



Minutes

Name of meeting	FULL COUNCIL
Date and time	WEDNESDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2010 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM
Venue	COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT
Present	Cllrs Ian Stephens (Chairman), Barry Abraham, Jonathan Bacon, Reg Barry, Peter Bingham, George Brown, Ivan Bulwer, George Cameron, Vanessa Churchman, Dawn Cousins, Roger Dixcey, Rodney Downer, Stuart Dyer, Paul Fuller, Edward Giles, John Hobart, John Howe, Heather Humby, Tim Hunter-Henderson, Julie Jones-Evans, David Knowles, Geoff Lumley, Roger Mazillius, David Pugh, Colin Richards, Susan Scoccia, Andy Sutton, Arthur Taylor, Gary Taylor, Ian Ward, Margaret Webster, Chris Welsford, Jerry White, Wayne Whittle, David Williams, William Wyatt-Millington
Apologies	Cllrs Patrick Joyce, Lora Peacey-Wilcox, David Whittaker

30. **Minutes**

RESOLVED :

THAT the Minutes of the meeting held on [21 July 2010](#) be confirmed.

31. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Arthur Taylor declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 35 (a), as a close family member worked at Westminster House, Newport.

Councillor Andy Sutton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Minute 35 (a), as a close family member worked at the Gouldings, Freshwater.

Councillor Roger Mazillius declared a personal interest in Minute 35 (a), as a relative was in residential care and was in receipt of a statutory attendance allowance.

32. Public Question Time

Questions were put to the Chairman as follows :

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr David Miller, Cowes (PQ 34/10)	Further to the decision to award two new secondary schools to an academy provider on 01/10/09 citing the ability to secure up-front funding and such capital funding grants for those two schools being quantified to £80m could the leader provide an update?	The Cabinet Member advised that the establishment of the new secondary schools, including those for Ryde and Sandown, was not affected by the end of Building Schools for the Future programme as the funding for establishing the schools, £250,000 each as estimated in the statutory proposals, was already secured as was the funding for the new build One School Pathfinder in Cowes. The extent of any future improvement and development of secondary school sites other than Cowes would now be influenced by the outcome of the comprehensive review of all capital investment in schools, early years, colleges and sixth forms that the Government was currently undertaking. The Cabinet Member advised he was unable to comment on individual cases.
	A supplementary question relating to a displaced pupil notice being brought home by his daughter, which was incorrectly addressed.	

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

Name	Subject	Comment
Ms Debra Wood, Ryde (PQ 35/10)	At the meeting of the Whole Life Service - Learning Disability Group, held on the 28th July, staff representatives from Westminster House raised a large number of questions and concerns	The Cabinet Member advised that the minutes were not a verbatim record but a summary of the issues agreed.

Name	Subject	Comment
<p>Ms Jackie Hawkins, Newport (PQ 36/10)</p>	<p>relating to the proposed closure of the site and the move to the Gouldings/Adelaide. Those concerns related primarily to service provision issues. Why had those questions and concerns not been reflected in the draft minutes of the meeting and why was there no vote taken?</p> <p>A supplementary question asked if future meetings could be minuted more fully and for service users, carers and staff be given the ability to vote or to address the Committee.</p> <p>How could Councillors vote on an issue they knew was still unresolved, was still causing a huge amount of stress, worry and upset; when service users, their families, and the staff of Westminster House were still expressing concerns and were saying that those issues that they had tried to address were being ignored?</p> <p>A supplementary question asked if there was to be a proper consultation.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member advised there was no capacity to take verbatim minutes, but key points were recorded.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member indicated that a 90 day consultation was to be undertaken to ensure the concerns of the people who used the service were taken into account.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member advised that if the authority wanted to take a decision that did not reflect the interests of service users, they would not be undertaking a 90 day consultation.</p>
<p>Ms Hazel Wyld, Freshwater (PQ 37/10)</p>	<p>Legally the council needed to consult all service users and carers prior to any decisions being made.</p> <p>In the case of both Medina centre and Westminster house no such consultation had taken place, although we had been invited to those meetings they had consisted of the council telling us of their plans, we had objected and they had continued to implement said plans, surely the word</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member advised the Council recognised they had a legal requirement to consult and were therefore proposing a formal period of consultation.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr Adrian Whittaker, Ryde	<p>consultation meant our objections should be listened too and acted upon and therefore was the proposed agenda lawful.</p> <p>A supplementary question indicated that the public had little faith in the Council and believed they had not been listened to.</p> <p>Supporting SEN pupils in mainstream schools.</p>	<p>The Cabinet Member refuted the comment, and indicated the proposals had previously been explained to a large number of people.</p> <p>The Cabinet member indicated a paper would be considered within the next few months relating to SEN pupils in both the primary and secondary sectors.</p>

