



# Cabinet

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Monday, 23 February 2009</b>
<b>Time:</b>	<b>6.15 pm</b>
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Committee Room 1 - Wallasey Town Hall</b>

**Contact Officer:** Andrea Grant  
**Tel:** 0151 691 8559  
**e-mail:** [andreagrant@wirral.gov.uk](mailto:andreagrant@wirral.gov.uk)  
**Website:** <http://www.wirral.gov.uk>

---

## AGENDA

### 1. MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting have been printed and published. Any matters called in will be reported at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: That the minutes be approved and adopted.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The members of the Cabinet are invited to consider whether they have a personal or prejudicial interest in connection with any of the items on this agenda and, if so, to declare it and state the nature of such interest.

## STREETSCENE AND TRANSPORT SERVICES

### 3. PROVISION OF SCHOOL CROSSING PATROLS - POLICY REVIEW (Pages 1 - 8)

## FINANCE AND BEST VALUE

### 4. CONSULTATION WITH NON-DOMESTIC RATEPAYERS (Pages 9 - 10)

### 5. BUDGET 2009-10 (To Follow)

### 6. SCHOOLS BUDGET

The details of the Schools Budget will be included in the report under item 5.

**7. BUDGET COUNCIL PROCEDURE (Pages 11 - 16)**

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

To consider any other business that the Chair accepts as being urgent.

WIRRAL COUNCIL

CABINET – 23<sup>RD</sup> FEBRUARY 2009

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

## **PROVISION OF SCHOOL CROSSING PATROLS – POLICY REVIEW**

### **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Further to the Notice of Motion approved by Council on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2008, this report proposes a new policy for the provision of School Crossing Patrols for Cabinet approval.
- 1.2 Taking account of the new policy, this report also recommends that a number of the School Crossing Patrol sites planned for dis-establishment on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 should now be retained. It also confirms that a number of sites be dis-established.

### **2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 To date, Wirral Council have provided School Crossing Patrols under the broad national guidelines issued by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (ROSPA) and the then County Road Safety Officers' Association (CRSOA).
- 2.2 The formula based criteria published in 1994, provides a measure of both the potential conflict and delay experienced by pedestrians as they attempt to cross the road. It accounts for the need to assist small numbers of pedestrians to cross roads when traffic flows are heavy, and conversely where traffic flow is light but there are significant numbers of pedestrians. The criteria also recognises that it would be impractical to provide a School Crossing Patrol (SCP) at locations with very low numbers of pedestrians wishing to cross and established that a minimum of 15 pedestrians in the busiest half an hour be necessary.
- 2.3 The formula was that a minimum of 15 children cross and that a "PV squared" figure of  $4.0 \times 10^6$  is achieved or exceeded where "P" relates to the number of pedestrians and "V" relates to the number of vehicles, i.e.  $PV^2 \geq 4 \times 10^6$ .
- 2.4 This empirical criteria is however not a national requirement but represents good practice, and has been adopted by many Highway Authorities throughout the country. Once established, there are no ongoing requirements to routinely measure sites against the criteria.
- 2.5 At Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2008, a budget saving option was proposed to dis-establish 18 SCP sites that fail to meet the above criteria. This proposal was subsequently considered by the Streetscene and Transportation Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2008 and approved by Cabinet on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2008.

2.6 In the meantime, officers have been in consultation with schools affected to discuss other options available to them including schools paying for their own patrols, providing voluntary staff that can be trained by the Council and further development of School Travel Plans.

