure because it would require the widening of the carriageway (within the highway boundary) to provide a right turn lane for traffic coming from Semington and that ideally it should be further back towards Semington to distance it from the entrance to the Rugby Club, this would be likely to require additional land not currently in the control of the council.

My understanding was that S106 had to be used for something 'viable'?

This is not a question.

Would car parking be a requirement for 'viability'?

As this refers to your stated assumption above it is a leading question. In seeking to answer the point you make though, this is a planning matter, not a matter for the S106 agreement.

What are our options and estimated costs in satisfying the S106 requirement, without any agreement from Trowbridge Rugby Club?

The Town Council has not pursued or sought to pursue any options which exclude access via the rugby club to develop our land at Doric Park to satisfy the S106. I would therefore respectfully request that you do not, once again, seek to use this lack of information in order to accuse the officers of the council of failing to provide such non-existent information to councillors.

I find a new procedure where I am not permitted to ask an Officer and have to go to an elected member of a 'working group' (which is not a recognised committee of the Town Council) extremely strange. I would remind the Council of Code of Conduct – Members Access to Information.

The Code of Conduct is available here and I would urge councillors to read the section referred to by Cllr Edward Kirk in full.

<https://www.trowbridge.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/210507-NEW-Code-of-Conduct.pdf>

This part of the Code of Conduct refers to availability of information which exists and is not about the generation of information that does not exist. It is not wholly clear what Cllr Edward Kirk's 'extremely strange' is specifically referring to. Paragraph 8.1 refers to 'Such approaches should normally be directed to the relevant Officer.' [my underlining] It is my assertion that it is Cllr Kirk who has made the situation one which is not 'normal', which is why the alternative of the Chair of the Working Group providing the answers to his questions was put in place. As this has not been satisfactory for Cllr Kirk then the alternative arrangement that I am now putting in place is that all questions from Cllr Kirk will be dealt with as formal questions to committee or the Council and response will be tabled at those meetings.

G. QUESTION: 220222 22:54 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Question:

It would had been useful if it had been explained earlier that the £300,000 was only a very rough estimate. As I explained at tonight's meeting the Council figures don't correspond – so information has been withheld, in that members were provided with the totals spent from S106, but not where the money had gone.

From the accounts extracts of ledger entries, I received tonight it would appear that the missing figures relate to legal costs with the rugby club.

Who signed off on this immense level of legal cost in the pursuance of an agreement with Trowbridge Rugby Club?

As I'm not allowed to ask you questions, perhaps out of courtesy you would at least now provide the full information to all Councillors of these transactions taking place a year ago?

Town Clerk's Response:

If the 'council figures don't correspond' can someone tell me what the difference is and where, and I will investigate. If I am asked how much S106 has been spent I will seek to answer the question. If I am asked how much has been spent on the project in total that is a slightly different question and is likely to result in a slightly different response. These are not anomalies or mistakes, they are genuine and accurate answers to different questions.

The Town Clerk approved an advance to the solicitors acting on behalf of the Trowbridge Rugby Football Club in order to prepare the agreement alongside the council's own solicitor. This covers both the lease for the land owned by the Rugby Club, access rights and another commercial agreement relating to other aspects.

H. QUESTION: 220302 21:40 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk to Cllr Palmen et al.

Preamble:

For the avoidance of doubt I can confirm that I do have a restriction on me in that: 'All questions from Cllr Kirk will be dealt with as formal questions to committee or the Council and response will be tabled at those meetings.'

Question & Town Clerk's Responses:

It would have been useful to know the extent of the restriction, timescale and appeal procedure, but I presume I have no rights to contest any of it.

The Town Clerk is more than happy to answer Cllr Kirk's questions but will include the questions and responses in the agenda of full council or appropriate committee. This is not a restriction, it is a higher level of transparency.

In the email sent to me with the restriction, it has been stated that information has been forthcoming on the complete breakdown of the S106 spent in the pursuance of Doric Park, as I made clear in the Leisure Services meeting on 22nd February – we have spent £265,855 and have only accounted for £224,410. No Councillor nor the Officer could answer this in the Leisure Services meeting and I was assured I would receive the answer on Monday – still no answer.

