

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting of the County Council held at County Hall, Hertford, on Tuesday 20 July 2004.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

N E Agar	R J M Ellis	D B Lloyd	R H Smith
T I Ambrose	K F Emsall (Chairman)	D E Lloyd	R J Smith
D A Ashley	B C Engel	R Mays	W A Storey
S A Batson	G D Game	D R McManus	I E M Tarry
M V Bayes	S B A Giles-Medhurst	J T Metcalf	J Taunton
D Beatty	J Gipps	R Mills	J W A Usher
D E Billing	P V Goggins	S J Mills	P A Webb
N K Brook	R I N Gordon	J R Morton	C J White
P T J Channell	A K Gray	S M P Newton	B A York
G R Churchard	M Green	A Oaten	
E M Clarke	F Guest	M H O'Neill	
D Clayton	B N W Hammond	D A A Peek	
F W Clayton	D W Hills	S J Pile	
R S Clements	J A Hobday	J M Pitman	
K J Coleman	M J Hobday	R Roberts	
M D Colne	M H T Janes	P A Ruffles	
G M Cook	S E Jones	R Sanderson	
R N Copping	T G M Kent	H M Saunders	
K M Crout	L R Kercher	D T F Scudder	
A D Dodd	I H Laidlaw-Dickson	A M R Searing	
M Downing	B J Lamb	I Simpson	
D J Drake	A Lee	E N Singam	

Upon consideration of the agenda for the meeting of the County Council held on 20 July 2004, as circulated, action was taken or decisions were reached as follows:-

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the Annual meeting of the Council held on 18 May 2004 were confirmed.

2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

2.1 Departing Officers

The Chairman referred to three officers who were leaving:

Anne Fisher, who had been with the County Council for four years as Assistant Chief Executive and latterly as Assistant Director of Environment, was leaving to become the new Director of Environment in Haringey London Borough Council.

Dave Kellett, Head of Economic and Community Development, who had been with the County Council since 1978, was leaving to head up a communities initiative in Southampton.

Maureen Tarling, Members' Secretary, who was retiring on 23 July after 14 years in the Members' Secretariat.

The Chairman was joined by County Councillors Ellis, Mays, Simpson, White, York and Janes in paying tribute to these officers, and the Council wished them all well in the future.

2.2 Civic Appointments

The Chairman congratulated County Councillor D Royall on being elected Mayor of Stevenage Borough Council, County Councillor R I N Gordon on being elected Chairman of Watford Borough Council and County Councillor M H O'Neill on being elected Deputy Mayor of Broxbourne Borough Council.

3. QUESTIONS: HERTFORDSHIRE POLICE AUTHORITY – STANDING ORDER 7 (6)

None were notified.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS – STANDING ORDER 7 (10)

None were notified.

5. PUBLIC PETITIONS – STANDING ORDER 14

The petitioner mentioned on the agenda withdrew. (It was likely that the petition in question would now be presented to the next Education Panel.)

6. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN – ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

6.1 Kristina Lawson, Chairman of Tewin Parish Council, presented a petition against proposed cuts in the 388 bus service from Hertford to Welwyn Garden City.

6.2 The following motions (Cabinet proposals) proposed by **D A Ashley**, and duly seconded, were CARRIED:-

"1. That the Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved for submission to the Department for Transport by 30 July 2004, including a new 'Major Scheme' bid of £7.9 million for the A414/A405.

2. That the Director of Environment be authorised, in consultation with the Executive Member, to finalise the document including:

(a) *provisional financial data for 2007/08, and*

(b) *the technical submission for A414/A405 Major Scheme bid.”*

7. REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 15 JUNE 2004

(Presented by M D Colne, Chairman of the Committee)

The Report of the Community Services Scrutiny Committee dated 15 June 2004 was received.

8. REPORT OF THE ADULT CARE & HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 17 JUNE 2004

(Presented by M Downing, Chairman of the Committee)

The Report of the Adult Care & Health Scrutiny Committee dated 17 June 2004 was received.