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

33. **Chairman's Report**

A written report had been circulated for information.

34. **Motions submitted under Procedure Rule 10 of the Council's Constitution**

In accordance with procedure Rule 10, the following motions were moved by :

(a) **Councillor David Pugh**

That Council recognises that there is a need for fundamental reform of the relationship between central and local government if we are to reduce public spending, tackle entrenched social, economic and environmental problems and rebuild trust in democratic accountability. It commends the detailed proposals for Place-based Budgets drawn up by the Local Government Association (LGA), which would bring together different streams of public spending into a single budget at the local level. It believes that these proposals would: save public money; cut waste and bureaucracy; allow for better decisions to be made transparently and accountably; and increase local communities control over spending in their area. It recommends that the Government begins the process of reform immediately by implementing Place-based Budgets throughout England and Wales as part of the 2010 Spending Review.

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

(b) Councillor Geoff Lumley

Council is concerned that cutting public services will have a devastating effect on the Isle of Wight. The public sector is an integral part of the Island's economy and Council cuts leading to a reduction in employment, together with less Council work for the local private sector, could only prove disastrous for our fragile economy. Additionally the demographics of the Island mean that some of the cuts proposed for services to older and vulnerable people could potentially be severely detrimental.

That Council resolves:

To defer consideration of the Cabinet's 'Second Budget Review' recommendations (option 2 in the Cabinet paper, 14.09.2010) for one month whilst it makes real, meaningful and strenuous efforts (involving the Island's MP) to persuade the coalition government that 25%+ cuts in our local public services will have a highly destructive effect on the local economy and our vulnerable population.

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

35. Cabinet

(a) **Recommendations from the Cabinet**

(During the following debate Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton left the room and took no part in the discussion whenever anything relating to Westminster House or the Gouldings was raised.)

Members had received a copy of the report which had been submitted to and agreed by Cabinet on 14 September 2010. The following recommendations arising from that meeting had been circulated with the agenda.

- 1 Consider the financial position facing the council as set out in the report and note the actions taken to date to contain budget pressures and recommend to Council that:
 - (a) They confirm the need to contain net revenue spend for the Council to the level agreed by Council on 24 February 2010
 - (b) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposals set out in paragraph 23 i.e:
 - Change the eligibility threshold (in line with FACS (Fair Access to Care Services) criteria) used to determine who the council provides adult social care services to so that those with the greatest needs are assured of support while those at greatest risk are also provided with targeted support in those areas in which they are most vulnerable. [Full year saving of £1.5m]

- Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute to the cost of the support that they receive on the same basis, irrespective of their age, disability or health condition. This would mean that people aged over 80 years would be assessed on the same basis as those aged under 80 years. [Full year saving of £1.25m]
 - Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute on the basis of the overall value of their allocated personal budget rather than how they are choosing to spend it. This would mean that whether people use their personal budget for home care, day care, meals on wheels or any other support, they would be charged on an equitable basis.[Full year saving of £900k]
- (c) After considering the equality impact assessment the proposed re-provisioning of services from Westminster House as set out in Appendix 5 be agreed and implemented forthwith.
- (d) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposed removal of the discretionary element of the concessionary fares scheme for post-16 transport and on the removal of discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision authorising this consultation being agreed in the near future.
- (e) As an immediate measure for post-16 students the contribution they make to their travel cost is increased from £27.50 per term to £60 per term (equivalent to £1 per day) as from the beginning of the January 2011 term, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision being agreed in the near future.
- (f) An in-principle decision is made to combine the Council's fire control centre with that of another authority in order to deliver a cost effective service with the necessary resilience. Officers are tasked with progressing the necessary arrangements to implement this proposal, subject to a final Cabinet Member delegated decision.
- (g) The leisure facilities improvement programme is reconfigured in order to deliver an effective programme at a revenue cost of £250k less than currently agreed. Improvement works to the Westridge facility to be completed as planned in order for it to be ready for the international games in 2011.
- (h) The parking income and permit options as set out in Appendix 4 are considered and Cabinet reaches a view on what recommendations are put forward to Council.