The Leisure Services Committee meeting was on Tuesday 22nd February. The Town Clerk's reply to Cllr E Kirk following the meeting was sent on Wednesday 23rd February. How, therefore, can Cllr Kirk suggest that the reply was referenced at the meeting the evening before?

Notwithstanding this, as will be shown below, Cllr Kirk had already received the answer (see above).

Note: The total of the first table above is £294,930 which includes S106 and other expenditure on the land at Doric Park – some is not capital and therefore not claimed against S106 and some is operating costs. This is where the rough estimate of £300,000 came from.

Since these questions were asked and answered time and time again, Councillor Kirk has persisted in his allegation that the Town Clerk has failed to answer the question and has alleged that his opportunity to ask questions has been restricted. The Town Clerk is not prepared to waste valuable time answering the same question again and again.

It should also be noted that Cllr Kirk has claimed that what he actually wanted was a 'complete breakdown' but he has not clarified what is meant by this. What he was provided with at the Leisure Services committee were the ledgers for Doric Park detailing every payment. If Cllr Kirk wants to see the invoices related to each payment then he can do so but I suspect that he will still be dissatisfied and will claim that the question has still not been answered.

At the last full council meeting I asked for the Auditors comments relating to our contribution to General Reserves - still no answer. Perhaps they are happy that we don't have enough GR to repay the S106 should the situation arise?

The auditor undertakes five visits per year and has recently completed his report for the third visit. Within that, he has provided further reporting related to the council's level of General Reserves as requested and within the limits of his responsibilities. The report has been circulated.

I. **QUESTION: 220303 22:35 DORIC PARK PROJECT**

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Preamble:

In response to my question requesting a cost breakdown in relation to Doric Park. I was provided the following by the Council:

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22 Q3	TOTAL
Purchase of Land										
Business Rates	452	-452			1067	1174	1316	1531	1190	6278
Water Rates	448	360	36	25	13	12	37	17	29	977
Electricity		152	86	110	-57					291
Insurance		77	69	70	67					283
Other			43		8387	8814	4002			21246
Capital	78093				0	32438	70640	51093	33591	265855

These figures identify only 2.65% (£7829) of £294,930 of what we have spent so far on the site and 0% of the Doric Park Project cost is identified (beyond 'Capital & Other'). Whilst I did have access to the Doric Park accounts ledger for an hour or so during the Leisure Services meeting, on its own is like being given a cipher without a code. Therefore, please can the following questions be answered:

Questions:

Please can I have a breakdown of the £265,855 Capital spend to date, What was this for?.

Please can the column marked 'Other' at £21,246 be expanded on? What does this cover?

Were these costs in line with our initial budgeted project costs, please provide the budgeted/actual?

Please may I have the cost (if any) in securing an agreement with Trowbridge Rugby Club?

Town Clerk's Response:

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	TOTAL
Business Rates	452	-452			1067	1174	1316	1531	1587	6675
Water Rates	448	360	36	25	13	12	37	17	29	977
Electricity		152	86	110	-57					291
Insurance		77	69	70	67					283
Other			43							43
QMP - Main Consultants					7850	38771	68665			115286
WT - Main Consultants								33519	22746	56265
RLF - 3G Consultants					537	2481	1332			4350
BWB - sub consultants								10975	6451	17426
Portaplan Quest							4645			4645
Solicitors								6600	4393.5	10993.5
Purchase of Land	78093									78093
S106	-78093				0	-32438	-70640	-51093	-33591	-265855
CIL						-10000	-5355			-15355
Net	900	137	234	205	9477	0	0	1549	1615.5	14117.5

The initial budget was set for the whole project, not broken down by stage (planning permission and tenders) original estimates from the consultants were exceeded due to changes to the specification and additions required to achieve planning permission.

The solicitors costs for the legal agreement with TRFC have not yet been finalised the estimate is between £6k and £10k.