9. REPORT OF THE CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 23 JUNE 2004

(Presented by T G M Kent, Chairman of the Committee)

Responding to the Recommendations of the SSI Inspection of Child Protection Services in Hertfordshire

9.1 The following motions were proposed by **D E Billing** and duly seconded:-

- “1. That the Council deeply regrets the Administration’s failures to safeguard adequately children on the child protection register, revealed by the December 2003 SSI inspection and the independent verification which showed that nearly half of a sample of 60 cases needed improved action. The Council welcomes the measures now put in place by the Director, and will ensure that resources are sufficient to implement them rapidly and fully.*
- 2. The Council believes that additional independent verifications should be carried out, not only as planned on another casework sample, but also on risk management of the unallocated cases and the backlog of referrals, on the quality of supervision, and the continuity of case management; the Council requests the Director to commission such verifications.*

3. *That the Children, Schools and Families Scrutiny Committee should be asked to review the new ACPC processes and criteria for effective quality assurance and multi-agency auditing.*”

9.2 The following amendments were proposed by **J M Pitman** and duly seconded:-

- (a) *“Amend 1 as follows:*

Delete first sentence, then amend second sentence to read:

‘That the Council welcomes the measures put in place by the Director and confirms that resources will continue to be provided to ensure their implementation as quickly and fully as possible.’”

- (b) *Amend 2 to read:*

‘The Council confirms that risk management of unallocated cases and the backlog of referrals is being satisfactorily managed.’”

9.3 The amendment at 9.2(a) was CARRIED and became the substantive motion, which was then CARRIED.

9.4 Upon the Chairman calling for a vote on the amendment at 9.2(b), **D E Billing** required a recorded vote under SO 12 (3).

The amendment was CARRIED, the recorded votes being:-

Those in favour (40):-

D A Ashley	G D Game	D A A Peek
M V Bayes	R I N Gordon	S J Pile
D Beatty	A K Gray	J M Pitman
N K Brook	F Guest	R Roberts
P T J Channell	B N W Hammond	P A Ruffles
D Clayton	D W Hills	H M Saunders
R S Clements	M H T Janes	A M R Searing
K J Coleman	B J Lamb	R H Smith
R N Copping	D B Lloyd	W A Storey
A D Dodd	D E Lloyd	I E M Tarry
D J Drake	S J Mills	J Taunton
R J M Ellis	J R Morton	J W A Usher
K F Emsall	S M P Newton	
B C Engel	M H O’Neill	

Those against (34):-

N E Agar	J Gipps	R Mills
T I Ambrose	P V Goggins	A Oaten
S A Batson	J A Hobday	R Sanderson
D E Billing	M J Hobday	D T F Scudder
G R Churchard	S E Jones	I Simpson
E M Clarke	T G M Kent	E N Singam
F W Clayton	L R Kercher	R J Smith
M D Colne	I H Laidlaw-Dickson	P A Webb
G M Cook	A Lee	C J White
K M Crout	R Mays	B A York
M Downing	D R McManus	
S B A Giles-Medhurst	J Metcalf	

Those absent (3):-

M Green, S Quilty, D Royall.

9.5

Upon the Chairman calling for a vote on substantive motion 2 (as set out at 9.2(b)), **D E Billing** required a recorded vote under SO 12 (3).

The substantive motion was CARRIED, the recorded votes being:-

Those in favour (40):-

D A Ashley	G D Game	D A A Peek
M V Bayes	R I N Gordon	S J Pile
D Beatty	A K Gray	J M Pitman
N K Brook	F Guest	R Roberts
P T J Channell	B N W Hammond	P A Ruffles
D Clayton	D W Hills	H M Saunders
R S Clements	M H T Janes	A M R Searing
K J Coleman	B J Lamb	R H Smith
R N Copping	D B Lloyd	W A Storey
A D Dodd	D E Lloyd	I E M Tarry
D J Drake	S J Mills	J Taunton
R J M Ellis	J R Morton	J W A Usher
K F Emsall	S M P Newton	
B C Engel	M H O'Neill	

