

EAST DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 December 2014 at 6.30 pm

Present:-

Cllr R D Cook – Chairman

Cllr S M Lugg – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M C Birr, Cllr Mrs S J Burns, Cllr D B F Burt, Cllr S Butler, Cllr Mrs L J Clark, Cllr A A J Clarke, Cllr Mrs T B Coombs, Cllr Mrs J Dover, Cllr M R Dyer, Cllr P J Edwards, Cllr S G Flower, Cllr S Gibson, Cllr Mrs J M Hazel, Cllr Mrs A Holland, Cllr J P Holland, Cllr Mrs P A Hymers, Cllr Mrs B T Manuel, Cllr I J Monks, Cllr D Morgan, Cllr B E Mortimer, Cllr D G L Packer, Cllr Mrs P A Reynolds, Cllr G W Russell, Cllr D W Shortell, Cllr A Skeats, Cllr S S Tong, Cllr Mrs A Warman, Cllr J L Wilson and Cllr B Roberts

Apologies: Cllr P G Bennett, Cllr R C Dudman, Cllr Mrs G S Elliot, Cllr J E Little and Cllr P W Richardson

275. Prayers

Prayers were said by the Reverend Peter Breckwoldt of St John's Church, Wimborne.

Following the close of prayers, the Chairman of the Council reported the recent death of a former Member of the Council Mr Neill Evans, who represented the Corfe Mullen South Ward on the District Council from 1991 to 1999, and was Chairman of the Council for the Civic Year 1996-1997. Neill Evans also sat on the County Council from 1993-1997.

Councillor Mrs Holland said a few words in respect of Neill Evans following which the Council held a minutes silence in tribute.

276. Minutes

The Minutes of the Council meeting held on 27 October were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

277. Declarations of Interests by Members

There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

278. Announcements

The Chairman of Council referred to his list of engagements attended since the last Council meeting which was included within the agenda, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Chairman advised Council that November and the beginning of December had been a busy period particularly with regards to festive engagements. The Chairman advised that he had been particularly honoured to be present at the Tourism Awards Ceremony. Further to this the Chairman informed Members that he had attended Remembrance events and services across the District and thanked other Members who had attended events in other areas on his behalf.

In addition the Chairman advised Members that the 'Chain Gang Choir' which was made up of Chairman and Mayors across Dorset were on You Tube singing at the recent Verwood Town Council winter reception

In summary the Chairman advised that he was very grateful for meeting all of the people that he had done, and that he was looking forward to the months ahead.

There were no announcements made by the Leader of the Council or Chief Executive on this occasion.

279. Questions by Members of the Public

The Chairman advised Council, that subject to their being no objection by Members it was his intention to suspend standing orders in respect of public speaking to enable there to be a total of 25 minutes allowed, in view of the interest in the business before the meeting.

The Chairman then took agenda item numbers 6, 7 and 8 together as one item.

The Chairman advised that seven Members of the public had indicated their wish to speak.

Mr Verguson

From the green pamphlet that I have here that was circulated, it appears that this parish review is solely of the instigation of East Dorset District Council, the aim being to bring about more effective and convenient delivery of local services reflecting the identities and interests of the community. Yet oddly, the whole purpose of this review seems to be set to on changing the identity of those areas effected and is against the interests of the residents, those Colehill residents threatened with relocation against their declared wish will face a very substantial increase in their precept with virtually nothing to show for it, for example, a band D dwelling will face an increase from £29.50 per annum to £108.63, for a Band G the increase is up from £49.17 to £180.73 equivalent to an extra £2.50 plus every week. These are not insignificant sums which can be ignored as some Councillors have suggested. As I understand it East Dorset District Council is responsible for a number of services across East Dorset, these services are provided uniformly across the area and transcend both parish and Council boarders, given that EDDC already provides these services in neighbouring Wimborne and Colehill, changing the boundaries between these two areas will appear pointless. Drawing new lines on maps, changing area names does not alter roads and routes used by these services, it does not influence traffic or change the number of homes and residents served

across Wimborne and Colehill for these services. For example the East Dorset District Council refuse collection along Leigh Road, one of the areas threatened, begins at the Quarterjack roundabout works through the Wimborne part of Leigh Road and then continues onto that part of Leigh Road in Colehill. All the homes along and off Leigh Road, Wimborne or Colehill, have the same bins, and the same Friday collection programme. Changing the boundary 200 yards to the East between Wimborne and Colehill, will achieve nothing, apart from the additional precept changes on those affected.