2. Agree to consider the necessary reports, results of consultations and final impact assessments flowing from decisions at Council on 22 September at the budget setting Full Council meeting in February 2011 in order to make any relevant decisions about the implementation of proposals with effect from 1 April 2010.

The Leader indicated that the majority of what was before Council was not about implementing decisions but setting a detailed process in motion to enable a number of decisions to be made in due course. It was noted that some decisions could have a significant impact for the Island community. There was also a need to see the full context of the spending review from Government in October 2010 before any decisions were implemented.

It was anticipated that from 1 April 2011 there would be a radically different shape to the organisation in terms of services delivered and structure of the local authority. A report would be presented to Cabinet in December 2010 which would set out the future shape of the organisation to include the management structure as a whole.

The authority continued to make representations to Government in relation to the Revenue Support Grant.

It was noted there were in-year pressures in particular areas, including those in Adult Social Care. There was a need to work within limited resources and tackle the overspend the authority had.

The Leader outlined the following revised recommendations which had been circulated to all members prior to the meeting.

1. That Council agrees to:
 - (a) Confirm the need to contain net revenue spend for the Council to the level agreed by Council on 24 February 2010.
 - (b) Officers to undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposals set out in paragraph 23 of the report i.e:
 - Change the eligibility threshold (in line with FACS (Fair Access to Care Services) criteria) used to determine who the council provides adult social care services to so that those with the greatest needs are assured of support while those at greatest risk are also provided with targeted support in those areas in which they are most vulnerable. [Full year saving of £1.5m]
 - Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute to the cost of the support that they receive on the same basis, irrespective of their age, disability or health condition. This would mean that people aged over 80 years would be assessed on the same basis as those aged under 80 years. [Full year saving of £1.25m]

- Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute on the basis of the overall value of their allocated personal budget rather than how they are choosing to spend it. This would mean that whether people use their personal budget for home care, day care, meals on wheels or any other support, they would be charged on an equitable basis.
[Full year saving of £900k]
- (c) Accept the recommendation of the "Whole Life Group" to relocate the current services provided at Westminster House to The Gouldings and The Adelaide as its preferred option. Officers are now asked to undertake a 90 day formal consultation with service users, carers, staff and other interested parties on this option.
- (d) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposed removal of the discretionary element of the concessionary fares scheme for post-16 transport and on the removal of discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision authorising this consultation being agreed in the near future.
- (e) An in-principle decision is made to combine the Council's fire control centre with that of another authority in order to deliver a cost effective service with the necessary resilience. Officers are tasked with progressing the necessary arrangements to implement this proposal, subject to a final Cabinet Member delegated decision.
- (f) The leisure facilities improvement programme is reconfigured in order to deliver an effective programme at a revenue cost of £250k less than currently agreed. Improvement works to the Westridge facility to be completed as planned in order for it to be ready for the International Island Games in 2011.
- (g) Introduce the following additional permit arrangements with effect from 1 January 2011:
 - A permit enabling residents to park in a single designated Isle of Wight Council car park within 200m of their home, at a cost of £150.
 - A town specific tourist permit allowing parking in a designated town only, at the same level of rates being applied during the 2010 summer season.

Any further possible changes to permit arrangements, the level of parking charges applied and locations in which charges are payable will be considered as part of the budget setting process in February 2011, taking into account the need to contain net revenue spend and to deliver a balanced budget, with a view to any such

possible changes being implemented with full year effect from 1 April 2011.

