



# Minutes

Name of meeting	<b>FULL COUNCIL</b>
Date and time	<b>WEDNESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2010 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM</b>
Venue	<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT</b>
Present	Cllrs Ian Stephens (Chairman), Barry Abraham, Jonathan Bacon, Reg Barry, Peter Bingham, George Brown, Ivan Bulwer, George Cameron, Vanessa Churchman, Dawn Cousins, , Rodney Downer, Stuart Dyer, Paul Fuller, Edward Giles, John Hobart, Richard Hollis, John Howe, Heather Humby, Tim Hunter-Henderson, Julie Jones-Evans, , Geoff Lumley, Roger Mazillius, Lora Peacey-Wilcox, David Pugh, Colin Richards, Susan Scoccia, Andy Sutton, Arthur Taylor, Gary Taylor, Ian Ward, Margaret Webster, Chris Welsford, Jerry White, Wayne Whittle, David Williams
Apologies	Cllr David Knowles, Patrick Joyce, Roger Dixcey David Whittaker

---

36. [Minutes](#)

RESOLVED :

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [22 September 2010](#) be confirmed.

37. [Declarations of Interest](#)

Councillor Arthur Taylor declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 38, as a close family member worked at Westminster House, Newport.

Councillor Andy Sutton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 38, as a close family member worked at the Gouldings, Freshwater.

38. [Public Question Time](#)

Questions were put to the Chairman as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Mr John Ward, Newport ( <a href="#">PQ 47/10</a> )	Mr Ward was not in attendance to ask his question in relation to the removal of the dragon sculpture at Coppins Bridge.	The Cabinet Member would provide a written response.

Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton left the room whilst the following public questions were asked.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Mr John Rosenthal, Cowes ( <a href="#">PQ 48/10</a> )	<p>With reference to the recently published Consultation Paper for the users of Westminster House, many of the questions in the Questionnaire will be difficult if not impossible for those with learning difficulties to understand and / or respond to. Many current users of the services provided by Westminster House cannot read or understand the sometimes complex questions posed, have no understanding of the concept of a questionnaire, no understanding of personal budgets or comprehension of money values and in many cases have no understanding of the current proposals for relocation.</p> <p>As it is therefore inevitable that Questionnaires will have to be completed by either the parents or carers, where service users cannot answer for themselves, how can the answers to the questions be treated as impartial or unbiased and how can the responses to the questionnaire provide a sound basis for assessing the proposals? How can we be assured that the proposed assistance from Council Officers for those completing questionnaires will be independent and unbiased and will those providing such assistance have training in dealing with those suffering from learning disabilities?"</p> <p>The following supplementary question was asked: Where are the Consultation Papers for the Parents and Carers of</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member advised that he fully appreciate that within the term "learning disability" there were a wide range of abilities represented. There were people who would be able to read and understand the "Easy Read" version of the consultation documents and who may even reply on line and there were others who not only may be unable to read but may also be unable to speak. For this reason we were taking a variety of approaches that included both the written format and opportunities for face to face meetings. To ensure that the latter really delivered the view of the disabled person, we were looking to work with the Advocacy Trust to ensure that the individual's voice is heard in whichever way they express it and that what they had to say was not unduly shaped by either the person supporting them, be it family member or other carer or the person seeking their views.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member advised that for parents and carers of learning disabled people there was a fuller</p>

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
	<p>the Learning Disabled, the Elderly, Their Carers And Family etc from the Gouldings and The Adelaide that are needed to complete this exercise as promised in the undertakings given by Councillor Mazillius at the last Full Council Meeting.</p>	<p>version of the consultation document that was available for all interested parties to use. If they wish they can use the Easy Read version as their reference for points that they would wish to make and there would be opportunities for them to have face to face meetings with officers undertaking the consultation. I also need to stress that there is no prescribed format for people to share their views with us. The consultation documents describe our current plans and the thinking behind them and suggest what we thought were the key issues but it is for individuals to choose what they wanted to tell us and how they wanted to do so.</p> <p>With regard to the older people who access services at The Gouldings and The Adelaide, we had not drafted separate consultation documents for them as the nature of the service that they received was not changing. We would however, be providing opportunities for both them and their family carers to express their views either in writing or through face to face meetings on the proposals and specifically what impact they felt there may potentially be on the service they received.</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs McKenzie, Cowes (<a href="#">PQ 50/10</a>)</p>	<p>Councillor George Cameron asked the question of behalf of Mr and Mrs McKenzie.</p> <p>Will future users of Westminster House be consulted regarding the</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member indicated that the council was committed to looking at the service provided by Westminster House, including not only people who used the service</p>