2.7 At Council on 15<sup>th</sup> December, the following Notice of Motion was approved (Minute 89 refers):

- (1) *This Council recognises and applauds the invaluable work carried out by school crossing patrols, and which they continue to do so, to keep our primary school children safe from accidents and death when crossing the road outside schools.*
- (2) *This Council recognises that the criteria for deciding whether to provide a school crossing patrol are advisory only.*
- (3) *Council believes that school budgets should be spent on services within schools' responsibilities, including supporting School Travel Plans.*
- (4) *Council urges that a regular process of updating risk assessments of all the current and future crossing patrols should be in place, the presumption being that sites should continue to be provided unless there has been a change of circumstances in the area (such as the closure of a school removing the need, or if there is a Pelican or Puffin crossing at that site or nearby) or that the risk assessment identifies sufficient changes to warrant a review and possible discontinuation after full discussion and examination with the school(s) concerned. Risk assessments shall pay due regard to the existing ROSPA guidelines and also to issues such as road gradient, layout, traffic flows, speeding and congestion. The same criteria should be used for assessing applications for new crossing patrols.*
- (5) *Officers be requested to develop a policy incorporating all the points raised in (4) above and present a report to the Cabinet within the next six months.*

The proposed policy in response to this Notice of Motion is set out in this report.

### **3.0 PROPOSED POLICY FOR THE PROVISION OF SCHOOL CROSSING PATROLS**

3.1 I consider the generic formula based criteria recommended by RoSPA and CROSA is essentially sound however, following the resolution of Council (Minute 89) in December 2008 a revised "Wirral based criteria" for both existing and new school crossing patrol sites has now been developed. I consider that the threshold level for the relationship between vehicles (squared) and child pedestrians should be raised to  $5 \times 10^6$  but that additional weighting factors be applied to take into account the following site specific issues:

	Site Condition/Consideration:	Comment:
1	Road Width	Roads of significant width (> 7.3m) gaining additional weighting.
2	Footway Width	Narrow footways (less than 2m) gaining additional weighting.
3	Gradient of Highway	Steeper gradients (more than 5%) gaining additional score. Sites with > 12% have additional weighting.
4	Complex Road Markings	Areas of significant additional complexity such as hatched areas or turning lanes.
5	Proximity Of Site To Junctions	Weighting factors given to sites operating in a minor road adjacent to a major road or in a major road adjacent to a minor road.
6	Street Lighting Presence & Type	This factor linked to significant vehicle speed. No weighting applied for 85%ile < 40mph.
7	Visibility of Site	Weighting given (based on 85%ile speed) to intervisibility distance of children on footway waiting to cross and drivers. Greater speeds and shorter distances gaining additional weighting.
8	Accident Record	Number of recorded pedestrian injury accidents during last 3 years.
9	Vehicle Speed	Weighting given progressively to 85%ile speeds over 30mph.
10	Number of Adults Crossing	Weighting progressively given (in bands) where significant numbers of adults cross at site – based on survey.
11	Record of “Drive Through” Events	Significant additional weighting given to recorded instances of existing patrol sites having drivers fail to stop whilst the patrol is in the road with Stop sign.
12	Site Difficulty	Experienced SCP Supervisor/Road Safety Officer assessment of overall complexity for pedestrians (especially children) to cross the road within the vicinity of the site.
13	Existing Facilities	Weighting factors will be negatively adjusted if there are existing formal facilities at the site which assist pedestrians to cross. For example, traffic lights with pedestrian facilities, Puffin/Pelican/Zebra crossings, and refuge islands.
14	Walking Bus	Weighting given to sites which support regular walking bus route

- 3.2 Weightings would then be applied to the original PV<sup>2</sup> results which are obtained under survey, and the necessary adjustments made. To qualify, sites would still need to meet a minimum of 15 children crossing and have an adjusted PV<sup>2</sup>  $\geq 5 \times 10^6$ .
- 3.3 Dual Carriageway sites (and others such as complex junctions) which require the provision of two SCP staff to effectively operate the crossing will need to satisfy this criteria for each of the carriageways crossed.
- 3.4 Although the original national guidance did not take into account any need to re-survey or undertake ongoing risk assessments of existing sites, it is proposed that in addition to the regular site supervision and dynamic risk assessments already undertaken each term by Officers, each site will be fully re-evaluated within a rolling three year programme commencing 2010/11 onwards.
- 3.5 Whilst it is reasonable to expect that any school crossing site is regularly used on any given day and fully meets the minimum criteria (including new weighting factors), it is further proposed that assessments for either existing or requests for new patrol sites will be undertaken on two separate typical days in Spring/Summer and Autumn Terms with the greatest flows being utilised against the criteria.
- 3.6 Where the criteria is met, it is proposed that the establishment of new sites is delegated to the Director of Technical Services to provide the service from within existing budget constraints.
- 3.7 In the event that it is proposed that a site is to be dis-established (for example, if there has been a significant environmental change such as the closure of a nearby school), it is proposed that the dis-establishment process is delegated to the Director of Technical Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

