

## BRIDGNORTH TOWN COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held in the Mayor's Parlour,  
College House on Tuesday 21st March 2017 at 7.15pm**

Present: The Town Mayor, Councillor Ms V Voysey in the Chair, Councillors Mrs C Baines MBE, Ms S Barlow, D Cooper, G Davies, J Gittins, A Hinton, E Marshall, G Mountcastle, Mrs J Onions, D Seipel, Mrs C Walden, Mrs C Whittle and R Whittle OBE

In Attendance: Town Clerk, Mrs A Wilson  
Thirteen members of the public  
Minutes' Secretary and transcribed by Mrs A Kendrick

The Mayor opened the meeting and advised that following a request from a resident, this meeting was being video recorded. Members were reminded to be polite and courteous and to not speak over one another.

0914/1617 **FIRE SAFETY ANNOUNCEMENT**

The meeting commenced with a fire safety announcement by the Mayor.

0915/1617 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**RESOLVED:** to receive the apology as listed below:

Councillor R Gill	(personal commitment)
Councillor Mrs V Gill	(personal commitment)

0916/1617 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Personal Interest

Councillor Mrs C Baines MBE	Item 21 – Grants Chairman of Crucial Crew
Councillor D Cooper	Item 21 – Grants Treasurer of Crucial Crew
Councillor E Marshall	Item 21 – Grants Member of Bridgnorth & District Historical Society
Councillor D Seipel	Item 21 – Grants Member of Bridgnorth & District Historical Society

Questions from Mr R Richards

1. What was the total cost to Bridgnorth Town Council of public liability insurance for the calendar of Bridgnorth Town Council events for the financial year 2015-16?

Our Public Liability premium for 2015/6 was £1176.46 plus IPT, Total £1247.05

2. What was the total cost to Bridgnorth Town Council of public liability insurance for the calendar of Bridgnorth Town Council events for the financial year 2016-17?

Our Public Liability premium for 2016/7 was £1685.58 plus IPT, Total £1845.71

*In relations to questions 1 and 2 above:*

This part of our premium covers both Public Liability and Officials Indemnity both at a Limit of Indemnity of £12,000,000. It factors in a premium for all our annual events.

The rating has remained unchanged for this section over the last two years in accordance with the current Three Year Long Term Agreement, which is due to expire this year.

3. What are the anticipated costs of insurance for the financial year 2017-18?

This is unknown as the Council has a three year agreement expiring in July 2017. The current insurance company, Zurich, has stated that they should be able to give us an indication of a discounted 2017/8 premium to reflect a further reduction in our current rating structure but they have to consider the claims history over the 3 year period as part of this. As the three year agreement is expiring other insurance companies will also be invited to quote.

Mr Richards stated that the reason for his questions was that the Town Council's certificate of insurance has expired. The Town Clerk stated that Mr Richards must have been given the wrong copy and that he had also been sent a copy of the insurance for 2016/17. Mr Richards stated that the expired insurance certificate could be found on the Town Council website. A current copy would be sent to Mr Richards again if he wished.

Questions from Mr A Tacchi

Mr Tacchi requested a written response to the following questions. This was acknowledged and confirmed by the Town Mayor that written answers would be provided after the meeting.

1. My first question relates to a report compiled by the Town Council Scrutiny Committee, Agenda Item 16 – Appendix H.

Madam Mayor, under what law does the Bridgnorth Town Council have the legal right to libel and humiliate named members of the public in a report by the Scrutiny Committee.

2. Madam Mayor, in the Scrutiny Committee report it is stated that the BRCI (Bridgnorth Retail Crime Initiative) ceased to exist in 2014, are you and your fellow Councillors, including the Scrutiny Committee, aware that in April 2016, 12 members of the BRCI wrote to the Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce and asked that they take over the responsibility of operating the Shop Watch Radio Scheme, and that the Town Council relinquish to the Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce the sum of £5,585.74 that sum was given to the Bridgnorth Town Council in January 2014 on the strict understanding that they would undertake to perform that duty, they failed to do so.

They also stated that they did not want the Town Council to operate a totally different scheme called Face Watch, these letters here, would you like to see them?

At this point in the meeting, a Member questioned who was recording the meeting. The Mayor advised that a written request had been received prior to the meeting and permission granted by the Town Clerk to record; however the members of the public could not be recorded.

The Town Clerk responded to Mr Tacchi and advised that due to the letters containing personal data, it was not appropriate to read these aloud.

3. Madam Mayor, I have here a copy of a letter which was delivered by hand to the Receptionist of Bridgnorth Town Council by the Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce on the 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016 advising that the members of the BRCI have requested the Chamber to take on the operation of Shopwatch, and that Bridgnorth Town Council release the money for this purpose. A reply was subsequently received from your employee, the Town Clerk, refusing this and demanding the details of the Members of the BRCI. Please, could you advise why the Town Council were never advised of the BRCI's wishes in the original letter from the Chamber on behalf of the BRCI and why the Town Council did not authorise the response sent by their Employee?

Mr Tacchi confirmed that a written copy of his questions would be provided. Mr Tacchi was thanked for his questions and it was reiterated that he would receive written answers.

0918/1617 **REPORT FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL**

There was no report from Shropshire Council.

0919/1617 **MINUTES**

- i) The minutes of the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a true record.

0920/1617 **MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

0921/1617 **TOWN MAYOR'S AND DEPUTY MAYOR'S DIARY**

Members noted that the Town Mayor had attended the following since the last Town Council meeting:

Mayor's Diary

- 3<sup>rd</sup> March – Freeman Ceremony
- 3<sup>rd</sup> March – Chair of Wyre Forest District Council's Charity Dinner
- 4<sup>th</sup> March – Mayor of Ludlow's Charity Dinner
- 5<sup>th</sup> March – High Sheriff of Shropshire's Legal Rededication Service
- 7<sup>th</sup> March – Mayor of Bewdley's Charity Dinner
- 17<sup>th</sup> March – Chair of Telford & Wrekin's Charity Dinner
- 18<sup>th</sup> March – Bridgnorth Lion's Annual Charter Dinner
- 19<sup>th</sup> March – Bridgnorth Sinfonia's Recital
- 20<sup>th</sup> March – High Sheriff of Shropshire's Youth Awards

Deputy Mayor's Diary

- Friday 10<sup>th</sup> March – Unveiling of new Community Bus

0922/1617 **MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

The following questions had been received by Councillor E Marshall relating to the Transparency Code.