Those against (35):-

N E Agar	P V Goggins	A Oaten
T I Ambrose	M Green	R Sanderson
S A Batson	J A Hobday	D T F Scudder
D E Billing	M J Hobday	I Simpson
G R Churchard	S E Jones	E N Singam
E M Clarke	T G M Kent	R J Smith
F W Clayton	L R Kercher	P A Webb
M D Colne	I H Laidlaw-Dickson	C J White
G M Cook	A Lee	B A York
K M Crout	R Mays	
M Downing	D R McManus	
S B A Giles-Medhurst	J Metcalf	
J Gipps	R Mills	

Those absent (2):-

S Quilty, D Royall.

9.6 Motion 3 (as set out in 9.1) was then CARRIED.

9.7 The Report of the Children, Schools and Families Scrutiny Committee dated 23 June 2004 was received.

10. REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 29 JUNE 2004

(Presented by C J White, Chairman of the Committee)

Item 3 – Contract Bus Services

10.1 The following motion was proposed by **S A Batson**, and duly seconded:-

“That the County Council investigates the provision of free or highly subsidised bus travel for young people in Hertfordshire so that they can attend activities provided for them in their towns and communities outside of school hours.”

10.2 The following amendment, proposed by **D A Ashley** (incorporating a further amendment proposed by I Simpson) and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

“Amend to read:

‘That the County Council investigates ways in which access to recreational activities for young people outside of school hours can be improved’.”

10.3 The substantive motion (as set out in 10.2) was then CARRIED.

10.4 The following motion was proposed by **B A York**, and duly seconded:-

“That in the County Council’s Bus Network Reviews:

- i) consideration be given to radical solutions for meeting the needs of passengers and potential passengers;*
- ii) provision of demand responsive services be considered;*
- iii) the success of other Authorities such as the County Councils of Leicestershire and Lancashire in providing contracted services be examined for possible adaptation in Hertfordshire;*
- iv) relevant targets, including that for bus ridership, be extended;*
- v) extensive publicity be given to the Reviews allowing passengers and the public generally to participate.”*

10.5 The following amendment proposed by **D A Ashley**, and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

“Amend to read:

‘That in the County Council’s Bus Network Reviews, the County Council continues to investigate:

- i) radical solutions for meeting the needs of passengers and potential passengers*
- ii) provision of demand responsive services*
- iii) good practice and success in other authorities which can be adopted for Hertfordshire.*

and that the Reviews be subject to public consultation’.”

10.6 The substantive motion (as set out in 10.5) was then CARRIED.

10.7 The Report of the Environment Scrutiny Committee dated 29 June 2004 was received.

**11. REPORT OF THE RESOURCES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
– 1 JULY 2004**

(Presented by I H Laidlaw-Dickson, Chairman of the Committee)

The Report of the Resources Scrutiny Committee dated 1 July 2004 was received.

12. APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The following motion proposed by **R J M Ellis** and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

“That Caroline Tapster be appointed as Chief Executive with immediate effect.”

The Chief Executive thanked the Council.

13. KEY DECISIONS / FORWARD PLAN

The following motion proposed by **R J M Ellis** and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

“That the position of Key Decisions in the decision-making process, shown in the current edition of the Forward Plan, be noted.”

14. MEMBERSHIP OF MEMBERS’ ALLOWANCES PANEL

The following motion proposed by **R J M Ellis** and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

- “1. That David Thomas be appointed as Chairman of the Allowances Panel to replace Don Latham.*
- 2. That the Chairman of the Panel, together with the two other current members of the Panel (Greg Grant and Margaret Jarvis) co-opt two further persons to be members of the Panel, following public advertisement, and that these five persons continue to serve until the Panel is reviewed by the new Council.”*

15. STATUS OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

15.1 The following motion was proposed by **R J M Ellis** and duly seconded:-

- “a) That the Constitution be amended to delete the Audit Committee,*
- b) That the Cabinet be invited to establish an Audit Panel, with a size and composition equal to the current Audit Committee, and with the following terms of reference, in order to discharge its statutory responsibilities:-*