#### **4.0 REVIEW OF SITES TO BE DIS-ESTABLISHED**

- 4.1 There are currently 18 SCP sites to be dis-established on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 because they were assessed and failed to meet the original basic criteria simply based on "PV squared" and a minimum number of 15 children.
- 4.2 Officers have recently assessed these sites again and considered how the proposed new policy set out in the previous section (3.0) would apply to them.
- 4.3 Of the 18 sites, 7 have been assessed as meeting the new policy criteria set out in this report and it is recommended that Cabinet approve the continued provision of a School Crossing Patrol at these locations. These sites are:
  - Eastham Rake (nr Glenburn Avenue)
  - Holm Lane (nr Overton Way)
  - Poulton Road / Park Road
  - Rocky Lane / Dee View Road
  - Thurstaston Road / Herberts Lane

- Well Lane / Albany Road
- Withens Lane

4.4 A summary of the assessment for all 18 sites is shown in Appendix A, which also identifies those sites which are still recommended for dis-establishment.

4.5 It is noted that in relation to the Houghton Road/ Glebe Hey Road site, the school concerned is due to close at the end of the summer term. Taking this into account, it is suggested that an SCP should continue to be provided at this point for the final term until closure of the school.

## **5.0 CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS**

5.1 A summary of the outstanding Petitions received in relation to the provision and dis-establishment of School Crossing Patrols is shown in Appendix B. This table highlights that only one Petition will not be fully or in part addressed by the recommendations in this report. Even so, this site on New Hey Road is within an existing traffic calming area and minor engineering improvements may be possible as part of the Safer Routes To School programme.

## **6.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The displaced School Crossing Patrol personnel will have the opportunity to be re-deployed to sites where currently no permanent School Crossing Patrol is in post. Approximately 12 sites are not permanently staffed. Ultimately, any outstanding displaced personnel will be placed on the Council's redeployment list.

## **7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 The proposed reinstatement of the 7 SCP sites outlined in section 4.0 will result in a shortfall in the School Crossing Patrol Revenue budget of £20,000 for 2009/10 onwards.

7.2 It is proposed that the continuation of the service at Houghton Road/Glebe Hey Road for the summer term can be funded from the existing Revenue budget.

## **8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **9.0 PLANNING IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **10.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **11.0 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **12.0 LOCAL AGENDA 21 IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **13.0 SOCIAL INCLUSION IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 There are no direct implications under this heading.

## **14.0 ANTI-POVERTY IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 There are no specific anti-poverty implications arising directly from this report.

## **15.0 ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT**

16.0 Individual site risk assessments have been used in the preparation of this report.

## **17.0 LOCAL MEMBER SUPPORT IMPLICATIONS**

17.1 This report contains a new policy for the provision of School Crossing Patrols on a borough-wide basis and therefore has implications for all Ward Members.

## **18.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

That

- (1) the policy for the provision of School Crossing Patrols outlined in section 3.0 be approved;
- (2) the continued provision of a School Crossing Patrol at the seven sites outlined in section 4.0 from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009 be approved on the basis that they comply with the new policy;
- (3) an increase in the School Crossing Patrol Revenue budget of £20,000 from 2009/10 onwards be approved to fund the reinstatement of the seven sites in (2);
- (4) the continued provision of a School Crossing Patrol at the Houghton Road/Glebe Hey Road site for the final summer term be approved as suggested in section 4.5;
- (5) the Petitions summarised in section 5.0 be noted and the Director of Technical Services be instructed to write to all Petitioners advising them of the outcome of this report.