1. On the Town Council's website, under Policies and Procedures/Policies and Plans, is listed Transparency Code – Adopted May 2015.

In the Transparency Code, Part 2.2 Information to be Published Annually, under section 44, there is specific mention of an organisation chart, and that it was agreed that the Council would publish this information.

This information has not been published. Why not? Can the current organisation chart that exists at the present time, (not any future possible chart), be published?

The Town Mayor stated that Bridgnorth Town Council has always published the Transparency Code through its website and minutes of the Town Council meeting. The 2016 adopted Transparency Code is on the website. Looking at other Town and Parish Council websites this appears not always to be the case. The organisation chart is on the website too.

2. Under section 44 there are seven items listed referring to staff who are paid in excess of £50,000 per year. If there are any Town Council staff paid in excess of £50,000, can this information be published?

Under sections 48 and 49 of the Transparency Code, the Council agreed to publish information about senior salaries over £50,000 per year. No information has been published.

Does the Council employ anyone earning in excess of £50,000 per year?

If so, how many employees, and can the amount being paid be shown in brackets of £5,000 above the £50,000 level, as mentioned in section 48?

If there are employees earning in excess of £50,000, could the Council comply with section 49?

The Town Mayor stated that all Councillors should know what each staff member earns if they are doing their job properly as it is their role to approve the salaries and wages each month.

The Town Mayor advised that this information was published through the end of year accounts but we no longer have to provide that level of detail with the accounts. The Council and residents know that there is one person who earns above £50,000 – this is not a secret in the town. Consideration on how to publish this information will be given.

3. Other information

Is there any other information which the Council agreed should be published, but has not been published? If so, could this be listed, and the information published?

The Mayor advised that consideration of this statement will be given.

Councillor Marshall advised that he had further questions; however the Town Clerk informed Members that Councillor Marshall had been advised by the Mayor that these questions could not be asked at the meeting. Councillor Marshall stated that the Mayor had not advised of this but that it was the Town Clerk who had done so. The Mayor stated that she had requested clarification on the questions and this had not been forthcoming; however she had been asked for other's opinions on a matter and she felt she could not speak on behalf of others.

- i) The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2017 be received and adopted.

- ii) The minutes of the Administration and General Purposes Committee meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 were submitted as circulated and proposed by the Chairman.

The Chairman highlighted the various virements which had been proposed.

The Chairman also brought Members attention to the following recommendation:

**RECOMMENDED:** *that all items be moved from EMR to GR, apart from any monies that have been allocated for a specific purpose or where monies are to be kept to satisfy statutory requirements.*

The Chairman advised that the Town Council had many “pots” within Earmarked Reserves and the proposal would mean that money could be moved without the need for virements.

The proposal to receive and adopt the minutes was seconded.

Councillor D Cooper made an amendment to the proposal.

**PROPOSED** that the proposal for all items be moved from Earmarked Reserves to General Reserves, apart from any monies that have been allocated for a specific purpose or where monies are to be kept to satisfy statutory requirements” not be adopted, and an amended resolution that “The Town Clerk is asked to review the Council’s likely needs for reserves to cover unpredictable and cyclical expenditure over the next 4 years and present the findings to a meeting of the Council following the adoption of the Annual Accounts for 2016/17, and that in the interim the Council’s accounts for the year end 31st March 2017 be prepared on the existing basis (subject to the other virements as agreed at the Administration and General Purposes Committee on 2nd March 2017).

Councillor Cooper explained that the reason for his amendment was that he felt the Council needed to consider carefully a requirement to keep some money earmarked for future large bills (e.g Property repairs), Contingencies, and Cyclical items (e.g. Elections) and thought that the new Council should make the decision about how much it holds in such reserves, not have its hands tied by the current Council.

The Town Clerk spoke to the amendment and advised that the proposal was made against her advice. She then took further advice from the Internal Auditor who stated that the Town Council has done its precept calculations based on the fact that they need to the money they have asked for. If the Town Council were suddenly to put all these reserves back into the general pot, the precepting authority, local residents and auditors have every right to challenge the level of precept requested given that the Council has general reserves (once the earmarked ones are in the general reserve) is not using reserves and it could be construed as overcharging residents as money is available for use.

The Internal Auditor had also said that if the Council had already put money aside for projects they were currently working on e.g. cemetery, properties, play equipment, annexe, civic etc then there would be a big query as to why these projects are ongoing and yet the relevant earmarked reserve spot is being emptied.

Councillor R Whittle OBE responded and stated that his proposal would not mean that the money would disappear and that it would still be available for cyclical repairs or projects which need a large amount of expenditure.

Councillor Cooper's proposal was seconded and a vote was taken on his amendment. A recorded vote had been requested.

For: Councillors Mrs C Baines MBE, D Cooper, J Gittins, G Mountcastle, V Voysey

Against: Councillors G Davies, A Hinton, E Marshall, Mrs J Onions, D Seipel, Mrs C Walden, R Whittle OBE

Abstentions: Councillors Ms S Barlow, Mrs C Whittle

Therefore the motion failed.

A vote was then taken on Councillor R Whittle OBE's proposal.

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Administration and General Purposes Committee meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

For: Councillors G Davies, A Hinton E Marshall, Mrs J Onions, D Seipel, Mrs C Walden, R Whittle OBE

Against: Councillors Mrs C Baines MBE, D Cooper, J Gittins, G Mountcastle

Abstentions: Councillors Ms S Barlow, Ms V Voysey, Mrs C Whittle

- iii) CCTV Committee – minutes of the meeting held on Monday 6th March 2017

Members were advised that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda as the minutes had not yet been agreed.

- iv) The minutes of the Property & Grounds Committee meeting held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 were submitted as circulated.

The Chairman highlighted that detailed discussions had taken place at the meeting regarding the offer from Shropshire Council for the Town Council to take on various responsibilities in the town. Kate Adams and Councillors Lea and Parr had been in attendance. The Town Clerk advised that she was having a further meeting with Kate Adams on Thursday.