J. QUESTION: 220303 22:56 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Question:

When considering a level of General Reserves, please can the Town Clerk confirm whether the RFO and the Council's Auditors ever consider the fact that reserves which are derived from S106 are subject to fulfilment of their legal obligations and therefore can potentially have to be repaid?

Town Clerk's Response:

None of the General Reserves are derived from S106.

When considering Earmarked Reserves which are derived from S106 the Responsible Finance Officer (Town Clerk) does consider that such funds are subject to fulfilment of their legal obligations and potentially have to be repaid. The likelihood of the council either not developing the land at Doric Park to provide new sports pitches and associated facilities or not using the funds to enhance existing sports pitch facilities is minimal and therefore the risk is very low. But the RFO has advised the council each year, as has our Internal Auditor, that the level of General Reserves held by the council is below the minimum recommended by JPAG.

In the most unlikely event of the council deciding not to use the S106 funds to provide sports pitches and associated buildings it would need to pay back to S106, negotiate terms with Wiltshire Council for that repayment and probably therefore increase the precept in the following year/years.

K. QUESTION: 220303 22:56 DORIC PARK PROJECT

To receive the following question submitted by Cllr Edward Kirk.

Preamble:

Please may I respectfully remind you of your statement: 'If S106 is invested in pitch and changing facilities it can be used. If the whole project is cancelled the Council WOULD have to give back the £400,000 S106 not spent and ALSO the £300,000 already spent on pursuing the project (including purchase of the land).' Also, the asset life in our own tender document refers to 25 years and the loan previously proposed was 30 years. There was also previous reference to the Council's financial security prior to any decision on Doric Park.

Questions:

If as Councillors we have a genuine option to not proceed with Doric Park and the associated borrowing, what is the cost of that option? If an alternative costed option is not available, how can Councillors demonstrate that they have considered the project and borrowing on its merits alone?

Is the life of the asset a relevant consideration in determining the loan term or is the overriding priority to ensure that there is no increase in the precept?

Given the low level of General Reserves and the increasing Doric Park project cost, how can the Council demonstrate it is in an appropriate financial position to proceed with the project?

Town Clerk's Response:

The first question is addressed to councillors.

The life of the asset is relevant. The asset includes landscaping and external works, a building and a 3G pitch. The business plan also includes the full cost of regular carpet replacement of the pitch as well as full building replacement costs. On this basis it is anticipated that the life of the assets is appropriate to the borrowing being spread over the full 50 years if the council decides to do that. Alternatively, the council could decide to spread the cost over a shorter period which may result in an increase in the precept or the use of Community Infrastructure Levy which is anticipated in the period during which the loan is being paid off.

The Council is in an appropriate financial position to proceed with the project and is likely to be in a better financial position, based upon fair and reasonable estimates, to proceed with the project than not to proceed with the project.

10. MOTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

To consider motions received from councillors by the deadline: Thursday 3rd March.

A. MOTION: 220223 11:52 - WORKING GROUPS

To consider the following motion submitted by Cllr Piazza

Preamble: Working Groups, Working Parties, or 'Task-and-finish Groups' are often setup by parish councils for a short-term purpose. Working Parties are not defined in legislation and are therefore not subject to the strict rubric that applies to formal council meetings. They do not need to be held in public and do not need to follow standing orders; however, as a result they cannot make decisions on behalf of the council and are solely created for exploring options to then present to the council for a decision.

Trowbridge Town Council's website currently does not have a list of active Working Groups that are accountable to the Council. These Working Groups also do not have a clear terms of reference setting out what their objectives, scope and outcome are. In order for these Working Groups to be accountable to the Council, this should be amended immediately and those Working Groups should draw up a terms of reference detailing this but also how many councillors are present on the group, how many need to attend to be quorate, and whether they are open for residents to become members of or attend.

Working Groups act in a purely advisory role. This enables councillors to gather technical information and input from specialists and residents with local knowledge. Working Group meetings should remain relatively informal; however, this protocol would ensure that they continue to benefit the Council's decision-making process and clearly detail what their goals are. They provide space for exploratory and detailed discussions, alongside the time to reflect and check facts before the group makes proposals to Trowbridge Town Council.