**DAVID GREEN, DIRECTOR  
TECHNICAL SERVICES**

## School Crossing Sites Identified for Disestablishment

Patrol Site	Original PV <sup>2</sup>	Total Adjustment Multiplier	New PV <sup>2</sup> inclusive of adjustment factors	Recommendation	Alternative Options	Likely Outcome
Bidston Village Road / Hoylake Road; <i>Bidston &amp; St.James</i>	1.6308	1.464	2.3875	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	Traffic lights with pedestrian facilities exist at site	Site to be disestablished
Chapelhill Road Road; <i>Leasowe &amp; Moreton East</i>	0.4774	1.331	0.6355	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	None available	Site to be disestablished
Corporation Road / Lincoln Street; <i>Birkenhead &amp; Tranmere</i>	0.3764	1.331	0.5009	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	None available	Site to be disestablished
Eastham Rake (nr Glenburn Avenue); <i>Eastham</i>	3.0186	1.772	5.3490	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
Gardenside / Meadowside, <i>Leasowe &amp; Moreton East</i>	2.1404	1.61	3.4460	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	Site within existing 20mph area with traffic calming	Site to be disestablished
Grange Road West / Grange Mount; <i>Birkenhead &amp; Tranmere</i>	0.2239	2.144	0.4801	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	None available	Site to be disestablished
Holm Lane (nr Overton Way); <i>Oxton</i>	3.1468	1.772	5.5762	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
Home Farm Road / New Hey Road; <i>Pensby &amp; Thingwall</i>	2.7583	1.331	3.6714	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	Site within existing area of traffic calming. Additional guard-railing and road hump considered as part of future SRTS programme.	Site to be disestablished
Houghton Road / Glebe Hey Road; <i>Upton</i>	2.1726	1.464	3.1806	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	School due to close at end of summer term 2009	Site to be disestablished
Pensby Road / Ashlea Road; <i>Pensby &amp; Thingwall</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	Site does not meet minimum criteria of more than 15 children	Potential for refuge island or light controlled crossing under examination.	Site to be disestablished
Poulton Road / Park Road; <i>Seacombe</i>	3.9761	4.781	19.011	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
Rocky Lane / Dee View Road; <i>Heswall</i>	1.9921	8.076	16.0892	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
St Pauls Road /Palermo Close; <i>Seacombe</i>	2.6173	1.772	4.638	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	None available	Site to be disestablished
Thurstaston Road / Herberts Lane; <i>Heswall</i>	3.2793	1.610	5.2796	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
Twickenham Drive; <i>Leasowe &amp; Moreton East</i>	0.3715	1.100	0.1086	Site does not meet new criteria and could be removed	Site within existing 20mph area with traffic calming	Site to be disestablished
Upton Road / Tollemache Road; <i>Bidston &amp; St.James</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	Site does not meet minimum criteria of more than 15 children	Traffic Lights now improved with new pedestrian phase	Site to be disestablished
Well Lane / Albany Road; <i>Rock Ferry</i>	2.1467	2.594	5.5687	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain
Withens Lane; <i>Liscard</i>	2.8944	1.772	5.1289	Site meets adjusted criteria and could remain	N/A	Site to remain