‘To advise the Cabinet, Executive Members and Chief Officers on:-

- the adequacy of internal control systems, including the risk management system*

- *The Statement of Internal Control*
- *financial statements*
- *the internal audit strategy & plan and the implementation of internal audit recommendations*
- *the annual report of the Chief Internal Auditor*
- *the annual external Audit Plan*
- *responses to the District Auditor's management letter and other reports from the District Auditor'."*

15.2 The following amendment proposed by **C J White** and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

"That the scrutiny duties of the Audit Committee be transferred to the Resources Scrutiny Committee."

15.3 The substantive motion (incorporating 15.1 and 15.2) was then CARRIED.

16. ITEM OF BUSINESS REQUESTED BY MEMBERS UNDER STANDING ORDER 6 (2) (1)

Proposal to reorganise Herts Outdoors

16.1 **K F Emsall, J T Metcalf, and P A Ruffles** declared personal interests in this item, remained in the meeting and took part in the consideration thereof.

16.2 Bob Fenton, Chairman of the Hertfordshire Schools Sailing and Canoeing Association, presented a petition against the closure of the Barton Sailing Base.

The Chairman additionally reported the receipt of petitions on the same subject from Morgans JMI School, Hertford and Fairfields Primary School, Cheshunt.

16.3 The following motion proposed by **G R Churchard** and duly seconded, was CARRIED:-

"That the Council ask the Cabinet not to go ahead with the closure of Barton Sailing Base until the Herts Educational Foundation and the schools who use the base have had an opportunity to explore ways of keeping the sailing base open."

16.4 The following motion proposed by **N E Agar** and duly seconded, was LOST:-

"That this Council refutes the policy of closing four of Hertfordshire's six educational field stations without adequate consultation and calls for the cases of Pelham/Astonbury, the Hertfordshire Environmental Centre in Stevenage, and Barton Turf in Norfolk to be reconsidered by the Cabinet on their merits."

17. NOTICES OF MOTION - STANDING ORDER 8 (5)

17.1 The following motion was proposed by **J T Metcalf** and duly seconded:-

Smoking in Public Places

“That the County Council ask the government to allow local authorities in Hertfordshire to be empowered to ban smoking in enclosed public places to support the Hertfordshire community strategy’s (Herts Together) objective of increasing the number of smoke-free environments.”

17.2 The Chairman determined under SO 8 (7) that it was desirable to deal with this motion on the day.

17.3 Following debate, upon the Chairman calling for a vote on the motion, **S B A Giles-Medhurst** required a recorded vote under SO 12 (3).

17.4 The motion was LOST, the recorded vote being:-

Those in favour (25):-

N E Agar	R I N Gordon	S J Mills
D E Billing	M Green	J R Morton
G R Churchard	D W Hills	R Sanderson
F W Clayton	J A Hobday	I Simpson
M D Colne	M J Hobday	E N Singam
K M Crout	S E Jones	C J White
M Downing	B J Lamb	B A York
S B A Giles-Medhurst	R Mays	
J Gipps	J Metcalf	

Those against (40):-

T I Ambrose	G D Game	R Roberts
D A Ashley	A K Gray	P A Ruffles
M V Bayes	F Guest	H M Saunders
D Beatty	B N W Hammond	A M R Searing
N K Brook	M H T Janes	R H Smith
P T J Channell	T G M Kent	W A Storey
D Clayton	L R Kercher	I E M Tarry
R S Clements	I H Laidlaw-Dickson	J Taunton
K J Coleman	D B Lloyd	J W A Usher
G M Cook	D E Lloyd	P A Webb
R N Copping	A Oaten	
A D Dodd	M H O’Neill	
R J M Ellis	D A A Peek	
K F Emsall	S J Pile	
B C Engel	J M Pitman	

Those abstaining (4):-

S A Batson, E M Clarke, D J Drake, S M P Newton.

Those absent (8):-

P V Goggins, A Lee, D R McManus, R Mills, S H Quilty,
D Royall, D T F Scudder, R J Smith.

18. QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(1)

18.1 S B A Giles-Medhurst asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

"At the last Council meeting I asked a question on behalf of the Joint Highways Panel for Watford about the failure of EDF to connect some 60 new street lights commissioned from Watford's discretionary budget in that the columns at that time had been installed some six months. Assurances were given at the time (18th May) that this was now in hand and that they would all be connected by the end of May.

It does not surprise me but is no doubt a great disappointment that this promise made by EDF has not been fulfilled. Despite being assured by EDF that power would be provided to the new columns by the end of May; on checking it would appear that only ten of the columns have been connected. The majority of the lights remain out of lighting. What action is the Executive Member now doing to sort out this long running saga?"

18.2 D A Ashley replied:-

"I agree that this is unacceptable.

At a local level, meetings are held weekly with EDF to attempt to get action. All work issued to the company is tracked to determine the time between order and installation. Some connections are currently taking in excess of 100 days, which I repeat is not acceptable.

Unfortunately, as we have rehearsed many times, the Council has no option but to use the company and EDF have different priorities than the Council. As far as these lights are concerned, EDF were provided with details of this work in November, March and again in late June. I understand that they have now programmed the remaining supplies for late August and we will do all we can to make this happen.

Further high level discussions with EDF will take place to re-emphasise our serious concerns about this area of their service."

18.3 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“In thanking the Executive Member for his answer and as I have explained to him this is not an attack on the County Council per se but a way of drawing attention to the deficiencies in the service, which he has acknowledged over the current arrangements with EDF, would he therefore agree that the inefficiencies in regard to the new lighting in Watford, which in one case Cllr Audrey Oaten, Alan Armson and David Cox of Mid West Lighting have been involved in and thus taken up a considerable amount of officer time, that could have been spent on other works is totally unacceptable and given this will he now contact the government regulator to raise these concerns about unacceptable performance?”

18.4 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“I will give this serious consideration.”

18.5 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

“Does the Executive Member think it is right that a contract specification handled by his area of responsibility can state that 50 per cent of the specification does not have to be met before action is taken?”

18.6 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“I presume that the question relates to grass cutting and the relevant guidance to staff when auditing performance.

I thank the member for bringing this to my attention and can advise that this has now been revised to 90%.”

18.7 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“In thanking the Executive Member for his reply it is pleasing that my question has resulted in a change of policy and highlighted this defective contract. Would he agree that this is now an improvement?”

18.8 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“Yes.”

18.9 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

“Would the Executive member agree that a road that has only been tarmacked two months ago to have weeds/grass growing through the new tarmac is a sign of the failure of the county's contractor and sub contractor to do the job correctly? Given this sort of example of poor workmanship carried out by a sub contractor of the county's main contractor would he not think it's about time the county put its foot down and insisted within Herts Highways who should be used to deliver such work?”

18.10 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“If work has not been carried out to specification, it is rectified by the Works Team at no expense to the County Council. Indeed only last week I met the senior managers of the partners to emphasise my concerns over workmanship.

However members do need to be aware that in some circumstances, even when work has been carried out to specification, weed growth through new tarmac can occur.”

18.11 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“In thanking the Executive Member for his reply would he agree that works undertaken in March in Charlock and Healey Roads in West Watford and reported in the local press as having weeds growing through them and ponding and admitted by the spokesperson for the County as being unsatisfactory and given that these defects have not yet been rectified will he now investigate this and ensure action is taken?”

18.12 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“Yes, I will look into it.”

18.13 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

“Would the Executive Member agree that the County needs to consider it's priorities for its highways budget to ensure that whilst carriageway defects and road maintenance are carried out within resources available that due priority is given to footway repairs, especially in areas of high pedestrian usage or those with considerable failure of the footway?”

18.14 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“Yes and it is.”

18.15 **S B A Giles-Medhurst** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“In thanking the Executive Member for his reply would he agree that one way of improving priorities within the budget is by ensuring that carriageway and footway repairs detailed in the Integrated Works Programme and budgeted for, as Watford has done, are to prioritise these to be done at the start of the financial year to ensure the maximum benefit for the council tax payers of Hertfordshire?”