2. That Council agrees to consider the necessary reports, results of consultations and final impact assessments flowing from the decisions at 1 (b) and (c) above at its budget setting Council meeting on 23 February 2011, in order to make any relevant budget decisions to enable the implementation of proposals with full year effect from 1 April 2011, or earlier as considered appropriate. Recommendations to the 23 February 2011 Council meeting, along with any required policy decisions with regard to future implementation, will be agreed at the Cabinet meeting on 8 February 2011.

(During the Leaders speech it was necessary that Procedure Rule 14(4) be partially suspended to increase the time limit on speeches for Group Leaders (or their nominees) from 10 minutes to up to 20 minutes)

It was noted that a formal 90 day consultation would take place with regard to the relocation of services provided by Westminster House, Newport. Following the consultation a final decision would be taken at the Full Council meeting due to be held on 23 February 2011.

There was some discussion that some of the elements within the report were not the way forward. Opposition members asked that paragraph 1 (c) of the revised recommendation be altered to read 'note the recommendation' rather than accept. Note was a neutral term and was not positive that the answer was to relocate the current services and allowed for a neutral balanced consultation.

Each recommendation was then voted on separately. Recommendations 1 (c) and 2 were taken last due to declarations of interest made by Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton who left the room and took no part on the voting on both of these.

RESOLVED :

1. THAT Council agreed to:
 - (a) Confirm the need to contain net revenue spend for the Council to the level agreed by Council on 24 February 2010.
 - (b) Officers to undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposals set out in paragraph 23 of the report i.e:
 - Change the eligibility threshold (in line with FACS (Fair Access to Care Services) criteria) used to determine who the council provides adult social care services to so that those with the greatest needs are assured of support while those at greatest risk are also provided with targeted support in those areas in which they are most vulnerable. [Full year saving of £1.5m]

- Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute to the cost of the support that they receive on the same basis, irrespective of their age, disability or health condition. This would mean that people aged over 80 years would be assessed on the same basis as those aged under 80 years. [Full year saving of £1.25m]
 - Revise the council's charging policy so that all people are assessed to contribute on the basis of the overall value of their allocated personal budget rather than how they are choosing to spend it. This would mean that whether people use their personal budget for home care, day care, meals on wheels or any other support, they would be charged on an equitable basis. [Full year saving of £900k]
- (d) Officers undertake the necessary consultation and impact assessments on the proposed removal of the discretionary element of the concessionary fares scheme for post-16 transport and on the removal of discretionary travel subsidy for denominational school transport from September 2011, subject to the proposed Cabinet Member delegated decision authorising this consultation being agreed in the near future.
- (e) An in-principle decision is made to combine the Council's fire control centre with that of another authority in order to deliver a cost effective service with the necessary resilience. Officers are tasked with progressing the necessary arrangements to implement this proposal, subject to a final Cabinet Member delegated decision.
- (f) The leisure facilities improvement programme is reconfigured in order to deliver an effective programme at a revenue cost of £250k less than currently agreed. Improvement works to the Westridge facility to be completed as planned in order for it to be ready for the International Island Games in 2011.
- (g) Introduce the following additional permit arrangements with effect from 1 January 2011:
- A permit enabling residents to park in a single designated Isle of Wight Council car park within 200m of their home, at a cost of £150 per year.
 - A town specific tourist permit allowing parking in a designated town only, at the same level of rates being applied during the 2010 summer season.

Any further possible changes to permit arrangements, the level of parking charges applied and locations in which charges are payable will be considered as part of the budget setting process in February 2011, taking into account the need to contain net revenue spend and to deliver a balanced budget, with a view to any such

possible changes being implemented with full year effect from 1 April 2011.

(Councillors Arthur Taylor and Andy Sutton left the room and took no part in the voting on the following two recommendations.)

- (c) Accept the recommendation of the “Whole Life Group” to relocate the current services provided at Westminster House to The Gouldings and The Adelaide as its preferred option. Officers are now asked to undertake a 90 day formal consultation with service users, carers, staff and other interested parties on this option.
2. THAT Council agreed to consider the necessary reports, results of consultations and final impact assessments flowing from the decisions at 1 (b) and (c) above at its budget setting Council meeting on 23 February 2011, in order to make any relevant budget decisions to enable the implementation of proposals with full year effect from 1 April 2011, or earlier as considered appropriate. Recommendations to the 23 February 2011 Council meeting, along with any required policy decisions with regard to future implementation, will be agreed at the Cabinet meeting on 8 February 2011.