I therefore question the assertion that the boundary changes are necessary to make more effective and convenient delivery of services which are already uniformly provided across East Dorset regardless of Parish or Town boundaries, which for these purposes seem irrelevant. However I do accept that given for the last three years East Dorset District Council has been unable to comply fully with governments council tax freeze, so more effective provision of services would seem desirable. But this is rather more dependent upon management than upon boundaries.

To summarise I object to the proposed boundary changes proposed for Colehill as they are unnecessary, expensive and against the best interests of those residents affected and it should be abandoned. The final point, I do wonder why at this late state in the life of this Council the controversial issue has been raised with the deadline tonight, so that the changes can take place in May 2015 presumably immediately before the next Council elections, surely a more appropriate time for this would be at the forthcoming May elections when Councillors can raise their views through their manifesto and local residents can make their views known through the ballot box, a far more democratic process. Furthermore in the meantime local residents minds could concentrate on much more pressing issues, the Core Strategy which threatens large scale development on green belt sites, puts developments interests ahead of local residents and threatens damaging consequences for both Wimborne and Colehill. Given recent events including todays Prime Ministers plans for massive subsidised housing in Poole, 100,000 houses has been mentioned, this must cast doubt over the extensive housing plans for this area, far in excess of Wimborne and Colehills genuine needs.

Councillor Susan Davis (Colehill Parish Council)

The recommendations made by the task and finish group are unfair, disproportionate and biased in favour of Wimborne, at two packed public meetings the residents of Colehill voiced their opinion against the recommendations made by the task and finish group to transfer Colehill West including some of the most significant and historic parts to Wimborne. The group knew they had overstepped the mark and generously decided to give back the Parish Church, School and the Sports and Social Club. Influential Members from Wimborne, including their District Councillors said the problem was now solved, and we had nothing to complain about. The recommendation to move most of the anomalous roads again into Wimborne rather than Colehill again demonstrates a bias in favour of Wimborne, even more so as these roads are of high quality housing in high tax bands.

What has been conveniently skirted over is the fact that all the developments proposed in the Core Strategy will now be under the administration of Wimborne, almost 2500 houses. The two biggest developments are planned for the Cranborne Road and the South of the Leigh Road, properties on land currently in Colehill. Pulling the Cranborne Road development into Wimborne is debateable, what is completely unacceptable is transferring both the Parmitters and the new neighbourhood planned for South of the Leigh Road into Wimborne. The spurious argument in favour of this is that the residents of Parmitter consider themselves as part of Wimborne; there is evidence to refute this claim. Using the indefinite move of the two Wimborne sports clubs is another red herring, they might have Wimborne in their title, but they were quite happy to move to Hampreston until planning was refused.

We have been told repeatedly that the precept has nothing to do with the recommendations made by the T&FG, you should ask why Members of Wimborne Council including District Councillors stated publically that Wimborne desperately needed the money and the future income from the housing planned on both the Cranborne Road and South of the Leigh Road was crucial for their financial security. What about the financial security of Colehill, we provide the same civic facilities for our residents; we just have a less costly administration. If you accept these recommendations, you will be agreeing to undermine the future prosperity of Colehill and its ability to go on providing the much needed services for its residents. We have been told that the Task and Finish Group has only looked at projections for the next 5 years, it is obvious from their report that all the recommendations concerning Colehill and Wimborne look to the next 10-15 years and are biased in favour of Wimborne. Their population and housing stock will double over that period, to say this is nothing to do with finance is disingenuous and patronising, the task and finish group has clearly demonstrated that this review has been far removed from its remit to provide fair and equitable representation and more cohesive communities.

This is a terrible outcome for Colehill and will leave us in a position of stagnation, nowhere to grow, no ability to provide homes for our young people, no means to provide medical or dental facilities for our residents. Why should we end up being the poor relations on the top of the hill. Maybe the intension is to revisit this in five years' time and decide that Colehill should become a fully integrated Ward of Wimborne, we simply will not allow this to happen. We have our own identity, a close knit community and we have the right to determine our own future. Imposing these completely inexplicable and unnecessary boundary changes on us, particularly when the task and finish group failed to give any rationale to back up their decision, will demonstrate that you have no regard for local opinion and local democracy and I would like to know how you are going to justify that to the electorate.