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Property & Grounds Committee meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

- v) The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

0924/1617 **MATTERS ARISING FROM COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Councillor Marshall queried the dates of the Planning Meetings as the latest meeting had been rescheduled. The Town Clerk confirmed that there was a Planning Meeting on Monday and that there would be a further meeting on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> March as the meeting had to be adjourned. It was questioned whether Planning meetings would continue throughout Purdah as this committee should be unaffected. The Town Clerk stated that it was hoped that this would be the case but that a conversation needed to take place with the Committee Secretary.

The Town Clerk also advised Members that since the Property and Grounds Meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> March, the owner of the children's roundabout had been contacted to find out if they would be willing to accept the concession of Severn Park for £500 instead of the proposed £300. Committee members were contacted and they had agreed this figure.

0925/1617 **NOTES OF OTHER MEETINGS**

- i) The notes of the Events Working Party/Committee Meeting held on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 were noted.



0926/1617 **SEALING OF DOCUMENTS**

**RESOLVED:** that the Common Seal be affixed to the following documents:

Beech Grove 5  
Oak Grove 182, 182A, 182B and 182H

0927/1617 **FINANCE**

i) Accounts for Payment

Members were asked to authorise the signing of invoices for payment and those invoices paid in between meetings.

Councillor R Whittle OBE raised a number of queries on the accounts for payment. He questioned why the Town Council had four Corporate Cards. The Town Clerk advised that the Town Council had one Corporate Card through Lloyds Bank but that the items listed showed the establishments that the card had been used in. Councillor R Whittle OBE then queried why the Town Council had an Amazon Prime subscription. The Town Clerk said that this was an error made by a member of staff and that the subscription had now been cancelled.

Councillor R Whittle also queried the car parking machine repair costs and the sanitary/nappy bin collections in the Castle Hall. The Town Clerk advised that the repairs to the car parking machines was not covered under the warranty, which had now expired, and was to change the machines to accept the new £1.00 coins. Regarding the sanitary/nappy bin collections, the Town Clerk advised that this was an annual charge and that the Town Council must have the necessary hygiene facilities in its buildings. Councillor R Whittle felt that this cost was unusually high.

Councillor Mrs J Onions questioned the amount of £60.81 for plants in the Castle Grounds, as she visited daily and could not see which plants had been purchased. The Town Clerk would make some enquiries and report back to Councillors Mrs Onions.

**RESOLVED:** that the accounts amounting to £63,742.39 be approved for payment.

ii) Income and Expenditure Report

i) i) Income and Expenditure Report

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the income and expenditure report.

ii) Account Code Report

i) Budget Report

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the account code budget report.

ii) Earmarked Reserves Report

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the account code earmarked reserves report.

iii) Report from Mrs R Williams

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the report from the Mrs R Williams.

iv) Level of Reserves

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the level of the Town Council's reserves of £623,362.

v) Town Council Bank Reconciliation Statement

**RESOLVED:** that Members noted the Town Council Bank Reconciliation Statement.

0928/1617 **LOW TOWN COMMUNITY HALL**

i) Accounts for Payment

**RESOLVED:** that the accounts amounting to £3,013.07 be approved for payment.

ii) Verbal Update regarding Low Town Community Hall

The Town Clerk advised that a meeting of the representatives of the Low Town Community Hall had been scheduled for 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017. The Hall was being well used and was getting increasingly busy.

0929/1617 **SCRUTINY REPORT OF FACEWATCH AND SHOPWATCH**

The Town Mayor felt that she did not need to comment on this item and asked that Members keep conversations civil and keep to the issues raised. The Town Mayor also requested that there was to be no public criticism of the staff.

*Report of the Scrutiny Panel Appointed on 17th January 2017*

*Membership:* Councillor Mrs C Baines, J Gittins and G Mountcastle

Subject: Disposal of monies held by Bridgnorth Town Council as custodians previously managed by Bridgnorth Retail Crime Initiative (BRCI) and its return.

We were appointed at the Town Council meeting on 17th January 2017 to consider the matter of who should receive the monies held in the council's reserves in respect of the former BRCI. The request had been made by Councillor David Cooper formally in writing before the January 17th meeting. The Scrutiny process was adopted at the Town Council meeting of 16th March 2016 to investigate any areas of concern about adherence to procedures identified by members. Membership of the panel is on a random rota which was adhered to.

The Scrutiny panel had hoped to report to the February 21st Town Council meeting but due to matters beyond its control there was a period when the panel had to stop its investigations. This will be explained below.

*BRCI History:*

The BRCI existed from 1999 to 2014. Its main function was to run the Shopwatch/Pubwatch radio based crime alert system linked to shops and businesses.

The organisation in 2013 was run solely by Daniel Wanklin, who was the treasurer, due to other members of BRCI leaving the town. Members of the scheme agreed to hand over the funds to the Town Council and the bank account was closed.

#### Investigation of the Scrutiny Panel

In order to consider the appropriate way forward the panel interviewed Dan Wanklin and PC Stuart Lippett as well as examining the Town Council file on Shopwatch/Pubwatch.

#### Information obtained relevant to the investigation

Up to 2013 the scheme had been in operation but in the last two or three years it became less effective with radios broken and not always turned on. The nature of Bridgnorths geography also meant the communication between Low Town and High Town was difficult.

During 2014 the agencies still interested in operating a crime alert system met with local shops and businesses to discuss relaunching the scheme. This was the Police, Town Council, Bridgnorth Crime Prevention Panel (BCPP) and Shropshire Council with advice from Shrewsbury on a scheme run there. Many meetings were held and a joint letter was sent out asking if shops and businesses wished the scheme to be relaunched. Tenders were received from two providers regarding the relaunch. Unfortunately there was no interest by anyone in taking responsibility for running the scheme as the Police and Town Council were not the appropriate agencies to run it.