(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.

Written questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows:

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor John Howe (MQ 19/10)	Could Cabinet Member confirm that the Council made a decision to provide student escorts on all school buses used by primary school children with effect from this academic year?	The Cabinet member advised that the only escorts provided by the Council were for children with special educational needs. Brighstone and Niton Primary schools had received funding this year to provide escorts for the displaced pupils from the closed Chale Primary school attending Brighstone CE and Niton primary schools only.
Councillor Reg Barry (MQ 21/10)	What was the level of the Council's General Reserve, and the total of all Reserves, when the last Conservative run administration took up office	The Cabinet member advised that on 1 April 2005 the Council had a total reserve of £39.535m of which £4.176m related to schools, giving an

Name	Subject	Comment
	and what was it when this Conservative administration took up office?	<p>effective Council total of £35.359m. Of that figure £2.055m was held as a general fund balance.</p> <p>As at the 1 April 2009 the Council had a total of £32.933m of reserves of which £2.688m related to schools, giving an effective Council total of £30.245m of which £11.515m was held an a general fund balance. The general fund balance had gone up from approx £2m to £11.5m.</p> <p>The effective difference over the four years was an overall fall of total reserves £5.114m which could be accounted for by the use of £5m of general fund balances used in 2008/09 to aid the budget strategy in keeping the council tax increase down and maintain services.</p> <p>The general fund balance stood at £11.515m as at 1 April 2009 some £6.515m more than the £5m that the Director of Resources viewed as the required level and some £9.46m more than the 1 April 2005.</p>
Councillor David Knowles (MQ 24/10)	When Cllr Sutton was suspended by the standards committee for six months, you told the media and public that he should resign from the Council. Now I see he's reappeared not just in the Council, but in the conservative group.	The Cabinet Member advised that he had made it clear that following the First Tier Tribunal judgement, which included a six month suspension from office, that Councillor Sutton should himself consider his position as a councillor.

Name	Subject	Comment
	Can you explain to us what has changed to make you think he is now suitable to serve as a member of your group?	Interim measures were put in place to deal with the unavailability of the ward member. Once the period of suspension had been concluded, the sanction applied to him for his breach of the code of conduct, he was able to resume his duties as a councillor.

(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 out to the Cabinet Member as follows :

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor Colin Richards	Clarification in relation to garden grabbing during the planning process.	The Cabinet member advised that decisions were made by the planning committee based on both national planning policy and local guidance.
Councillor David Knowles	As Northwood House was now in the hands of the Trust to run what had happened to the five paintings in the house?	The Cabinet Member advised they had been removed and were in the process of being cleaned.

(iii) [**Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee**](#)

A written report had been circulated for information.

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

A written report had been circulated for information.

A written question was put to the Cabinet Member as follows:

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor Jonathan Bacon (<u>MQ 25/10</u>)	As the consultation was of the utmost importance to the future of various aspects of care provision on the Isle of Wight could the Cabinet member confirm the following:	The Cabinet Member indicated that the consultation period would be over 90 days and that this would give adequate time both for people to make their

Name**Subject****Comment**

- (a) What was the proposed period of the consultation?
- (b) How long would be allowed to assess the representations that would be gathered during the consultation?
- (c) When was it anticipated that a final decision would be made following the consultation?
- (d) That any decision would be made by Full Council, as was originally to be the case tonight, and would not be delegated to a Cabinet Member?

representations and for officers to collate them and produce responses to them for consideration by Full Council. The final decision on the future of Westminster House will be made by Full Council in February 2011.

Please could the Cabinet member also identify those groups and individuals who would be actively consulted and that those groups would include carers and service users at Westminster House as well as carers and service users at The Gouddings and The Adelaide who would potentially be affected by the proposal?

Lastly, would the Cabinet member undertake to ensure that the consultation would deal with all relevant ancillary questions, in particular the accessibility of services and the availability of free or reasonably priced public or bespoke transport provision to staff and service users?"