I'd like to finish and I have just added this note, I find it somewhat ironic that Reverend Breckwoldt has been invited here to give you all guidance in the decisions that you make, and all that I can hope is that divine guidance might intervene.

Councillor David Mitchell (Colehill Parish Council)

Your meeting this evening amongst other things is required to make a decision on proposals for some wholesale boundary changes in East Dorset, and from my point of view the major changes being around Colehill.

In the 26 years since I came back to Colehill, I've been involved in business in Wimborne, I've been a Member of the Chamber of Trade in Wimborne for quite some years and I've been involved of course with Colehill Parish Council. And I cannot in all that time remember any issue involving Colehill which has been as divisive as this one.

This process started back in September, when the Task and Finish Group put out their first proposals for boundary changes, to be frank with you they were preposterous, the only saving grace was that it was supposed to be the commencement of a period of consultation, but the anger was started by that first document. And then we come onto the question of consultation because this seems to have been singularly literate. In the dictionary consultation is defined as 'being a process involving an exchange of views, with two way flow of opinion aimed at reaching agreeable conclusions.' We didn't see any of that, and there was very little sign that there was going to be any and had it not been for that fact that Colehill Parish Council had insisted there would not have been any meeting at all with the Task and Finish Group. And more recently we have had the proposal which is now before you, and again its really been without much discussion or consultation, and there are people in the gallery who will tell you that it was so little advertised that there was so little opportunity for them to consider it, that really they had no chance to say what they would really like to say. What really annoys me about it is that as a document, it looks as though it is crumbs from the rich mans table, it is as though we should be grateful for being allowed to retain these crumbs which are actually a part of our parish council anyway.

I refer to in particular to the Parmitter decision, which I find very unacceptable, the idea of annexing that to Wimborne and thus ensuring that all the proposed developments under the Core Strategy in this area will fall to Wimborne is in my view extremely sinister, you have to ask why it has been done, and why is the task and finish group so behold to Wimborne.

My big concern really is that it puts Colehill in a straight jacket, a geographical straight jacket we have nowhere where we can expand, so that any young people from our parish area that want to live in the area where they were brought up will find it very difficult to do so. So really what I am asking you is to consider two questions when you decide on your vote;

- Given that Wimborne would now hold the entire Core Strategy development, where is Colehill to find any area for development,
- and perhaps alternatively, has this been the intention all along? The idea that Colehill is in a straight jacket the best thing is for it to be taken over by Wimborne?

I would add that at a recent event a comment was overheard well of course you know the reality of this is that what Wimborne wants Wimborne gets, and my question is why should they get it? Please think about this when you vote.

Councillor Shane Bartlett (Wimborne Minster Town Council)

In September 2013 I made a deputation to this chamber concerning the Core Strategy development sites known as WMC7 and WMC8 so that the council tax from these developments would come to Wimborne Minster Town Council.

Prior to my deputation the Town Council had sought to open informal negotiations with Colehill Parish Council with a view to jointly asking the District Council to consider this proposal; however Colehill refused to enter into any discussion.

The Town Council recognizes that there is less money available to both County and District Councils. It has to manage with a 2400 tax base and finds itself increasingly having to contribute towards additional services previously funded by the aforementioned Councils.

In future years the Town Council will find it necessary to raise the precept to unacceptable levels if change is not forthcoming

You find yourselves here today with an opportunity to put right this injustice.

The recommendation concerning moving West Colehill into the Parish of Wimborne unfortunately included such infrastructure as the schools, church, youth club and community centre and the cricket ground. This was not supported by the Town Council and I suggested taking out the area in which this infrastructure lay. This was weeks before the public meetings that Colehill Parish Council had called and yet Colehill Councillors failed to inform their parishioners of this proposal.

Members will be aware that the aim of a Community Governance Review "is to bring about improved and stronger community engagement, more cohesive communities, better local democracy and more effective and convenient delivery of local services, ensuring electors across the whole district are treated equitably and fairly".

The Town Council has been both shocked and disappointed at the level of vitriolic contempt and criticism it has had to face and endure in unison with the four individual District Councillors who are on the Task and Finish Group. In contrast the Town Council hopes that the District Council considers that the Town Council has approached and complied with the process of the Community Governance Review in an appropriately professional manner.