*The police in 2015 became aware of a more modern scheme based on smart phones and piloted in Hereford – Facewatch. Some demonstrations of this scheme took place in early 2016.*

*On 12th May 2016 the Town Council received a letter from the Chairman of Bridgnorth Chamber of Commerce requesting the former BRCI monies be transferred to the Chamber of Commerce. There was no written evidence or signature from any members or officers of the BRCI supporting this. The Town Clerk responded to this letter on 7th June 2016 explaining the joint work being undertaken by the police, Town Council, BCPP and Shropshire Council.*

*The Town Council CCTV Committee resolved at its September 2016 meeting that the monies should be returned to the members of the BRCI who contributed during its operation. However, the Chair and Vice Chair disputed the minutes after they had been agreed at the September Town Council meeting. Eight Members of the Council asked for the matter to be reconsidered and the Mayor agreed for this discussion to happen on January 2017. From November 2016 until January 2017 the issue was the subject of much heated discussion between Councillors mainly by email. Parallel with this, members of the public became involved on social media with insulting and unhelpful views and statements of a personal nature clouding the debate.*

*Several Councillors have stated that BRCI still exists and has a bank account, constitution and structure.*

*At our interview on February 8th Dan Wanklin said he had set up a new bank account about three weeks before (around the time of the January 17th Town Council meeting). He had been asked some time before by Councillor Geoff Davies to open an account. He also said that he had been approached by another Councillor on several occasions to take steps to re-establish the BRCI. Councillors David Seipel and Connie Baines had seen the accounts and he had had contact from Councillors Ron Whittle and Sarah Barlow. We felt Dan was in a difficult position as ‘piggy in the middle’ and acknowledged the problems this may cause him.*

*Dan said he had begun calculating the monies paid in by all the agencies since the scheme started in 1999. He had completed the first two years as it was an onerous task. We offered him assistance in undertaking this and he said he would have more time in March and April.*

*PC Stuart Lippett met with us also on February 8th. There had been some dispute between Councillors about what he said at the CCTV Committee regarding BRCI. Stuart said he told the Committee that BRCI was defunct. He said that the recommendation of the police to the Town Council was that the monies should be returned to the businesses, shops and agencies who had contributed. He commented that personally he had found some of the statements made at the CCTV Committee meeting were defamatory and inappropriate.*

*The Town Clerk in January 2017 spoke to the internal auditor to obtain advice on how the former BRCI monies should be dealt with. He advised that returning it to the shops and businesses who contributed was the appropriate way forward. He also felt that the actions of some people could be seen as fraudulent manipulation.*

#### *Delay in investigation*

*On Friday 10th February a letter was delivered to the Town Council with copies for each Councillor purporting to be from Dan Wanklin demanding the transfer of the monies by the next Friday – February 17th or court action would result. A copy of this letter was delivered to Dan at his workplace the same morning.*

*Dan came to the council offices and asked to see the Town Clerk as he had received a copy of the letter. He said he had not written the letter and was shocked that his name, address and name of his workplace were contained in the letter. He had had a meeting with David Seipel, Adrian Tacchi, Steven Robbins and another person (who he did not know) some days before where it was suggested he write a letter regarding the matter.*

*Being made aware of this situation – the letter being sent demanding money be forwarded to an organisation where the person named on the letter did not send it – the panel felt it was a matter that needed to be referred to the police. We did not know who had written and sent the letter. It could be seen as trying to obtain money by deception i.e. theft.*

*The matter was formally reported to the police on February 15th and an interview took place on February 18th. This was the reason for the inability to report in time for February 21st Town Council meeting.*

*The police have decided to take no further action although there is a suggestion of fraud. We were unable to provide any evidence as to who had written and delivered the letter.*

#### *Conclusion*

- 1. In view of the fact we have no information on the alleged new BRCI organisation we consider it is not appropriate to transfer the money to Dan Wanklin, treasurer of the previous body. The Town Council has had no contact with a chairman or officers of the BRCI apart from Dan Wanklin. The only people who have spoken and asserted the organisations existence are David Seipel and Steve Robbins. Dan has said there are no new members and there has been no meetings apart from informal discussions with two Councillors and officers of the Chamber of Commerce. This follows our duty to be responsible for money held by us with due diligence and transparency. This also follows the police recommendation.*
- 2. We recommend that the money is returned to the previous members of the old BRCI in proportion to the money they contributed.*

3. *Dan Wanklin is currently calculating the amounts each organisation has paid in. The total amount to be distributed is £5385.74 as two payments of £100 have been paid out for licences.*
4. *The Town Council does not become involved in any future Shopwatch or Facewatch schemes. Businesses and agencies will be free to use their refund in any way they choose. Businesses can cooperate and develop any scheme or joint ventures they wish.*
5. *Where businesses are no longer in existence e.g Woolworths, attempts are made to inform and return money to the appropriate organisation.*

Organisational and Procedural Matters

1. *The events regarding this issue are unfortunately a very clear example of lack of trust and respect between some Councillors and officers of the council.*
2. *It is clear some Councillors have been involved with BRCI (if it exists) as advocates and representatives without declaring an interest or assisting the Town Council in making an appropriate safe justifiable decision on the transfer of money. A local authority has to make payment to organisations or people who are bona fide and safe.*
3. *Members have a duty to support staff in carrying out their duties and not support non councillors who decide to abuse and insult their staff.*
4. *The Town Clerk has acted professionally and appropriately in dealing with the matter of the previous BRCI monies as had the Locum Town Clerk before her.*

Councillor Mrs C Whittle felt that the report should have clarified what the purpose of the money was for when the money was handed over to the Town Council.

Councillor E Marshall read aloud the following statement:

“Why and how was this Scrutiny Panel set up? At the Council meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017, under the agenda item Shopwatch/Radiowatch/Facewatch, Members were asked to consider a report by the Town Clerk which had been written at the request of the Mayor. In the agenda papers for that meeting was the Town Clerk’s comprehensive 6 page report and at this council meeting, all 16 councillors were present.

But strangely and perversely, the detailed rules and procedures which apply to all Town Council meetings, as clearly set out in Standing Orders, suddenly no longer apply. Standing Orders have been cast aside and in effect ripped up. One councillor, Cllr. Cooper, had assumed absolute power and claimed the right to dictate to Council that that meeting would not make a decision on this particular agenda item. No vote; the views of other councillors did not matter. Democracy has flown out of the window.