## List of Petitions Received opposing dis-establishment of School Crossing Patrols

Petition Ref	School / Area / Patrol Site	Lead Petitioner	Concern Expressed	Number of Signatures	Petition Addressed
T/Pet/770	Holm Lane/Overton Way	Councillor Patricia Williams	Petitioners disagree with Council decision to remove patrol	241	Yes
T/Pet/767	Well Lane, Tranmere	Headteacher (Well Lane Primary School)	Petitioners disagree with Council decision to remove patrol	512	Yes
T/Pet/773	Eastham Rake/Glenburn Avenue	Mr P Richards (Wirral resident)	Petitioners disagree with Council decision to remove patrol	35	Yes
T/Pet/764	Withens Lane	Councillor Leah Fraser	Petitioners oppose removal of patrol due to overall road safety concerns for children	161	Yes
T/Pet/768	Rocky Lane/Dee View Lane	Councillor Peter Johnson	Petitioners oppose removal of patrol believing road safety, not finance should be the paramount consideration.	273	Yes
T/Pet/771	St Michael & All Angels Primary School	Councillor Tom Anderson	Petitioners feel New Hey Road is dangerous, and has heavy traffic flow with coaches, busses and mini-busses	262	No
T/Pet/769	Various Schools & Patrol Locations within Wirral	Mr Roberts (Wirral resident)	Petitioners oppose removal of patrol due to overall road safety concerns for children	384	In Part
T/Pet/772	Liscard; Sommerville; Sandbrook & Our Lady of Lourdes Primary Schools	Councillor Leah Fraser	Petitioners oppose removal of patrol due to overall road safety concerns for children	2,720	In Part

METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF WIRRAL

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF LAW, HR AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

CABINET – 23 FEBRUARY 2009

## **CONSULTATION WITH NON-DOMESTIC RATEPAYERS**

---

### **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Cabinet and Council of the steps taken to consult non-domestic ratepayers about expenditure proposals for 2009/10

### **2. Background**

- 2.1 The Council is required by Section 65 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to consult “persons or bodies appearing to it to be representative of persons subject to non-domestic rates” about its proposals for expenditure (including capital expenditure) in the next financial year.

### **3. Consultation**

- 3.1 An advertisement was placed in the Wirral Globe on 14 January 2009 inviting interested parties to contact the Director of Finance in the first instance, who could supply them with relevant information, and to submit any comments in writing by the deadline of 18 February.

- 3.2 In addition, separate letters were sent to the following organisations:

Wirral Chamber of Commerce and Industry  
Wirral Investment Network  
Federation of Small Businesses (Merseyside & West Cheshire).

The letters drew their attention to the terms of the advertisement and to the imminent publication of the draft Corporate Plan for 2009/10 on the Council agenda for 5 February.

### **4. Outcome of consultation**

- 4.1 At the time of writing no responses to the consultation have been received, but an up-to-date report will be made to the meeting.

### **5. Financial and Staffing Implications**

- 5.1 There are no financial or staffing implications arising directly out of this report.

### **6. Other Implications**

- 6.1 There are no implications arising out of this report in terms of equal opportunities, ethnic minorities, the elderly or the disabled; nor are there any implications relating to community safety, human rights, Local Agenda 21, planning or social inclusion.

### **7. Local Member Support**

- 7.1 The report has no implications for individual wards.

**8. Background Papers**

- 8.1 Other than published works and the Council minutes, no background papers have been used in the preparation of this report.

**9. Decision Required**

- 9.1 The Cabinet is requested to note this report, to take account as it thinks fit of any responses to the consultation and to inform the Council accordingly.

**Bill Norman**

Director of Law, H.R. and Asset Management

3 February 2009

METROPOLITAN BOROUGH OF WIRRAL

**CABINET – 23 FEBRUARY 2009**

---

## **BUDGET COUNCIL PROCEDURE**

### **1. Executive Summary**

1.1 This report proposes a procedure for the Budget meeting of the Council.

### **2. Background**

2.1 Standing Order 13 provides that the Director of Law, H.R. and Asset Management “shall, prior to the Budget meeting of the Council, consult with the Leaders of each political group and submit to the Cabinet and Council a suggested procedure to be adopted at the budget meeting, but if no such procedure is adopted the normal procedures of the Council in relation to amendments to Cabinet recommendations will apply”.

### **3. Proposed procedure**

3.1 The Budget meeting clearly is different from ordinary meetings and therefore the procedure that is proposed is based largely on that used in 2008, the relevant sections of the Constitution and one or two suggestions made in the light of comments made in previous years. It is set out in the appendix to this report.

### **4. Outcome of consultation**

4.1 As indicated above, the Party Leaders should be consulted on the procedure. Their views will be reported to the meeting.