The Town Council supports the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group and hopes that this will be endorsed by the full council.

Mr Terry Wheeler

I am a resident of Wimborne Minster and am also a Town Councillor, however tonight I speak in a personal capacity.

I speak in support of the proposals of the East Dorset Governance Review put before you tonight, in particular those relating to Colehill and Wimborne. Those opposing any change suggest that Colehill and Wimborne have a different sense of community and identity, whilst this may be the case in the village at the top of the hill; it is not always the case of the boundaries.

There has not been no review of the boundaries for a many years now and indeed a number of the properties in the Lacy and Parmitter areas did not exist when the current boundaries were drawn up. There was a clear distinction then between the two Parishes, as such properties in these areas have no clear historic link with Colehill. This is borne out by East Dorset's own consultation process where in the original consultation only one household in Lacy and ten in Parmitter objected to your original proposals. Tell me, do the Colehill residents of the Lacy Estate feel a different sense of history and community and identity from those residents living literally in the next road? Of course not. Where those Colehill residents cannot even drive to another part of Colehill without entering Wimborne first. Do the Wimborne residents of Cranfield Ward have a different sense of history and community and identity from their neighbours just inside the Colehill boundary, of course not. If Wimborne First School is moved to the Cranborne Road development the children of both parishes are likely to be taught there, will they feel a different sense of community? Of course not. The Core Strategy is moving Green Belt boundaries to make way for future development, if those boundaries are not in violet, why should parish boundaries be?

Your Officers and the Task and Finish Group have proposed the revised solution that leaves Colehill Village and its major features intact and yet still achieves the aims of the Governance Review. These proposals have taken into account the character of the areas in places such as Cranfield and Highland Road where properties would move from Wimborne to Colehill, because they are considered to be in a more rural rather than urban setting.

Whilst outside the remit of the review the proposal will also address what would otherwise be the growing imbalance in the tax base between the two parishes which would otherwise widen as the population of Colehill would become much larger than Wimborne over the next 20 years and yet still having little infrastructure to support. I hope the Members will have the courage to look beyond the emotive arguments this evening and support the sensible proposals before them.

Councillor Pete Holden (West Moors Parish Council)

Councillor Holden submitted a written question as set out below:

Is this Council aware that when you consider agenda item number 10H in respect of the Community Governance Review that the boundary change requested by West Moors Parish Council does not involve any residential property and serves only to rationalise a stretch of the parish council's border that was interfered by the construction of the Ferndown by-pass and the request for the boundary to be drawn from the Palmersford roundabout along the central reservation of the by-pass until it reaches the mid-point of the Ameysford underpass and from there to go northerly to the point where it meets the current border, and that the lateness of this news to Ferndown Town Council was not of the making of West Moors Parish Council who had first requested the change at the outset of this process in September to this Council.

Councillor Holden advised that he understood that further to the above question being submitted he know understood that at the Special

Resources Committee an amendment had been proposed which addressed the above. In addition Councillor Holden stressed that he would like to reassure Ferndown Town Council that West Moors had made a recommendation back in September, and it wasn't West Moors which had delayed the announcement.

West Moors fully endorses the Special Resources Committees amended recommendation regarding the boundary.

Mr John Gooch

I am apparently not allowed to make a statement so I can't tell you how disgusted I am with the flawed Core Strategy and its undemocratic implementation. As I say I can't tell you that you will just have to gauge it from my question which I have put.

As the District Council shows every sign of reverting to its former role of Wimborne Rural District Council, what is its vision for the communities of East Dorset and how much further does Wimborne need to meet East Dorset District Councils planning rationale both now and in the foreseeable future? Is it Colehill today, West Moors tomorrow?

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments and questions and informed them that the report relating to the Community Governance Review will be dealt with under Agenda Item 10 H of this evening's agenda.

280. Petitions by Members of the Public

The Chairman reported that a petition had been received under Council Procedure Rule 8(3).

The Chairman advised that the petitioner was not present at the Council meeting to present the petition which requested that the Council ask that the Illuminated Pharmacy sign at the NISA store, High Street, Sturminster Marshall be replaced with a non-illuminated sign.

The Chairman advised that the petition would be passed to the appropriate officer to deal with.