I think there are some serious problems with the report.

One concerns naming people. Without being asked, informed or given the opportunity to respond, a number of councillors and members of the public have been named, and in effect accused and shamed. In particular the section headed "Delay in Investigation" is of particular concern as it could be interpreted that 4 people, 3 being named, acted in concert together, in effect a conspiracy, to send a fraudulent letter demanding money. The report itself states that this could be seen as trying to obtain money by deception, i.e. theft. Bridgnorth Town Council should never ever use its unique privileges to attack members of the public who do not have and were never given the opportunity to respond. Clearly this is a significant breach of the Code of Conduct which applies to both councillors and staff. Further, because of the potentially libellous content of the report, the acknowledged authors of this report, and others, and the Council may become involved in legal actions. If this should happen, who will pay any costs associated with any legal action? Hopefully not the Council, as that would mean the residents of the town.

I would like the Mayor and Town Clerk to explain their roles in this matter. Did the Mayor see any problems, express any concerns or ask the Town Clerk for advice? The Town Clerk is the professional person who gives guidance and advice to the Council. Did the Town Clerk review the report, check the content for accuracy and fairness, and most importantly ensure that there were no potential legal issues? Did she raise any concerns or seek advice from other sources?

Finally, I have major concerns about the conclusions, or should I say recommendations; the report is unclear. I do not like the suggestion that the money is returned to the previous members of the old BRCI in proportion to the money they contributed. This is not a sensible practical solution, and is asking the Council to act with the Wisdom of Solomon. Presumably during the period that the scheme was in operation, shops joined or left the scheme, some would late payers, etc. The Panel has identified the problem by naming Woolworths, a store that closed down within a two week period around 1<sup>st</sup> January 2009. The company was officially dissolved on 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2015.

The money and any problems associated with it should be handed over as quickly as possible to someone or some organisation that can deal with this matter in a more effective way than the Town Council. What the Panel has proposed could leave the Council with a problem which would take a very long time to sort out and could be very costly in terms of staff time, correspondence, etc."

The Town Mayor reminded Members that she has specifically asked that there was to be no public criticism of the staff when discussing this item.

The Town Clerk responded, stating that she had not been involved in this process, had not been questioned by the Scrutiny Panel on the matter, and had not seen the report until it had been submitted to go out with the agenda for this meeting. The report was an independent report and the Town Clerk felt that she was owed an apology from Councillor Marshall as he had implied that she had not done her job properly. The Town Mayor stated that the Town Clerk had been subject to public accusations about this matter and felt that the Town Clerk did the most sensible thing in not becoming involved.

The Mayor stated that it was Members duty to protect the Town Clerk as their employee and requested that no further comments were made about the staff in relation to this report.

Councillor J Gittins stated that on behalf of the Scrutiny Panel, he would like it to be minuted that the Town Clerk had no input into the production of this report.

Councillor G Davies was shocked to see that his name featured in the report and that by the staff circulating this report through the Mayor, he felt that they had no confidence in him for being an honest person. The Mayor and Town Clerk responded and stated that they had nothing to do with the production of the report. Councillor G Davies then questioned why the report was put on social media. The Town Clerk reminded Members that the Council commissioned this report and Councillors knew that the findings may not be what they wanted to hear. The report was like a public interest report to check that the Council had been acting legally. The Town Mayor stated that at no time had she questioned Councillor Davies' honesty. She stated that it was a difficult situation and questioned how it was possible to discuss this in confidential session when the matter has been discussed previously in open session for openness and transparency. Councillor Davies acknowledged the Mayor's predicament but could also see his own. It was felt by Members of the Scrutiny Panel that the report had been taken out of context.

Councillor Ms S Barlow agreed that certain parts of the report had been taken out of context and that residents had taken extracts of the report published on certain social media sites and read them in a different way than intended. She was concerned that this report had been put on the Town Council website before she had read it and received notification of its publication through external parties.

Councillor Ms S Barlow then read aloud the following statement:

"As stated in Standing Orders 30b and 30c we should only be stating our personal views on such sites, unfortunately members of the public seem unable to separate the personal view from the councillor view.



"I abstained from voting on item 0709/1617 Shopwatch/Radiowatch because the final proposal talked about a letter of apology to the Locum Town Clerk and in my view this was not relevant to the original point of discussion.

I was mentioned in the scrutiny panel report as someone who had visited Mr Wanklin. I visited his place of work to establish some facts from him regarding the Shopwatch scheme, I was hoping to be able to give a more educated vote on the subject at the next Town Council meeting. Mr Wanklin was unavailable but I left a message that he could contact me, he did not.

I do support transparency and having a scrutiny panel BUT I am concerned at the length of time it takes to resolve some issues. In the meantime, bits of information get misinterpreted."

Councillor Mrs C Whittle raised concerns that the original letter regarding the Shopwatch scheme had only been sent to Councillors; however a photograph of this letter had appeared on social media and this included personal details, including names, addresses and bank account details. It was proposed that a letter of apology be sent to Mr Wanklin as Councillor Mrs Whittle felt that no-one should have been named, especially when they were not contacted to see what their involvement was.

The Mayor stated that if the post on social media containing this information was still available, she would ask for it to be taken down as it was not appropriate. Councillor J Gittins then questioned how Councillor Mrs Whittle knew that the letter had only been sent to Councillors as a copy had also been put through a shop's door.

The Town Clerk advised that she had spoken to Mr Wanklin to reassure him but that to date, he had not received any further visitors or correspondence regarding the matter, except for two Councillors. The Mayor requested that he is now left alone as he is the innocent party.