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
	proposal ie. current users of Beaulieu House? After all they need to prepare for the profound changes that will affect them if this proposal goes through.	currently but also to those who may use it in the future. We were therefore targeting young people who used Beaulieu and their families as part of this consultation.
	Has the medical profession been consulted or will they be consulted? After all, the proposals will influence the care of their elderly patients, what about bed blocking if we have future winters like the last one? We are an aging population and need more facilities not fewer - would the Council care to comment on this?	We are working closely with NHS IW on these consultations and they have had the documents and have undertaken to forward them to GPs and other health professionals on the Island
	Have current users of The Gouldings and Adelaide been consulted about the proposal? Will they be consulted? Are they likely to want to share with potentially disruptive young adults with a learning disability?	We were also going to seek the views of people who currently used The Gouldings and The Adelaide and their families. We had confirmed on several occasions both within the Whole Life Working Group and since that the learning disabled use at The Gouldings and The Adelaide would be entirely separated from the existing use.
	Is the Council going to seek the views of organisations such as MENCAP, Age UK and the National Autistic Society as part of the consultation?"	Finally, we were working closely with a wide range of voluntary organisations on the Island. People First a group of learning disabled adults provided a valuable input to us in preparing the consultation documents as did the User and Carer reference Group that worked with us on the Transforming Adult Social Care programme. I am also very grateful to the representatives of Age UK, the Advocacy Trust, Carers UK, the Learning Disability Partnership Board and IoW LINK who had kindly volunteered to be part of a group that I am chairing to

Name	Subject	Comment
		ensure that the consultations are both full in their coverage and appropriate in terms of ensuring that all people affected by those issues had an opportunity to have their voice heard.
		I have also invited every member of the Council to contribute to the consultation and I have also asked for every Parish and Town Council to be similarly briefed, in addition I am delivering details to all homes in my electoral division.

Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton re-entered the room.

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr David Miller, Cowes ( <a href="#">PQ 49/10</a> )	Mr Miller was not in attendance to ask his question in relation to the scheduled start times of some Council meetings.	The Cabinet Member would provide a written response.

39. **Chairman's Report**

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

The Chairman offered his congratulations to Councillor and Mrs Brown on their recent Golden wedding anniversary.

40. **Motion Submitted under procedure Rule 10 of the Council's constitution**

In accordance with Procedure Rule 10, the following motion was moved by Councillor Geoff Lumley :

Council welcomes the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's measures to curtail Council's spending money on "glossy propaganda magazines".

Council resolves to embrace wholeheartedly these measures and agrees to reduce publication of 'One Island' to biannually.

Following debate the motion was put to the vote and was lost.

41. **Appointments and Constitutional Issues**

(a) **[Elect a Chairman for Overview and Scrutiny Committee](#)**

The name of Councillor Wayne Whittle was proposed and seconded, there being no further nominations and after a vote was taken it was

RESOLVED :

THAT Councillor Wayne Whittle be elected Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the ensuing year.

(b) **[Consideration of Appointment Process to the Independent Remuneration Panel and a proposed change in respect of the start times for Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels](#)**

Council considered the arrangements as to how members were appointed to the Independent Remuneration Panel with a suggestion that the process be completely independent of councillors. It was also suggested that as from 31 December 2012 (when the term of office of the current Chairman expires), the Panel elect their own Chairman on an annual basis. This would be in line with the arrangements already in place for the Ethical Standards Committee.

There was also a proposal to alter the start time of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panel meetings from 6.00 pm to 5.00 pm.

RESOLVED :

- (i) THAT the appointment of Panel members to the Independent Remuneration Panel, including the appointment process, be delegated to the Director of Corporate Services and Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Head of Democratic Services and the remaining members of the Panel.
- (ii) THAT the Independent Remuneration Panel members be authorised, following the expiry of the current Panel Chairman's appointment on 31 December 2012, to elect their own Chairman.
- (iii) THAT meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels commence at 5.00 pm with immediate effect.

42. **Cabinet**

(a) **Recommendation from the Cabinet**

**[Corporate Parenting Strategy](#)**

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services advised on the delegated decision relating to the Corporate Parenting Strategy which she had

brought before Council to endorse the decision to revise and enhance the existing strategy.