281. Deputations by Members of the Public

Deputations received under Council Procedural Rule 8(4) were on this occasion dealt with under Minute 279.

282. Questions by Members of the Council

The Chairman reported that a question had been submitted under Council Procedure Rules 9(2).

Question by Councillor D Burt

The Office Accommodation Working Group met on 2 October when it was reported that the Dorset County Council had not given a firm undertaking to

be involved with the Office building proposed to be constructed in Wimborne. The Working Group agreed to give DCC until the end of October to sign a Memorandum of Undertaking to be part of this project. Did DCC sign an undertaking before the end of October? If they did sign, how many DCC staff will be accommodated in the new Office? This Council is working towards most staff being based in the Civic Centre at Christchurch but how many East Dorset District Staff will be based permanently in the new Civic Centre in Wimborne?

When will the working Group meet again so as to be updated on progress?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor I Monks responded:

Since the Office Accommodation Working Party met on the 2 October good progress has been made with our partner organisations to more accurately define their requirements. As to Dorset County Council in particular they have held two workshops, led by one of their Directors to explore which services they would wish to deliver from the new public facility in Wimborne. This is very encouraging news, and their list includes services which will very much add to our objective of providing a wider range of public services to our residents. As yet none of the partners have formally signed a memorandum of undertaking but it shouldn't be long before this is completed. In the meantime all have agreed to work together with our architects and move to the next stage of design, this will allow us to work on the detail of the plans and therefore better understand the costs involved.

In terms of services that this Council will provide, it is not envisaged that there will be any difference from those presently provided, indeed we would anticipate that the inclusion of partners and their services would be more comprehensive. As part of the ongoing process we will examine this in more detail, including at the Accommodation Working Party.

The services provided by this Council should not be confused with where staff are based, these are not the same thing. Heads of Service are clear that they do not need any staff based permanently in East Dorset in order to provide services. Officers have to this point assumed that a requirement of 30 work stations, but it needs to be remembered that the accommodation changes will be implemented at the same time as the introduction of new ways of working for staff, this includes much more mobile and flexible arrangements, so that the 30 work station does not mean that there will be 30 staff based in East Dorset. The reality is that many more than this number will be providing services for the District at any one time.

I look forward to discussing these matters with Councillors at the next Office Accommodation Working Party which will be held in early February.

283. Planning Committee, 14 October 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

284. Community Committee, 4 November 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

285. Planning Committee, 11 November 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

286. Licensing Sub-Committee, 12 November 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

287. Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, 18 November 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

288. Resources Committee, 26 November 2014

The Minutes and the recommendation Minute No. 259 (Review of the Treasury Management Policy) of the meeting held on 4 November 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Nem.Con. (1 Abstention)

289. Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, 10 December 2014

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2014 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes as submitted be adopted.

Voting: Unanimous

290. Special Resources Committee, 15 December 2014

The Minutes and the recommendation of Minute No. 274 (Community Governance Review – Final Recommendations) of the meeting held on 15 December 2014 were submitted.

Councillor Mrs Dover requested clarification with regards to whether the review had given regard to the Gunning Principles of consultation. The Solicitor to the Council advised that the review process had followed the Boundary Review Guidance.

During the debate, an amendment was proposed by Councillor D G L Packer and seconded by Councillor Mrs J Dover that those Sections relating to Colehill and Wimborne Minster be deferred until a proposition can be put forward in the next session based on factual evidence and involving the two communities and their representatives.

A recorded vote was requested in respect of the amendment.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was declared lost (4 votes for, 26 votes against)

For: Cllr Mrs S J Burns, Cllr Mrs J Dover, Cllr D G L Packer and Cllr B Roberts.

Against: Cllr M C Birr, Cllr S Butler, Cllr Mrs L J Clark, Cllr A A J Clarke, Cllr R D Cook, Cllr Mrs T B Coombs, Cllr M R Dyer, Cllr P J Edwards, Cllr S G Flower, Cllr S Gibson, Cllr Mrs J M Hazel, Cllr Mrs A Holland, Cllr Mrs J P Holland, Cllr Mrs P A Hymers, Cllr S M Lugg, Cllr Mrs B T Manuel, Cllr I Monks, Cllr D Morgan, Cllr B E Mortimer, Cllr Mrs P A Reynolds, Cllr G W Russell, Cllr D W Shortell, Cllr A Skeats, Cllr S S Tong, Cllr Mrs A Warman and Cllr J L Wilson.