18.16 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“I would refer the member to my previous answer. However, if there are ways of improving our system prioritisation then I would be happy to look at it.”

18.17 **A D Dodd** asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

“Would the Executive Member agree that the new London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Study (the Study to study all studies) is unnecessary and ill conceived and does not allow for any reasonable period of proper consultation? Comments have to be received by 26th July and the report is due to be published on 30th July; a gap of only three days for any detailed consideration of any queries raised. Is this really democracy?”

18.18 **F Guest** asked the Executive Member for Environment:-

“I understand the EERA has commissioned a study that assesses all the previous consultancy studies EERA has commissioned. Isn't it time for the Regional Planning Panel to embark on mature reflection about what RPG14 is really trying to achieve, rather than repeatedly asking questions in the hope that finally a consultant will come up with the right answer?”

18.19 **D A Ashley** replied to both 18.17 and 18.18 as follows:-

“Can I first provide some context for the members: There are currently a number of studies underway affecting the drafting of RSS 14 and Hertfordshire, as follows:

*The London-Stansted-Cambirdge-Peterborough corridor study
The Hertfordshire Housing development and Spatial Strategy Audit
Peterborough Sub Regional Study Phase2
Stansted 2nd Runway Study
Norwich Sub region study*

*Strategic Environmental Assessment
Legal Audit
Employment Policy review
Affordable Housing study
Harlow area studies*

Plus the Study of Studies.

This commission requires the consultant to analyse the other studies – all of which are not yet complete. The consultant has two months to undertake the task and come up with a solution. Currently RPP has just one more meeting to digest all of this and make a recommendation to the East of England Assembly. It is clearly in need of time to absorb this information and is in danger of not getting it.

We have made it clear to EERA that Regional Planning Guidance must tackle all the issues that people in the region need resolving. The current inconsistent approach to housing numbers and acceptance of growth in areas that are already overwhelmed with development pressures has not worked. As a member of the Regional Planning Panel and supported by colleague members in this county, I have asked EERA to consider the most sustainable levels of growth that the region can accommodate and to ensure they look at all the options, including challenging solutions such as new settlements. If it is to do this with rigour, then EERA needs to reconsider its timetable for the submission of RPG14.

We cannot separate development from infrastructure. Critically, Hertfordshire today has a major infrastructure deficit. Until that is resolved then there can be no logic to increasing the problem by planning for more growth. I see nothing in the Comprehensive Spending Review that addresses our problems today, let alone the pressures that further growth in this region and London will bring. EERA needs to secure infrastructure funding to address the deficient we face today as well as future pressures. At the Hertfordshire County and District meetings with Lord Rooker, Members emphasised that point. Lord Rooker himself recognised that infrastructure investment needs to come before housing growth.

EERA needs to assure itself that it has achieved the right balance between the level of housing that the region needs to meet its predicted levels to economic growth and the pressure on businesses from historically low levels of infrastructure investment. That way we can achieve a sustainable solution for Hertfordshire, and the whole of the East of England. The current timetable and process does not seem to be allowing for this.”

18.20 **A D Dodd** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“Is the Executive Member aware that the MP for Harlow has recently stated that there is a developing view locally and across the region that development north of Harlow would be the best way to protect Harlow and the surrounding area whilst meeting our genuine housing needs? Would he like to comment on this statement, especially as such a proposal would considerably impact upon Hertfordshire, and what action is being considered to challenge such a move?”

18.21 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“I am aware of this intervention. I do think it is unwise for MPs, and particularly Government Ministers, to try to pre-empt the proper planning process.”

18.22 **F Guest** then asked the following supplementary question:-

“In the recent Government spending review, has the Government agreed that the infrastructure deficit needs addressing?”

18.23 **D A Ashley** replied:-

“What do most members of the Council think? I know what I think.”

ANDREW LAYCOCK
County Secretary