The Strategy set out to ensure duties were monitored and delivered. The revised measures were clearer, gave more detail and assisted and supported the children to enable them to raise issues, where to go with concerns and to understand through the Children and Care Council, their social workers, independent review officers the council's role as their corporate parents.

The Strategy was that infrastructure be put in place through effective participation to help deliver measures and through careful data monitoring on a regular basis. The revised strategy aimed to drive forward improvements and deal with shortfalls.

The Cabinet Member thanked Cllrs Susan Scoccia, Fostering Panel, John Howe, Adoption Panel and George Cameron, Corporate Parenting Board for their help.

Members asked for an assurance that the Strategy would remain an absolute priority for the Council and would not become subject to budget cuts at a later date. Members would also find it useful to set out in layman's terms what a Corporate Parent was.

The Cabinet Member indicated a plenary session could be set up in order to make clear what the role of a Corporate Parent was.

RESOLVED :

THAT the Corporate Parenting Strategy for 2010 be approved.

(b) **Reports Of The Cabinet Members**

(i) **[The Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and School Improvement](#)**

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

The Leader gave a brief report on the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review. He outlined the level of public sector expenditure reduction there would be over the coming years and how that would affect the services the council would be able to provide as a local authority. The reduction in the overall local government budget was likely to be a 28% cut in money from government with a projected 7.1% cut each year over a four year period. The initial indication was that it would be weighted towards a higher reduction in 2011/12.

He reminded members that a report was due to go to the December 2010 Cabinet meeting indicating the future shape and structure of the organisation.

Oral questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Councillor John Howe	Would the buy back from schools services continue until April 2012?	The Cabinet Member advised there had been some discussion with the new secondary providers. Arrangements were in place to ensure services were available. Looking to the new providers, particularly within the secondary sector to provide greater leadership in providing those support services. Historically the authority had not always recovered the full costs from schools for some of the services they had provided, which had an impact on the budget while the dedicated school grant had gone up. The council could not afford to subsidise the services to schools from which they had benefited from in the past. It was anticipated that perhaps the Scrutiny Panel could look at whole funding arrangements.
Councillor Ian Ward	Would the Scrutiny Panel chairs be included in the reviews for their particular area?	The Cabinet Member indicated that both the Chair and the Scrutiny Panel Chairs would be involved.
Councillor Chris Welsford	Could the Southern Vectis complaints procedure be publicised to school and pupils in relation to the complaints being received with regard to Home to School transport.	The Cabinet Member indicated he was happy to work with schools and Southern Vectis to ensure the message was delivered.
Councillor Chris Welsford	Performance figures for GCSE	The Cabinet Member believed the schools re-organisation would allow the figures to be driven up. It was hoped that better results would be delivered in 2012.

(ii) [The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for the Economy, Tourism, Leisure, Planning and Property](#)

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

Oral questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Councillor Susan Scoccia	Over 3,000 review forms, (previously distributed by the Friends of Ventnor Botanic Gardens, with the agreement of the Isle of Wight Council), on the future of Ventnor Botanic Gardens had been completed by members of the public, could she be assured they would be looked at and taken into consideration and be fed into the review going to Cabinet.	The Cabinet Member gave that assurance and indicated he was trying to find the best option.
Councillor Vanessa Churchman	How was the sum of £220,000 for the installation of the new lift at Ventnor Botanic Gardens arrived at?	The Cabinet Member advised it was the maximum cost which a lift of a vertical design would be likely to cost. Following the delegated decision the procurement process would be followed.
Councillor Wayne Whittle	The council continued to provide support for a proposed scheme to create tidal energy test facilities for the DECC, was that financial support as you may be aware that this week the government had pulled the funding for the tidal generator on the River Severn, would the funding therefore be in vain now?  Understood the scheme had been cancelled as it was not as cost effective in relation to wind energy.	The Cabinet Member advised that work being undertaken at the moment was being done by council officer with external support from the university and others. The Island could be the site for one of the government marine parks. Meetings with ministers were to be held in the near future. It was one of the Islands leading economic opportunities. The Cabinet Member indicated that the value re wind energy was influenced by the tariff that enabled that power to be fed into the national grid. There was a

Name	Subject	Comment
<a href="#">Councillor Jonathan Bacon</a>	Why has or was no legal action been taken in regard to the lift at Ventnor Botanic Gardens?	favourable tariff for wind generated power whereas the tariff for other forms of generated power was nothing like as generous. The Cabinet Member advised that the first port of call would be in installing company, but they were no longer in existence, the lift manufacturer exist in Italy. The designer of the building was also still in existence. I don't know why no action was taken. The lift has worked and not worked for unpredictable periods of time over the last 10 years. The council could have taken more robust action and possibly effectively. The legal advice received at that time was that there was very little chance of recovery against a manufacturer in Italy.