MOTION: That Trowbridge Town Council creates a protocol that all Working Parties must adhere to at all times to ensure they are accountable to the Council and function well. Each Working Group should prepare clear terms of reference to be approved by P&R on 3rd May 2022. The protocol should also be implemented by this date.

The protocol is as follows:

- 1. The Council and any of its Committees can set up a Working Group to carry out tasks as defined by the Council or the Committee. The opportunity for residents to join such groups will be for the Working Group to determine.**
- 2. The purpose of Working Groups is to meet to discuss issues, explore options, and develop plans and then report back to the Council or Committee with recommendations. Subsequently, Working Groups may be tasked to deliver their plans. They have no decision-making powers but simply present the Council or Committee with their findings. However, their ability to give particular topics much more time outside agenda-driven meetings is invaluable.**
- 3. When setting up a Working Group, the Council or Committee must set clear terms of reference for it regarding objectives, scope and outcome(s). These will be approved by the Council or Committee before the Working Group is formed. Once their work has been completed, the Working Group will be disbanded.**
- 4. The Terms of Reference will include this protocol and the name of the Committee to which the Working Group reports.**
- 5. The Terms of Reference and membership will be published on the Council's website.**
- 6. The number of Councillors able to join a Working Group will be decided at the time of its formation but it must consist of no fewer than three councillors.**
- 7. The Working Group will notify the Council or Committee of the name of the Chair once they have been appointed after the first meeting.**

8. A quorum for any meeting of a Working Group will be three members, at least one of whom must be a councillor.
9. The role of the Council or sponsoring Committee is to consider and question the recommendations put to it by the Working Group before a decision is taken and, in the case of a Committee, to be satisfied with them before making any recommendations to the full Council.
10. A Working Group will be accountable to its sponsoring Committee unless agreement is made, due to expediency and subject to agreement via email of a majority of members of that sponsoring Committee, for recommendations to be made to the Policy & Resources Committee or to Full Council;
11. The Working Group must provide the Council or Committee with such information as necessary to ensure it can make an informed decision on its recommendation(s).
12. A Working Group will not have a budget. The budget will remain with the Council or sponsoring Committee.
13. Working Groups do not meet in public, therefore the Council's Standing Orders are not applicable. However, the Code of Conduct still applies and declarations of pecuniary and other interests will be required at each meeting.
14. All Working Groups will follow all relevant Council policies;
15. All documents and records produced and emails shared by working groups will be retained and disposed of in accordance with the Council's Retention Policy.
16. An officer of the Council should be in attendance at Working Group meetings to take notes. A clear agenda (or document resembling an agenda) should also be prepared by the officer in consultation with the Chair of the Working Group. The agenda and notes should then be made available on the website, with commercially-sensitive information being redacted when appropriate.
17. Working Groups may meet in person or online.

Town Clerk's Response: I have discussed the motion with Cllr Piazza and made some adjustments with his agreement and am therefore happy to advise that it would be appropriate to adopt this protocol for the management of the council's Working Groups.

11. SEALING OF DOCUMENTS

To approve the sealing of the following:
NONE.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 17th May 2022.

AGENDA to include: Appointment of Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Committees and Committee Chairs for Civic Year 2022/23

Confirm end of year earmarked reserves and other end of year financial decisions prio to completion of accounts.

13. MEDIA RELEASES

To consider if the Council should make a press/social media release regarding any of the issues considered by this meeting.

RECORDED VOTES

Councillor	MOTION WORKING GROUPS A						
Allsworth							
Bates							
Beaver							
Blackmore							
Blakemore							
Bridges							
Bryant							
Cave							
Cavill							
Cooper							
Halik							
Hill							
Hoar							
Jacob							
Edward Kirk							
Emily Kirk							
Lincoln							
Palmen							
Piazza							
Trigg							
Vigar							

	For	Against	Abstain
--	------------	----------------	----------------