Councillor D Cooper then read the following statement:

"I've been accused of subverting the democratic process and all sorts of things. I made the decision to refer the handling of the Shopwatch money to the scrutiny panel over the weekend of 7th/ 8th January and submitted my requisition first thing on the Monday morning (9th). At that stage it was a fairly simple matter of the Council having resolved in September to pay the money back to the businesses which provided it, but Councillors were making various conflicting claims in emails, disagreeing with the information which the staff had and sometimes also with each other. Thus, there was not a solid basis of factual, documented and undisputed information on which to pay the money out with a clear conscience. This situation had been exacerbated by some quite extraordinary posts on social media shortly after Christmas. I saw it as a relatively simple matter when I made the referral, it was just a way of resolving a dispute about appropriate procedures without having the kind of protracted debates we have had over some other matters in the past. This situation did have the potential to be fraudulent if misrepresentations were made about who

was actually receiving the money or for what purpose, and it is our responsibility as Councillors to put in place reasonable preventative measures by making sure we have sound procedures in place. Subsequently, a member submitted a requisition, signed by 8 Councillors to discuss the matter of whom the Shopwatch moneys should be paid to over again. This alleged that the historical minutes were inaccurate and proposed that the Council should make a payment to BRCI without enquiring into the details of its membership. However, since my request had already been submitted it took precedence over that requisition and there would have been no point in attempting to take a decision unless we were sure of what the procedural requirements are. I am firmly of the view that it would be very unwise of the Council to make a payment to an organization without knowing, and having documentation for, what that organization is and what its plans for the money are.”

Resident Mr A Tacchi stated that he had letters proving the existence of the BRCI. Neither the Town Mayor or Town Clerk were aware of these letters. The public were reminded that heckling was not permitted.

Councillor Mrs C Walden questioned when the Town Clerk had spoken to the Internal Auditors as Members had previously been informed that advice had been sought on this matter. The Town Clerk advised that the statement which she had read from the Internal Auditor had included a concern about fraudulent manoeuvring but that the Mayor and Town Clerk had omitted this from what had been reported to Members. The Town Mayor stated that the only people who had seen this statement were herself and the Town Clerk in an email from the Town Clerk to the Mayor following a conversation with the internal auditor at the request of the Mayor. It had been omitted as it was felt that this could be open to innuendo.

Councillor Mrs C Walden also asked for the statement from PC S Lippitt to be put in writing to clarify exactly what he had said regarding this matter.

Councillor Mrs C Whittle felt that it would have been better to have been kept informed of any issues surrounding Shopwatch/Radiowatch/Facewatch as she had previously requested an agenda item for it to be discussed, but had been told that it was nothing to do with the Town Council. She stated that Members had been prevented from discussing it until January.

Councillor Mrs C Baines MBE then read aloud the following statement:

“I would like to make a comment on my involvement in the Scrutiny Panel; by the way none of this is hearsay, it is fact.

At all times, only three of us have been involved in our deliberations. I’m sorry if you don’t like our comments, and that persons have been named (including myself) but as often stated, the truth hurts and what you have is *our* report which is a culmination of *our* enquiries not shaped by any other Councillors.

An email has been received from Councillor Whittle threatening libel action unless his name is removed. I would like to make it clear that the only reference to him was that he contacted Mr Wanklin. Comments in the report that have been made by the Police and Auditors these are *their* comments.

Our main priority was to give the public an honest and truthful report, that is what you have got and to make recommendations to the Council as to an appropriate way forward and the question of money being resolved and returned to the people who paid it in?

This, as stated previously, was our *main* priority and I believe we have achieved that with no hidden agenda as has been suggested.”

Councillor R Whittle OBE stated that he did not condone or support deception but felt disgusted by the report and thought that it was blatant electioneering. He also felt that his reputation and integrity had been called into question. He requested confirmation from the panel that he had not been interviewed as part of the scrutiny process and had not taken part in any illegal activity and that if this was not forthcoming, he would be taking legal action following the meeting. He then made two proposals; the first was that the Council rejects the findings of the Scrutiny Panel, and secondly, that the funds are immediately transferred to the BRCI account as he had received confirmation from Mr Wanklin that this was acceptable.

Councillor J Gittins advised that the Council had now been provided with a list of all of the businesses which had paid money into the scheme.

The Town Mayor raised her concerns regarding the reputation on an individual business man and that it seemed no-one else was concerned about this, just their own reputation. She felt that the Council should focus on what to do to get out of this mess.

Councillor Mrs C Baines MBE clarified that there was never any suggestion in the report that anyone who was named had been involved in fraudulent activity. However, Councillor Ms S Barlow felt that people had taken snippets of the report and they had then been misinterpreted and taken out of context.

Councillor R Whittle OBE reminded the Mayor that he had made two proposals. The Mayor responded and stated that the first proposal would not get the Council anywhere. Councillor D Cooper raised a Point of Order and stated that the Council had already agreed how to deal with this matter in September 2016 and that the Council were now going round in circles. He stated that Members were still within the six month period of when the matter was last discussed and therefore it could not be discussed again.

Councillor A Hinton questioned why the money could not be paid back to the BRCI. The Town Clerk informed Members that she had been advised that there were no officers at the current time and that Mr Wanklin was the sole signatory on the account. The Town Council would be failing in their duty if they paid money to an individual. Councillor J Gittins stated that PC S Lippitt had

previously advised Members that BRCI was no longer operating and had then confirmed this again to the Mayor and Councillor Gittins. Councillor Mrs J Onions disputed that PC Lippitt had said this in a meeting as in her time on the CCTV Committee, she had only met him once and he only spoke about Facewatch.

The Mayor reminded Members once more that the meeting was being recorded and therefore rude comments should not be made as it gives a poor impression to the public.

Councillor G Mountcastle stated that the report reflects the facts which had been provided to the panel. He felt that the Council should be ashamed of their terrible double standards in expressing concern about naming people in a report, but allowing abuse of the Town Clerk on social media. It was the Council's duty as an employer to protect her. Councillor Mrs C Whittle reminded Members that she had previously condemned abuse of anyone on social media but that people should not get involved in posts on certain sites. She stated that when the BRCI ceased operation, the money was given to the Town Council for a Radiowatch/Shopwatch scheme. Two licences for the radios were then bought and therefore Councillor Mrs C Whittle felt that this must have been up and running. The Town Clerk responded and advised that the Town Council had been trying to get the scheme up and running for a number of years working alongside the Police and the Crime Prevention Panel.

The Town Clerk advised Members that she had recently had a horrendous time on social media. As soon as the report was circulated, the remarks started again and very few people stand up to defend her. She advised that she would take action at the appropriate time. The Town Clerk also reminded Members that she had done nothing wrong with the money and that it had been sat in a bank account and not used for anything else, as had been suggested by certain individuals.