An oral question was put to the Cabinet member as follows:

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor Geoff Lumley	Would the Cabinet Member recognise the excellent work undertaken by the staff of the Pan Neighbourhood Partnership in delivering the playbuilder ahead of the cutback of the playbuilder programme?	The Cabinet Member congratulated Pan Neighbourhood Partnership.

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

A written report had been circulated for information.

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor John Howe	There was a problem with play equipment due to be delivered to certain areas, could the Cabinet Member clarify?	The Cabinet member advised they were awaiting more details and a full reply would be provided when more information was available.

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

A written report had been circulated for information.

Written questions were put to the Cabinet Member as follows:

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor David Knowles (<u>MQ 23/10</u>)	The increase in street and countryside litter over the summer months and was this due to the black bag kerbside collection (bags are being ripped open by dogs, cats, foxes overnight)? Would he make sure that the new street cleaning contractor had a schedule which tied in with the days of waste collection ie the street cleaners follow the waste collection.	The Cabinet member advised the new street cleaning contract required the contractor to have due regard to the refuse collection days when organising scheduled cleaning days. However, not all roads on the Island had a scheduled clean and, for those that did, the frequency of cleaning was not the same as that of collection. Therefore, whilst the contractor would have due regard to refuse collection days in

Name**Subject****Comment**

as much as a road would not be cleaned on the day before refuse was collected, this did not mean that each road would have a clean scheduled for the same day as collection. It remained the responsibility of the homeowner to ensure that their waste was securely stored prior to collection and not placed at the kerbside earlier than necessary.

Also, can we be assured that there would be no reduction in the schedule of streets to be cleaned by the new contractor?

There were currently no plans to reduce the cleaning frequencies of roads in any areas.

A supplementary question - exactly what role, if any, did Council Officers play in getting Southern Vectis to raise their child fare eligibility up to the age of eighteen?

The Cabinet Member advised the Director of Economy and Environment and the Head of Highways and Transport met the Managing Director and Divisional Director of Go Ahead South Coast on 20 July 2010. That meeting covered a range of issues including the potential for Southern Vectis providing a commercial alternative to Student Rider. It was agreed that would be investigated and the option of extending the half fare scheme was suggested.

The Managing Director of Go Ahead South Coast wrote to the Director of Economy and Environment on 30 July 2010 confirming that they were going to explore providing an alternative to student rider.

Name	Subject	Comment
		Subsequently both the Transport Manager and The Head of Highways and Transport were in touch with Southern Vectis to ascertain whether or not they had been able to formulate an alternative to Student Rider. The increase in age limit for the half fare scheme was confirmed to the Head of Highways and Transport by the Divisional Director for Go Ahead South Coast on the 11 August 2010.

Oral questions were asked of the Cabinet Member as follows:

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor Chris Welsford	The gasification plant remained closed and the Isle of Wight Council was losing money. Were the owners of the plant going to compensate the Council?	The Cabinet Member advised that the cost was being offset by cost sharing arrangements negotiated with Island Waste Services. It was a matter of concern that the Council may not meet their landfill obligations and officers were investigating. The Director of Environment and Economy would be asked to provide more detailed information.
	A supplementary question regarding a problem with recycling food waste.	The Cabinet Member indicated he was not aware of that particular problem and would ask the Director of Environment and Economy for further information.

Name	Subject	Comment
Councillor Vanessa Churchman	2 nd home owners leaving their rubbish out 48 hours in advance of collection days, what was the cost to the Council, what steps were being taken and what sanctions were available?	The Cabinet Member asked that the Councillor let him know where the homes were and officers would investigate. The responsibility was on home owners not to put their rubbish out too early.
Councillor David Pugh	Would the Cabinet Member agree that the commitment made at the July 2010 Council meeting to undertake further work with Southern Vectis to explore options to introduce variations to their concessions to young people was superceded by the early decision by Southern Vectis to make a commercial decision of their own to introduce a varied concession for young people and therefore the Council did not need to undertake that piece of work.	A written response in relation to sanctions would be provided. The Cabinet Member indicated that further work was done by officers.

Due to lack of time the reports for the Cabinet Members for Fire and Community Safety and for Major Projects, Performance and Customer Services were not considered.

CHAIRMAN