RESOLVED that the minutes and recommendation as submitted be adopted.

Voting: 27:3

For: Cllr M C Birr, Cllr Mrs S J Burns, Cllr S Butler, Cllr Mrs L J Clark, Cllr A A J Clarke, Cllr R D Cook, Cllr Mrs T B Coombs, Cllr M R Dyer, Cllr P J Edwards, Cllr S G Flower, Cllr S Gibson, Cllr Mrs J M Hazel, Cllr Mrs A Holland, Cllr Mrs J P Holland, Cllr Mrs P A Hymers, Cllr S M Lugg, Cllr Mrs B T Manuel, Cllr I Monks, Cllr D Morgan, Cllr B E Mortimer, Cllr Mrs P A Reynolds, Cllr G W Russell, Cllr D W Shortell, Cllr A Skeats, Cllr S S Tong, Cllr Mrs A Warman and Cllr J L Wilson.

Against: Cllr Mrs J Dover, Cllr D G L Packer and Cllr B Roberts.

291. Executive Style Governance - Outcome of Consultation

The Solicitor to the Council submitted a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Members were requested to note the responses received to the consultation exercise on changing to Executive style of governance and to support that change for implementation from May 2015.

Members requested that a recorded vote be taken in respect of Recommendation (1).

RESOLVED that:

- (1) **Members formally resolve to move to Executive style of governance , being a Leader and Cabinet model , from May 2015;**
- (2) **Constitutional changes be prepared by officers and a small cross party group of Councillors for approval by Council to give effect to the change to Executive style of governance;**
- (3) **Within the Constitutional changes , Members agree that the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee will be chaired by a Member of the Opposition;**
- (4) **A schedule of meetings for post May 2015 be submitted to the next meeting of Council based upon the change to Executive style of governance;**

Voting:

(1) 19:3 (8 Abstentions) with voting:-

For: Cllr M C Birr, Cllr S Butler, Cllr Mrs L J Clark, Cllr A A J Clarke, Cllr R D Cook, Cllr Mrs T B Coombs, Cllr M R Dyer, Cllr P J Edwards, Cllr S G Flower, Cllr S Gibson, Cllr Mrs J M Hazel, Cllr S M Lugg, Cllr Mrs B T Manuel, Cllr I Monks, Cllr B E Mortimer, Cllr D W Shortell, Cllr A Skeats, Cllr S S Tong, Cllr J L Wilson.

Against: Cllr Mrs J Dover, Cllr Mrs A Holland, Cllr J P Holland.

Abstentions: Cllr Mrs S J Burns, Cllr Mrs P A Hymers, Cllr D Morgan, Cllr D G L Packer, Cllr Mrs P A Reynolds, Cllr B Roberts, Cllr G W Russell, Cllr Mrs A Warman.

(2), (3) and (4) Nem.Con. (2 Abstentions)

292. Corporate Plan Progress Report

The report was submitted to Council, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Members were informed about the Council's achievements against the 2012-2016 Corporate Plan.

RESOLVED that Members:

- a) **Note the progress made against the Christchurch and East Dorset Corporate Plan objectives**
- b) **instruct the Corporate Team to examine any areas of the Corporate Plan where there are concerns over the Council's ability to achieve any of its objectives and report their findings to the relevant committee**

Voting: Unanimous

293. Review of East Dorset Polling Districts and Polling Stations

The Democratic Services and Elections Manger submitted a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Members were requested to approve a scheme of polling districts and polling places for the East Dorset District Council administrative area.

RESOLVED that the schedule of polling districts and polling places as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to this report be approved for implementation for the May 2015 elections.

Voting: Unanimous

294. Approval of Leave of Absence

The Chief Executive advised Members that owing to illness Councillor R. C. Dudman had not been able to attend meetings since the 7 July 2014.

Members were provided with an update with regards to Councillor Dudmans health, and further to this asked that their well wishes be sent to Councillor Dudman.

RESOLVED that due to ill health, a period of 6 months leave of absence be granted to Councillor R C Dudman with effect from 16 December 2014.

Voting: Unanimous

295. Representations from Outside Bodies

The Chairman advised that there were no reports from Members of the Council with respect of Outside Bodies on this occasion.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

CHAIRMAN