Councillor J Gittins advised Members that at a CCTV Meeting, Members had been advised that a Radiowatch scheme would not work due to the radius in which the Police now have to work in. They would not be able to respond to a call as the area PC S Lippitt covers is approximately 60 miles. Facewatch is available to anyone anywhere.

The Mayor proposed that Members move on from this item and that the Town Clerk is left alone to work with Mr Wanklin to resolve the matter. The Town Clerk advised that she had a complete list of people who paid money into the scheme.

0930/1617 **LOCAL PLAN REVIEW**

Members were asked to note a response had been formulated by a small working party and sent in response to the review of the Local Plan. Two meetings were held with our neighbouring parishes, one of which Adrian Cooper, from Shropshire Council also attended.

Councillor D Cooper and the Town Clerk were thanked for responding in such a short time.

Members were advised that this was the first stage of consultation to decide where 25,000 houses and employment land is to be provided. It was felt that Shropshire Council should recognise local needs and the ability of the infrastructure to cope with any new developments.

Councillor R Whittle OBE raised his concerns regarding how much emphasis was put on affordable housing in the response, as he had been informed that approximately £50,000 is added to other houses in the development.

Councillor E Marshall felt that the response may not be considered seriously as there was no critique as everything was classed as "very important". The Town Clerk advised that the responses were discussed at length.

## 0931/1617 **MOTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

Members were asked to consider the motions below from Councillor Edward Marshall:

- i) That the Scrutiny Process, adopted by the Town Council in Confidential Session on the 15th March 2015, be rescinded with immediate effect.

Councillor Marshall read the following statement:

"The proposal to establish a Scrutiny Process was discussed and adopted, in Confidential Session at the Council meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2016. Why in Confidential? This is supposed to be an open and transparent Council. There was absolutely nothing at that time that merited this item being discussed in Confidential. Two councillors, Cllr. Davies and I, asked for our votes against to be recorded.

As I have carefully explained in Appendix J, when compared to the much larger size of many principal councils like Shropshire Council with its 74 councillors, Bridgnorth Town Council is a smaller parish council with just 16 councillors, and does not devolve decision making to a few councillors in some form of cabinet. Therefore there is no primary need to set up a scrutiny system.

Under normal circumstances, any Member of this Council should have the right to ask for an item to go on a Council agenda and thereby to be debated, including areas of concern about adherence to procedures or processes. If Councillors should think it would be appropriate, they can propose the setting up of a Task & Finish Group or Working Party, and agree its membership. I should clarify one aspect of what I have just said; in my opinion any Member should have the right to ask for an agenda item. I believe that at a recent Council meeting, at least two councillors did not agree with me that councillors should have this right.

The Scrutiny Process itself is presumably supposed to be secret. Any Member can make a referral to the Scrutiny Panel, with the Town Clerk and the Mayor/Deputy Mayor advised of the referral on a confidential basis. But at any one time would the Scrutiny Panel consist of appropriate councillors with the appropriate skills and no bias to hear a particular matter? Who decides if one or more members of the Scrutiny Panel should not be involved?

I intensely dislike all this secrecy. I am a firm believer in openness and transparency in all council matters, and whenever it has been appropriate and I have been able to do something about it, I have always made information available. So I was very surprised to be informed that my name has appeared on Face book, and in a negative way, in relation to this matter. Why am I, the biggest champion of openness on this Council being accused of wanting secrecy, whilst others who frequently seem to favour secrecy, are being praised? There is currently an in word to describe this phenomenon - fake news. This scrutiny process has been activated only once, and the results discussed earlier in this meeting. On that occasion, almost every aspect of the scrutiny process had been broken, and the end result disastrous.

The application by Cllr. Cooper was a deliberate act to interfere with a matter being debating at a properly convened Council meeting, and intended to prevent a decision being made by all 16 councillors present at that meeting. It was not a retrospective review of processes or procedure. It was not done confidentially. It was not done in a competent manner. The work was not kept confidential. The investigation was not done in a timely manner.

Clearly this Scrutiny Process is not fit for purpose. It should be rescinded with immediate effect.

I ask for a recorded vote.”

Councillor D Cooper responded with the following statement:

“I originally proposed the introduction of the scrutiny process, and I’d like to explain why. Historically, the Council has a history of disputes between members, and sometimes between members and staff, about whether the Council has followed appropriate procedures or followed them correctly. These disputes have been carried on principally through email correspondence, and have in the past got quite heated leading to bad working relationships. Often there have been dozens of emails circulated about items in dispute, involve various members wading in on one side or the other. Essentially, there was no provision for a referee to be called in or means of bringing differences of opinion to an end. This matter was considered in the confidential session of a meeting, as part of a range of measures to address the issue of poor working relationships between Councillors, and between Councillors and staff. The solution to dealing with disputes about procedures is a

very simple one. If the issue isn't resolved between the parties fairly quickly, any Councillor can step in and ask a panel of 3 Councillors to look at the issue and make a report. The members of the panel serve for 3 months at a time, and are chosen by the drawing of lots at the adjourned annual meeting. The referral of the protracted issue about the Shopwatch money, which had been going on for several months, was the first such use of this procedure. It was not intended to prevent a decision being taken, but rather to ensure that there is a sound basis on which to take a decision."

A vote was taken on the motion.

For: Councillors G Davies, A Hinton, E Marshall,  
Mrs J Onions, D Seipel, Mrs C Walden,  
Mrs C Whittle, R Whittle OBE

Against: Councillors Mrs C Baines MBE, Ms S Barlow,  
D Cooper, J Gittins, G Mountcastle, Ms V Voysey

**RESOLVED:** that the Scrutiny Process, adopted by the Town Council in Confidential Session on the 15th March 2015, be rescinded with immediate effect.

- ii) That Bridgnorth Town Council submits a request to Shropshire Council to conduct a Community Governance Review to examine merging the parishes of Bridgnorth and Tasley and to give consideration to other changes to the boundaries of Bridgnorth that would enhance local government in the immediate area.

Members raised concerns that as the Council were now in Purdah, they could be accused of electioneering.