### **5. Financial and Staffing Implications**

5.1 There are no financial or staffing implications arising directly out of this report.

### **6. Other Implications**

6.1 There are no implications arising out of this report in terms of equal opportunities, ethnic minorities, the elderly or the disabled; nor are there any implications relating to community safety, human rights, Local Agenda 21, planning or social inclusion.

### **7. Local Member Support**

7.1 The report has no implications for individual wards.

### **8. Background Papers**

8.1 Other than published works and the Council minutes, no background papers have been used in the preparation of this report.

**9. Decision Required**

9.1 The Cabinet is requested to approve the Budget Council procedure.

**Bill Norman**

Director of Law, H.R. and Asset Management

13 February 2009

## **COUNCIL – 2 March 2009**

### **BUDGET COUNCIL PROCEDURE**

- 1. Mayor's communications**
  
- 2. Declarations of Interest / Restrictions on voting**  
Note: a letter on what restrictions might apply has been sent to all members
  
- 3. Petitions**  
Note: if a petition relates to the setting of the Budget, the member who presents it should be given the opportunity during the main debate to speak about it, in order that the Council can take account of it in that context.
  
- 4. Matters requiring approval by the Council**

#### **BUDGET**

The Leader will formally move the Cabinet's Budget recommendations, with any additional paragraphs (e.g. those relating to precepts), plus any other minutes from the Cabinet meeting on 23 February that require approval by the Council.

Minutes formally seconded (Cllr Holbrook)

#### **Budget debate**

There will be one debate on the Budget (Cabinet minute xxx). Any alternative proposals to those of the Cabinet should have been lodged with the Director of Law, H.R. and Asset Management by **5.00pm on Wednesday 25 February**.

The Leader of the Conservative Group formally moves his Group's Budget proposals.

Formally seconded.

Any other amendments to the Budget recommendations are formally moved.

Each amendment is formally seconded.

**Mayor calls speakers:**

Councillor Foulkes may request leave to save all or part of his time (15 minutes) until the end of the debate, in which case it will be added to the time for his right of reply (7 minutes).

Councillor Green, speaking to Conservative budget (15 minutes)

Movers of other amendments (7 minutes)

**Note:** if there are several such amendments, the Mayor should consider varying the order of movers to ensure a balanced debate.

Mayor will decide the order of other speakers (3 minutes each).

**Note:** Councillor PL Davies should be allocated 5 minutes by virtue of his speaking on the Schools Budget element.)

**Debate ends** with seconders, **unless** they have spoken earlier:

Councillor Holbrook, seconding Cabinet's budget (7 minutes)

Councillor Mrs Rennie, seconding Conservative budget (5 minutes)

Seconders of other amendments (3 minutes each)

Leader's speech / right of reply (all or remainder of 22-minute allocation)

### **Voting:**

The first vote will be on the Conservative budget, and if it falls .....

The Council votes on any other amendments.

### **Decision**

If all amendments to the Budget fall, minute xxx of the Cabinet will be **taken as approved, without the need for any further vote**, in accordance with Standing Order 7(1).

**If the proposed budget is amended**, wholly or partly, that will be regarded as an in-principle decision, which will automatically come into effect five working days from the date of that decision, **unless** the Leader of the Council informs the Director of Law, H.R. and Asset Management in writing within that time that he objects to the decision becoming effective and provides reasons why.

In such circumstances, the Budget and Policy Framework provides for the Director to call another meeting of the Council within a further five days. The Council will then be required to reconsider its decision, and the Leader's written submission, within a further five working days. The actual position is that a reserve date (**Monday 9 March**) has been set aside for considering any objection by the Leader. At that second meeting the Council can:

- (i) accept the Cabinet's recommendation, without amendment or objection; or
- (ii) approve a different decision that does not accord with the recommendation of the Cabinet, by a simple majority of votes cast at the meeting.

**Other objections**

The Council will then debate, in the normal manner, any objections to other minutes that are subject to Council approval.

**5. Vacancies**

**6. Any other business**

This page is intentionally left blank