(iii) [\*\*Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Housing\*\*](#)

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

The Cabinet Member gave a brief update on the effect of the Comprehensive Spending Review. Briefings had been received from the Department of Health, and from the Minister for Housing. On the Department of Health grant funding, the government were making an additional £2b available, half of which would go the NHS and then come back in terms of social care. The other half would come as grant funding to local authorities, which would be over the four years of the spending review period.

With regard to affordable housing the government was committed to spending £4.5 billion to fund new affordable homes over the four year spending review period. That was designed to produce 150,000 new affordable homes.

Oral questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows :

(Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton left the room and took no part in the discussion that followed)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Councillor Reg Barry	Did you still believe that the take up use for Westminster House was 50%?	The Cabinet member advised that the average use of the occupancy rates of Westminster House has been reported as 50%.
	A supplementary question from October 2009 – September 2010 there had been an 89% booking for a 12 night stay, which was a take up of 72%. If closure was based on 50% and the real figure was 72% there was something wrong.	The Cabinet Member indicated that was the year on year average.
Councillor John Howe	Could the Cabinet Member re-iterate his statement that there would be no disruption to the users of the Gouldings.	The Cabinet Member indicated that the Gouldings as presently used occupies a certain part of that building, if the move of the Westminster House clients proceeds to the Gouldings they will be completely self contained, including a garden area which will be fenced. There would be no prospect or intent to mix the two cliental.
Councillor Chris Welsford	With regard to homelessness, households in temporary accommodation had risen by 10 to 138, do you have any idea when the target of 175 would be reached.	The Cabinet Member indicated that applications for homelessness provision varies year on year. It still remains well below the target of 175. the three causes
	A supplementary question regarding Westminster House and what the estimate was to upgrade the building to make it fit for purpose, to include the provision of a new lift.	The Cabinet Member indicated that the capital costs which would include the replacement of the lift was in the region of £128,000.

(Councillor Arthur Taylor re-entered the room.)

(iv) [Cabinet Member for Children's Services](#)

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

(v) [Cabinet Member for the Environment, Transport and Corporate Services](#)

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

Oral questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Councillor Julie Jones-Evans	Three years since the no entry sign was erected in Chapel Street, Newport, how was the situation to be addressed.	The Cabinet member advised the area had been used as a rat run and as Chapel Street was not able to handle all the traffic in a safe and effective manner, therefore the road was made one way.
Councillor Chris Welsford	Could something be done with regards to the signage in relation to the coastal path?	The Cabinet Member asked that if there was a particular area where the signage was not clear if the member advised him he would take the matter up with the appropriate officers.
Councillor Stuart Dyer	Congratulated the PFI group and indicated that the Isle of Wight had been cited as an exemplar for a bid.	The Cabinet Member agreed.
Councillor Rodney Downer	Could verge and grass cutting be monitored as at present some places were left in poor condition.	The Cabinet Member advised that it was monitored at the present time, if there were problems the councillor should let him know so it could be addressed.
Councillor John Howe	The gasification plant was now working again, how much had it cost the council in having to use the landfill site instead.	The Cabinet Member would provide a written response.
Councillor Richard Hollis	Asked that salt should only be used on roads in extreme circumstances.	The Cabinet Member noted what was said.

(vi) **Cabinet Member for Fire and Community Safety**

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

Oral questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows :

<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Councillor Geoff Lumley	Asked if it would have been appropriate to consult with Newport Parish Council on the removal of the dragon sculpture from Coppins Bridge?	The Cabinet member indicated that the planning department had been approached who were happy to extend the planning permission. Unfortunately the recycled materials used in the construction of the dragon were disintegrating. Robin Hill had offered to take on the ongoing responsibility for the sculpture.
	A supplementary question – would it have been possible to take the sculpture away and refurbish it over the winter months and replace it when the better weather returned?	The Cabinet Member advised it would not be possible to do that.
Councillor John Howe	How many dog wardens did the council employ and how many prosecutions had there been over the last six months?	The Cabinet Member would provide a written response.

(vii) **Cabinet Member for Major Projects, Performance and Customer Services**

A [written report](#) had been circulated for information.

(viii) **Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

The Vice Chairman provided an update.

CHAIRMAN