It was proposed that this item be deferred for at least six months as it would be wrong to pre-empt the views of the new Council.

It was then agreed that this item be moved to the Adjourned Annual meeting in May.

At this point in the meeting, it was agreed that Item 21 – Grant Applications be brought forward to this point.

## 0932/1617 **GRANT APPLICATIONS**

Councillors E Marshall and D Seipel left the room for this item.

Members were asked to consider the synopsis of grant applications received from 2017/18.

**RESOLVED:** that the following grants be given for 2017/18:

- Bridgnorth Junior Netball Club - £400
- Llangollen International Musical Eisteddfod – Nil
- Bridgnorth Musical Theatre Co - £350
- Headcase Cancer Trust – Nil
- St James Dancing Club - £150
- Bridgnorth Community Cars - £150
- Ray Hulse - £50
- Dry Bar Trust - £400
- Bridgnorth Old People's Welfare and Good Neighbours Scheme - £350
- Bridgnorth Music & Arts Festival - £400
- Bridgnorth & District Historical Society - £275
- Shropshire Handball Foundry - £350
- Bridgnorth Jazz Festival - £250
- Bridgnorth & South Shropshire Crucial Crew - £400
- Bridgnorth Severn District Girlguiding - £400
- Bridgnorth 55+ Club - £250

Councillors E Marshall and D Seipel re-joined the meeting.

0933/1617 **CCTV**

Members were asked to consider the findings regarding how CCTV was run in other towns.

It was agreed that this item would be deferred to the Adjourned Annual Meeting held in May.

0934/1617 **SEVERN PARK LOCKING UP 2017**

Following a recommendation by Council members that the Severn Park security gates remain open at night for a trial period, the Outdoors and Properties Manager, after consultation with the DLF staff, had raised a concern over this item and respectfully reminded members of why the gates were locked in the first place. The decision to secure Severn Park at night was a result of an escalating trend of anti-social behaviour including; underage drinking, drug taking, setting fire to benches, vandalism of the toilets and damaging driving practices to name but a few.

While it would appear that leaving the top gate open during the winter months to benefit the Rugby Clubs training sessions has passed without incident and therefore can be seen as a success. There is little confidence shared, that this will be the case when it becomes common knowledge that the whole park will remain open during the longer, warmer nights, when anti-social behaviour becomes more prevalent.

The Outdoors and Properties Manager felt that Members may well decide to continue with the trial period throughout the summer months and hope that nothing happens, or may wish to review it again if, and when, the anti-social activity reoccurs.



A compromise should any incidents occur in the lower half of the park might be to continue the trial whereby, only the stone car park remains open, and the lower gate onto the grassed areas is locked as per the opening times stated on the car park notice boards; 1st April – 30 September 7.30am to 8.30pm. This would prevent the more damaging activity of joy riding. It would however require someone to lock the lower gate at 8.30pm. At the moment this is being done by a private security company at a cost £2,379 plus VAT. An alternative to this and for the same trial period may be to include this duty as part of the out of hour's additional payment package and could be written, so as to include this duty from the onset. If this option is successful then there would be a saving of £2,379. However, if there are incidents that our staff are unable to deal with, then we may have to revert back to paid security, but at least we would have exhausted all other options first.

The Town Clerk advised that she was in the process of putting together an amended out of hours package for our staff.

The Town Clerk also informed Members that she had been asked to obtain a quotation for CCTV in Severn Park but a figure of £18,000 had been quoted and unfortunately, there was no grant funding available for this.

It was proposed that the Town Council continues with the current arrangements for three months and review this towards the summer months. Other suggestions were then received for differing timescales.

**RESOLVED:** that the Town Council continues to leave Severn Park unlocked for three months and review this towards the summer months.

0935/1617 **LEADERSHIP IN ACTION SEMINAR**

**RESOLVED:** that the Town Clerk attends the Leadership in Action seminar due to be held on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> June 2017 at a cost of £310.00 + VAT.

0936/1617 **CORRESPONDENCE FROM SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL**

i) Economic Growth Strategy

The Town Clerk felt that it was an incomprehensible document and that Town and Parish Councils are a long way down the pecking order. Shropshire Council did not seem interested that their consultation period fell within Purdah.

It was stated that Members would like to see Shropshire Council engaging at a local level.

0937/1617 **CONFERENCE/MEETING UPDATES**

Members noted the following reports received since the last meeting:

From the Town Clerk

- i) Society of Local Council Clerks Practitioners Conference held on 23-24<sup>th</sup> February 2017

Members noted the report.

From Councillors

- i) Report from the AGM of the Bridgnorth & District Historical Society from Councillor E Marshall

Members noted the report.

From Outside Bodies

- i) Notes of the Meeting with the Churches Conservation Trust held on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> February 2017

Members noted that notes.

0938/1617 **PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISSIONS TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960**

**RESOLVED:** in terms of Schedule 12A, Local Government Act 1972, the following items will be likely to disclose exempt information relating to establishment and contractual matters and it is, therefore, **RESOLVED** that pursuant to the provisions of the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 the public and press be excluded.

0939/1617 **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

- i) The confidential minutes of the Extraordinary (Budget) Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the confidential minutes of the Extraordinary (Budget) Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a true record.

- ii) The confidential minutes of the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the confidential minutes of the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a true record.

0940/1617 **MATTERS ARISING**

- i) Updates from the Extraordinary Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017 that are not included elsewhere on the agenda.

There were no updates.

- ii) Updates from the Meeting of Bridgnorth Town Council held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 that are not included elsewhere on the agenda.

There were no updates.

0941/1617 **CONFIDENTIAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

Members were asked to approve confidential minutes and confirm the recommendations contained therein.

- i) The confidential minutes of the Administration and General Purposes meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the confidential minutes of the Administration and General Purposes Committee meeting held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

- ii) The confidential minutes of the Property and Grounds Committee held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the confidential minutes of the Property and Grounds Committee meeting held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

- iii) The confidential minutes Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017 were submitted as circulated.

**RESOLVED:** that the confidential minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017 be received and adopted.

0942/1617 **MATTERS ARISING FROM CONFIDENTIAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

There were no matters arising from confidential committee minutes.

The meeting closed at 9.30 p.m.